

**Manpower & Organization**

**SUGGESTION PROGRAM**

---

\*This instruction implements Department of Defense (DoD) 1400.25-M, *DoD Civilian Personnel Manual*, Subchapter 451, "Awards", December 1996. It gives the directive requirements for the Air National Guard Suggestion Program. This instruction applies to all Air National Guard (ANG) military and competitive technicians, active military members including Traditional Guardsmen, and the Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) members. ANG Title 5 and Title 10 employees fall under the Air Force IDEA (Innovative Development through Employee Awareness) Program and should submit their ideas through their servicing civilian/military personnel flight.

**SUMMARY OF REVISIONS**

\*This revision allows changes from the Air National Guard Directorate of Personnel, Manpower, and Training, Manpower and Organization Division (ANG/MPM) to the Directorate of Plans and Programs, Manpower and Organization Division (ANG/XPM); Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management Policy) to HQ Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs (HQ USAF/XP); from Air Force Management Engineering Agency (AFMEA) to Air Force Center for Quality and Management Innovation (AFCQMI); from suggestion program monitor/remote designee to Suggestion Program Manager; National Guard Bureau Suggestion Program to Air National Guard Suggestion Program; and changes the monetary award scale to align with Air Force's scale. It also provides clarification of Unit Commander's and Suggestion Awards Committee responsibilities; disapproval routing; man-hour savings; award certificates; Zero Overpricing (ZOP) Challenges/Referrals; determining job responsibility and awarding related suggestions; and award reconsideration. An (\*) indicates revision from the previous edition.

	<b>Paragraph</b>
<b>Chapter 1--General</b>	
Purpose.....	1.1
Responsibilities.....	1.2
<b>Chapter 2--Determining Eligibility and Submitting Suggestions</b>	
Suggestion Eligibility Criteria.....	2.1
Submitting Suggestions.....	2.2
Uniform Change Suggestion.....	2.3
Requesting Status.....	2.4
Retaining Ownership Rights.....	2.5
Requesting Reconsiderations or Reevaluations.....	2.6
<b>Chapter 3--Evaluation Procedures</b>	
Evaluating Suggestions.....	3.1
Meeting Total Processing Time.....	3.2
Evaluator Administration.....	3.3
<b>Chapter 4--Authority to Grant Awards</b>	
Awards Approval Authority.....	4.1

Meeting Eligibility for Cash Awards.....	4.2
Granting Cash Awards.....	4.3
Award Types.....	4.4
Paying Awards.....	4.5
Processing Awards Based on Tangible Savings.....	4.6
Determining Job Responsibility.....	4.7
Processing Contributions and Awards by Other DoD Components or Federal Agencies.....	4.8
Requesting Award Reconsideration.....	4.9
<b>*Chapter 5--Air National Guard Suggestion Awards Committee</b>	
Responsibilities.....	5.1
Awards Phase.....	5.2
Membership of the Committee.....	5.3
<b>Table</b>	
4.1. Authority to Approve Awards.....	8
<b>Attachment</b>	
1. References, Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Terms.....	13

## Chapter 1

### GENERAL

**\*1.1. Purpose.** This instruction prescribes policies and procedures for administering and managing the ANG Suggestion Program. It also gives instructions on the submission and eligibility of suggestions, explains evaluation and disposition procedures, and provides guidance for the payment of awards. The use of either masculine or feminine pronouns is intended to include both genders. Awards are based on the merits of the contribution and benefits that accrue without regard to race, color, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, physical handicap, age, political affiliation, or union membership affiliation or participation. Supplementation of this regulation and establishment of local forms are prohibited without prior approval from the ANG, Directorate of Plans and Programs, Manpower and Organization Division, Management Engineering Branch (ANG/XPME). Supplements will not change the intent of the governing instruction.

#### **1.2. Responsibilities:**

1.2.1. The Chief, National Guard Bureau. The Chief, National Guard Bureau is responsible for the overall administration, improvement, and evaluation of the National Guard Suggestion Program. This responsibility has been delegated to ANG/XPME for Air National Guard suggestions.

