



Your Friendly IG Newsletter

December 2025

AFI 1-2: Evolution of AF Standards and Expectations

AFI 1-2 has evolved significantly in recent years, reflecting the AF's intent to modernize standards, strengthen trust in the profession of arms, and align expectations with an increasingly complex operational and social environment.

From Prescriptive Rules to Professional Standards

Historically, AFI 1-2 functioned as a broad, catch-all instruction addressing professional behavior. Recent revisions deliberately repositioned AFI 1-2 as a foundational standards instruction, emphasizing Airmen's responsibilities as professionals rather than mere compliance with isolated rules. The focus shifted from defining prohibitions to clearly articulating what is expected of Airmen as representatives of the AF.

Trust, Accountability, and Culture

A key change is the explicit linkage between standards, trust, and readiness. AFI 1-2 now underscores how personal conduct—on duty, off duty, and online—directly impacts unit cohesion, public confidence, and mission effectiveness. It

reinforces that standards are not situational and that enforcing them is a fundamental leadership responsibility at every level.

Modernized Expectations for Conduct

AFI 1-2 reflects contemporary realities by addressing online behavior, extremist activity, and actions that undermine good order and discipline. It makes clear that Airmen are accountable for conduct that discredits the service, regardless of platform or setting, aligning professional expectations with today's information environment.

Reinforcing the Profession of Arms

Overall, the evolution of AFI 1-2 represents a deliberate cultural shift. It frames standards as a shared commitment to professionalism, ethical conduct, and mutual respect—essential to sustaining the AF's credibility and combat readiness. By emphasizing values, trust, and leadership accountability, AFI 1-2 now serves as a cornerstone for shaping and sustaining AF culture

- Col Joyce Storm

Retaliation vs Reprisal

Feeling punished for doing the right thing is an issue your leadership and the IG take seriously. Many people think retaliation and reprisal are the same thing, but the Air Force sees retaliation and reprisal as two distinct problems with two different solutions.

It is the job of your leadership and the IG to explain the difference and your options for resolution.

- **Choose the "Reprisal" path if you want formal WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTION.** Your complaint will be investigated by the IG, outside of your chain of command. This process offers legal protection but can take more time.
- **Choose the "Retaliation" path if you want your COMMAND to fix the problem.** Your leadership will address the issue directly to hold the wrongdoer accountable. This is usually the faster option.

The bottom line is that you don't have to be the expert. When you make a report, it is a leader's duty to provide you with these options, giving you the power to decide how your complaint moves forward.

- Ms. Kathleen Soldano



Air Force Inspector General
Hotline: File a Complaint



USAF Inspector General:
File a Complaint



USAF Inspector General:
General Inquiries





From the Top Down: The Critical Role of Service Guidance in Implementing Secretary of War Memos

In the hierarchical structure of the Department of War, directives issued by the Secretary of War (SOW) represent the highest level of policy and strategic intent. These memos set the course for the entire department, outlining new priorities, policy changes, and strategic shifts. However, for these top-level directives to be executed effectively and uniformly, they must first be translated into actionable guidance by the individual service components.

The SOW's Intent vs. Service Implementation

A memorandum from the Secretary of War provides the strategic "what" and "why." It is, by nature, broad in scope to apply to the diverse branches of the armed forces, from the Army and Navy to the Air Force and Space Force. It is not intended to be an immediate execution order at the unit level.

The critical next step belongs to the service components. Their role is to take the SOW's strategic directive and develop the specific "how." This involves creating detailed implementation plans, regulations, and orders that are tailored to the unique operational realities, equipment, and personnel structures of their respective services. This guidance ensures that the SOW's intent is applied in a way that is consistent, safe, and effective for their warfighters.

The Dangers of Jumping the Gun

When lower echelons attempt to implement a SOW memo directly, without waiting for their service-specific instructions, it can lead to significant problems:

- **Fragmented and Inconsistent Application:** Different commands may interpret the broad language

of the SOW memo in vastly different ways, leading to a patchwork of policies instead of a unified standard.

- **Conflict with Existing Doctrine:** A premature local policy might clash with established service-level doctrine, regulations, or technical standards, creating confusion and potential operational risks.
- **Wasted Effort:** Work and resources may be expended on developing local solutions that are later rendered obsolete or incorrect by the official service component guidance, requiring duplicative effort.

Undermining the Chain of Command: Bypassing the established policy-making process can erode procedural discipline and create confusion regarding which orders hold precedence.

Conclusion: Patience Ensures Proper Execution

The principle is clear: directives from the Secretary of War initiate a process, they do not conclude it. Effective and orderly military administration requires that high-level policy is carefully and deliberately cascaded down the chain of command. Waiting for the official guidance and implementation plans from the service components is not a delay; it is a fundamental step that ensures the Secretary of War's strategic vision is translated into coherent, sustainable, and successful action across the force.

- SMSgt Steven Edwards

Waivers Explained: Empowering Leaders to make Informed Decisions

In the Air Force, waivers are a vital risk management tool, informing command authorities of potential conflicts between regulations and mission needs. A waiver is a formal request for relief from specific regulations, highlighting associated risks. This allows command to:

- Accept risks.
- Plan mitigation strategies.
- Document decisions.

Review mitigation effectiveness.

Commanders/directors submit waiver requests through the chain of command. Waivers can be retroactive unless prohibited. A waiver should be requested if strict adherence to regulations negatively impacts the organization or mission, such as when

compliance is infeasible, creates hardship, or hinders mission accomplishment.

Post-waiver responsibilities include:

- Implementing approved risk controls.
- Working toward compliance.
- Re-evaluating risk and adjusting controls.
- Maintaining waiver records.

Waivers empower informed decision-making, enabling command to mitigate risks and enhance mission effectiveness. Understanding DAFMAN 90-161, DAFI 90-161, and DAFI 90-302 is crucial for effectively managing waivers.

- Mr. Paul Dunbar

MICT: Confidence Through Continuous Assessment

The Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT) provides commanders with a powerful, standardized platform for actively evaluating mission readiness and ensuring effectiveness across all levels. Commanders use MICT as the foundation for the Commander's Inspection Program (CCIP) and unit self-assessment initiatives, shifting oversight from reactive inspections to a proactive, continuous evaluation process. With MICT, commanders execute standardized checklists derived from Air Force guidance, and, if necessary, create localized, customized checklists designed to address specific mission requirements. This customized approach guarantees a thorough and relevant assessment tailored to the unit and provides a clear view of the unit's business processes to support the mission.

By effectively utilizing MICT, commanders gain immediate insight into unit compliance and program health, facilitating well-informed, data-driven decisions and optimized resource allocation. A solid MICT program empowers commanders to pinpoint vulnerabilities in program management, subsequently allowing them to strategically align resources to better address mission demands. Moreover, MICT offers Flight Commanders and Flight Chiefs a means to teach junior personnel how to utilize Air Force guidance to manage their sections in accordance with established standards. Consider MICT a valuable instrument that enables the entire organization to identify and achieve the standards the Air Force expects to maximize organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

- Mr. Troy Lillemon