\*1.2.2. Air National Guard. The ANG/XPME Suggestion Program Manager (SPM) interprets policy and provides guidance to the states'/territories' Human Resources Office (HRO) SPMs. The ANG SPM ensures that the states/territories uniformly apply suggestion policy. Award packages that exceed ANG award approval authority are prepared and forwarded through the Director of the Air National Guard to HQ Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs (HQ USAF/XP). The ANG SPM develops appropriate supplements, policies, and plans; conducts training workshops; decides disputed cases and reports their decisions to management; and reviews direct inquiries from suggesters.

1.2.3. State Adjutant Generals. The State Adjutant Generals are responsible for assuring compliance with program requirements, establishing a State Incentive (Suggestion) Awards Committee, promoting and supporting the Suggestion Program, and ensuring that prompt action is taken on awards.

\*1.2.4. Unit Commanders. Unit Commanders budget for and ensure that the unit promptly pays suggestion awards (5 CFR 451.205(a) (3)), designate a Suggestion Program Manager, and establish procedures to verify that their unit implements suggestions.

1.2.5. HRO SPMs. State SPMs administer and publicize the Suggestion Program; provide advice, assistance, and training to supervisors on the effective use and participation in the program; provide training and/or orientation to all technicians and military members on how to submit suggestions; ensure that all suggesters are kept informed of the status of their suggestion; determine requirements for evaluations and ensure that evaluation is performed within prescribed time limits; and ensure that all suggestions meet eligibility requirements.

1.2.6. Functional Offices of Primary Responsibility (OPR). OPRs receive, control, and evaluate suggestions.

1.2.7. Supervisors. Supervisors help suggesters obtain photographs, drawings, or mock-ups needed to present a suggestion and inform the suggester of the confirmatory rule if the supervisor is the first recipient of the approved separate document.

\*1.2.8. Suggestion Awards Committee. This committee is established at the state HRO's discretion. The Suggestion Awards Committee includes a chairperson, alternate chairperson, military and civilian members from major functional areas, nonvoting technical advisors (as required), and the HRO SPM, who serves as the executive secretary. The committee reviews all suggestions, inventions, and scientific achievements that require a decision on the final award, and when requested, assists the HRO SPM in resolving problem cases and disputed decisions.

## Chapter 2

### DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY AND SUBMITTING SUGGESTIONS

**\*2.1. Suggestion Eligibility Criteria.** Any individual, team, or group within the ANG may submit a suggestion. An idea does not become a suggestion until a person submits it on an AF Form 1000, **Idea Application**, and it meets the following criteria:

2.1.1. A suggestion must outline a specific area for improvement, state a workable solution, and incorporate expected benefits.

2.1.2. A suggestion must be the suggester's own thoughts; however, it may be a new application of an old principle.

\*2.1.3. Suggesters must sign the AF Form 1000, agreeing that the US Government may use their suggestions, once awarded, without incurring further claims by suggesters, their heirs, or any other persons.

2.1.4. Suggestions are ineligible if they suggest a form be developed, revised, or changed without specific proposals for improvement, entail a study of all forms, or result from use of new forms technology (see AFI 37-160, Volume 8). However, if a suggestion identifies a specific procedural problem, it is eligible.

**2.2. Submitting Suggestions.** Suggesters submit and SPMs process all suggestions in English.

\*2.2.1. Group Suggestions. There is no limit to the number of co-suggesters as long as each co-suggester dates and signs the AF Form 1000. After the Suggestion Office accepts a suggestion, a co-suggester may only be added or deleted if all co-suggesters give their consent in writing.

2.2.1.1. Designate one suggester as the "primary contact," who keeps other co-suggesters informed.

2.2.1.2. Suggestions originating from team efforts follow group suggestion procedures in this paragraph and include the statement, "This is a result of a team effort." If all members of the team agree the submission is one person's idea, then all members must sign a statement to that effect.

\*2.2.2. **Confirmatory Suggestions/After-the-Fact.** A suggester must confirm an idea previously offered orally or informally to management by completing an AF Form 1000 and sending it to the unit suggestion manager or HRO SPM within 30 days of first offering the suggestion. Suggesters must send the unit suggestion manager or HRO SPM an AF Form 1000 for ideas offered to management through other management initiative programs (separate improvement processes), such as, but not limited to, AFTO Form 22, **Technical Order Improvement Report and Reply**, and AFTO Form 135, **Source, Maintenance, and Recoverability Code Change Request**, AF Forms 1067, **Modification Proposal**, and AF Form 1046, **Zero Overpricing Challenges/Referrals**, within 30 days of receiving official written approval.

\*2.2.2.1. Suggesters may request waivers to the 30-day confirmatory time limit. The request must be in writing to the SPM and identify the person or organization to whom the proposal was made. Suggesters must provide the reason they were unable to submit an AF Form 1000 within 30 days. Lack of knowledge of the confirmatory requirement is not justification for a waiver.

2.2.2.2. Unit-level managers soliciting ideas or initiatives from employees must notify them of their option to submit a confirmatory suggestion.

\*2.2.3. **Separate Improvement Processes.** Separate improvement processes ideas including, but not limited to, the documents cited in paragraph 2.2.2. above, will be accepted only as confirmatory suggestions. When processing a suggestion to an approved separate improvement process, an AF Form 1000-1, **Idea Evaluation and Transmittal**, need not be completed. Consult the governing regulation of the separate improvement process to ensure that recommended changes go through proper channels. For example, AFTO Forms 135 and AF Forms 1067 have to be sent to and approved by ANG/LGM before being sent onto Air Force. AFTO Forms 22 are sent directly to the Air Force with a few exceptions (see Chapter 5 of TO 00-5-1). Specific guidance for submitting an AFTO Form 22 is found in TO 00-5-1 and guidance for submitting an AFTO Form 135 is found in TO 00-25-195. AF Forms 1067 are used only when modifying aircraft systems or equipment.

\*2.3. **Uniform Change Suggestions.** All suggestions involving uniform changes must be submitted on an AF Form 1000. The Air Force Uniform Board meets once every 4 years. Uniform suggestions approved by the ANG Uniform Board are held until the next Air Force Uniform Board.

\*2.4. **Requesting Status.** Request information about the status of a suggestion from the HRO SPM maintaining the suggestion case file.

2.5. **Retaining Ownership Rights.** The suggester retains “ownership” of a suggestion for 1 year after the date of the final action (the date of approval of an award or written notification of disapproval). When a suggestion is withdrawn, the suggester does not retain the 1-year ownership allowed by this paragraph.

2.6. **Requesting Reconsiderations or Reevaluations.** The suggester must submit a written request for reconsideration or reevaluation to the HRO SPM before ownership rights have expired. This request must include either additional evidence; new material, information, or rationale; a new approach; or clarification of significant issues or questions (disagreement with the evaluation is not justification). This request may be submitted any time during the 1-year ownership period. A new 1-year ownership period begins when a suggestion is reopened. When ownership expires, the same idea may be submitted as a new suggestion.

2.6.1. Any office in the evaluation channel may request further review when a higher level evaluator has misinterpreted, overlooked something, or been vague in the first review. These reevaluations are initiated by, but not limited to, evaluators, SPMs, or quality control representatives.

2.6.2. If an SPM refers a suggester’s request for reconsideration, an evaluator one level above the previous evaluator (within the same OPR function) who made the final decision will do the reevaluation. There should be a new evaluator signing the evaluation in response to the reconsideration request. If there is a second request for reconsideration, it is referred to the next higher level for adjudication. EXCEPTION: The original evaluator may sign the reevaluation if the initial decision is reversed.

2.6.3. When an OPR has disapproved a suggestion but later reexamines and implements the idea within the suggester's 1-year ownership, the OPR completes an evaluation and credits the suggester. If the OPR acted because of directives from higher authority, the suggester cannot be credited, but the suggester is advised why.

2.6.4. When a previous disapproval of a suggestion is reversed within the ownership period, the evaluator or responsible official must make sure the appropriate suggester is credited even if there is no request to do so.

---

## Chapter 3

### EVALUATION PROCEDURES

**\*3.1. Evaluating Suggestions.** Evaluators complete an AF Form 1000-1 for each evaluation.

3.1.1. Both the evaluator and responsible official must sign the form.

3.1.2. To approve or disapprove a suggestion, the responsible official must have the authority to implement the suggestion.

**3.2. Meeting Total Processing Time.** Each evaluation level establishes controls to meet the following evaluation processing times (treat suggestion evaluations like any other suspended correspondence).

3.2.1. Unit Level. Total processing time must not exceed 30 calendar days. Unit processing time starts when the unit SPM receives the suggestion and ends when the SPM notifies the submitter that the suggestion is approved, in concurrent (approval pending implementation) status, being forwarded to a higher authority, or disapproved.

3.2.2. MAJCOM Level. Total processing time must not exceed 30 calendar days. MAJCOM processing time starts when the MAJCOM SPM forwards the suggestion to the MAJCOM OPR and ends on the date the MAJCOM SPM sends the approval, concurrent (approval pending implementation) status, or disapproval to the state SPM, or refers the suggestion to an Air Force MAJCOM for higher level evaluation.

\*3.2.2.1. ANG suggestions disapproved at unit level or ANG level will not be forwarded to AFCQMI/MQDC for evaluation by other Air Force MAJCOMS.

\*3.2.2.2. If a suggestion requires extensive study, testing, etc., the HRO SPM or ANG SPM may grant extensions to complete the evaluation. The organization responsible for the study or test must provide the SPM rationale for the extension and an estimated completion date on or prior to the processing times established by this instruction. The ANG SPM will notify the HRO SPM and the HRO SPM will notify the suggester.

**3.3. Evaluator Administration.** The evaluator should:

\*3.3.1. Check every suggestion for duplication before evaluating it. Since the suggester retains ownership of an idea for 1 year following the final action, the date for determining duplication is the date the first suggestion is received by the OPR at each organizational level, not the date the suggestion was introduced into suggestion channels. If the suggestion duplicates a proposal already under consideration by management, provide a description and the date management initiated the action. Use an AF Form 1000-1 to return any duplicates.

3.3.2. Maintain a workable history file for checking duplications, set up a suggestion file and keep it for 1 year following final action. The physical location of a file is left to the OPR's discretion.

3.3.2.1. If a suggestion indicates the same problem as an earlier suggestion but contributes a different solution, it is not a duplicate and should be evaluated on its own merits. If the solution you adopt combines the proposals of more than one suggestion, base the evaluation of benefits on the respective portions of each individual suggestion.

3.3.2.2. There may be cases when more than one suggestion is received that concerns a similar, particular problem or situation. If they propose different solutions, the suggestion that provides the adopted solution should be approved. In your evaluation, show how the suggestion corrected the problem. Give suggestions without usable solutions an evaluation stating why they were not adopted. Failure to provide sufficient explanation could result in a request for reevaluation by a disgruntled suggester.

3.3.3. Contact the suggester for clarification or additional information, when needed. Suggestions received with incomplete or technical inaccuracies must be corrected by the suggester promptly. The suggester may help by gathering additional data and by preparing separate forms or formats. However, the suggester should never be permitted to write or make direct input to the evaluation.

3.3.4. Request inputs from other concerned functional areas.

\*3.3.5. Be sure to complete an AF Form 1000-1 every time you evaluate a suggestion. Strive to be brief, objective, and factual. However, if the suggestion is complex, include all essential facts necessary to support your evaluation.

3.3.5.1. Address the form to the OPR required to take further action and return the entire file through the functional point of contact to the SPM.

3.3.5.2. Send the original and two copies of the suggestion file when referring it to another office for additional evaluation.

\*3.3.5.3. Make sure the evaluator and responsible official sign the AF Form 1000-1 and include the evaluator's DSN telephone number.

3.3.5.4. Require the OPR at each organizational level to include in his or her comments to an evaluation (which indicates approval, disapproval, or other recommended action) enough information to help the final evaluator make a decision. A statement that the suggestion has merit without rationale to support it is an incomplete evaluation.

3.3.5.5. Emphasize the necessity for meaningful, complete, and accurate evaluations.

\*3.3.5.5.1. Compute tangible savings for your entire organization or unit. Give detailed computations for old and new methods. Separate the man-hour savings from other savings reported. Remember, tangible savings are measurable and should stand the test of verification when required. Man-hour savings must be documented; i.e., will eliminate manpower authorizations or reduce and/or eliminate documented overtime or backlog. If man-hour savings cannot be documented, then they become intangible benefits.

3.3.5.5.2. Give the source used for figures reported (supply documents, office records, etc.). If feasible, furnish a copy. Figures may be based on estimates if the basis for the estimate is provided.

3.3.5.5.3. Do not include any cost associated with conducting the evaluation. Do not use printing costs for publications.

\*3.3.5.5.4. If intangible benefits are used, give a brief explanation of the intangible benefits noted on the AF Form 1000-1, item 4.B.

3.3.6. Do not disapprove any suggestion because:

3.3.6.1. The suggestion is job-related. Don't be concerned with the job responsibility of the suggester. That is addressed separately from the evaluation process.

\*3.3.6.2. You feel the suggestion channel is inappropriate because there may be another prescribed way to submit a particular idea; for example, a technical order change, supply procedure change, civil engineering work orders, or safety improvement. Even though other management programs have forms or procedures to report corrections or

changes, the Air National Guard Suggestion Program interfaces with all of them. It supports voluntary submission of ideas that can improve any government function.

3.3.6.3. There is an existing directive that outlines current procedures. A directive may be changed as a result of an approved suggestion. If approval or disapproval of a proposed change is not authorized at your level, forward an evaluation with your comments and recommendations to the next higher OPR.

\*3.3.7. Implementation of the suggestion is the responsibility of the approving authority. Implement approved suggestions according to the following:

\*3.3.7.1. When written confirmation of implementation is received. **NOTE:** An AF Form 1000-1 may be used for interim as well as final response.

\*3.3.7.2. If the suggestion can be used at other organizations or bases, the suggestion should be considered for mandatory use at each level of evaluation to make sure maximum benefits will be realized. If the suggested idea does not warrant mandatory adoption, it may be adopted for optional use. Optionally adopted ideas are sent, in writing, to users by the OPR.

## Chapter 4

### AUTHORITY TO GRANT AWARDS

**\*4.1. Awards Approval Authority.** State Adjutant Generals may approve cash awards up to and including \$3,000 for locally adopted suggestions only resulting in tangible/intangible benefits or a combination of both. These awards will be reviewed by the State Incentive Awards Program Committee for mathematical accuracy and compliance with this regulation. Cash awards for locally approved suggestions in excess of \$3,000 will be sent to ANG/XPME with a recommendation for the additional award.

\*4.1.1. Awards for approved suggestions that have been evaluated beyond the State level will be returned to the State by ANG/XPME with authority for full payment. All cash awards must be accompanied with an NGB Form 50, **Award Certificate**, or other suitable Award Certificate.

\*4.1.2. The amount of a cash award approved by the State Adjutant General must be determined based on the savings/benefits derived.

\*4.1.3. The Chief, National Guard Bureau, is authorized to approve cash awards up to and including \$10,000 (individual or group), inclusive of awards granted at the State level.

**Table 4.1. Authority to Approve Awards.**

R U L E	A	B
1	If the total amount of the award for tangible savings, intangible benefits, or combined benefits is  Not more than \$10,000	Then the approving authority is  ANG level

#### 4.2. Meeting Eligibility for Cash Awards:

4.2.1. All military members and Federal civilian employees paid from appropriated funds are eligible for cash awards.

4.2.2. Military and federal civilian retirees are eligible if they submitted their suggestions prior to their retirement date.

#### 4.3. Granting Cash Awards. Grant cash awards under the following conditions:

\*4.3.1. ANG or Air Force implements the suggestion or the OPR provides written certification that the suggestion will be implemented he will implement it on a specific date.

\*4.3.2. If the suggestion is implemented locally, you may consider an award for the local tangible savings or intangible benefits. Consider an additional award if ANG or the Air Force implements the suggestion at a higher level for wider application.

\*4.3.3. If ANG or Air Force adopts a suggestion in part or the suggestion causes action to be taken, you may consider, for award, the part that contributed to the action. The evaluation must state to what extent the suggestion contributed to the action.

\*4.3.4. The cash award should be based only on savings to operations and activities supported by appropriated funds. However, you may pay an award when a suggestion saves resources or improves safety conditions of non-appropriated fund activities. The cash award should be based on the final suggestion evaluation.

4.3.5. Suggestions, which result in direct savings to a contractor, are not eligible for cash awards. **NOTE:** Suggestions that alter contracts and result in tangible savings or intangible benefits to the government are eligible for cash awards.

\*4.3.6. Do not grant suggestion cash awards for contributions that have been recognized by another cash award. **EXCEPTION:** The recipient of an invention or patent award is eligible to earn a cash suggestion award for the same achievement. Cases when a suggestion is identified in an employee's annual performance report will not preclude an individual from receiving a cash award under the ANG Suggestion Program.

\*4.3.7. The ANG SPM may consider an adopted ZOP challenge for a cash award. The ZOP case file will include annual demand or consumption rates, old and new prices to validate savings or anticipated savings, and the scope of use (Air Force- or DoD-wide). **NOTE:** When possible, obtain tangible savings; otherwise, an intangible award will be given. The ANG SPM may use a validated ZOP case file as management's verification if unable to compute accurate one-year tangible savings. The SPM will base award payment on intangible benefits and close the case file. The ANG SPM will base the cash award on intangible benefits when ZOP is a result of an error in documentation.

**\*4.4. Award Types.** Recognition may be either a monetary or a non-monetary award, but may not be a time-off award.

\*4.4.1. Monetary Awards. All cash awards are subject to applicable tax rules. Awards differ according to job responsibility of suggester.

\*4.4.1.1. Individual Suggester:

\*4.4.1.1.1. Tangible Savings. Award will be 15 percent of estimated first-year savings, total award will be no less than \$200 and no more than \$10,000.

\*4.4.1.1.2. Intangible Benefits. Award will be \$200 (limited to one award per approved suggestion).

\*4.4.1.2. Multiple (Team/Group) Suggesters. If an individual declines a share of the award, that share will be subtracted from the total award.

\*4.4.1.2.1. Tangible Savings. Award will be 15 percent of estimated first-year savings, total award will be no less than \$200 and no more than \$10,000. Suggesters will share equally in total award. Exception: Co-suggesters will receive no less than \$25 each.

\*4.4.1.2.2. Intangible Benefits. Award will be \$200 per approved submission, shared equally by co-suggesters. Exception in para 4.4.1.2.1. does not apply to this award.

\*4.4.1.3. Suggestions determined to be within job responsibility (see paragraph 4.7. for definition).

\*4.4.1.3.1. Tangible Savings. Award will be 3 percent of estimated first-year savings. (The suggestion must save a minimum of \$20,000; award will be based on entire savings, not the amount exceeding \$20,000). Minimum award is \$600 and maximum award is \$10,000. Consider a non-monetary award for any intangible benefits.

\*4.4.1.3.2. Intangible benefits. Non-monetary award.

\*4.4.2. Non-Monetary Awards. A certificate and/or promotional item valued at \$25 or less.

**\*4.5. Paying Awards.** Pay cash awards for suggestions only for actual improvements and benefits to the Government. Apply awards payment scales equally to all who are eligible for cash awards. To calculate savings and benefits or award payment, always round up to the nearest dollar. Finance awards from the Operations and Maintenance Fund to which the individual was assigned at the time the suggestion was submitted. Meet the Federal regulation (5 CFR 451.205(a)(3)) which requires funding to be available for paying suggestion awards. Use a SF 50-B to pay technicians and a SF 1034 to pay AGRs. Do not pay an award before the final evaluation is approved. You cannot recover an award that is erroneously paid because of management error.

4.5.1. If you know an adopted suggestion will be used for less than a full year, base the amount of the award on the savings and benefits that will accrue during the period of actual use.

\*4.5.2. Except as described in paragraph 4.5., compute savings based on the estimated net savings for the first year of operation. When the improvement has a significant up-front investment (50 percent of first-year savings) but will yield tangible savings for more than 1 year, compute the cash award based on an average annual net savings for 3 years or less unless there is documented evidence of longer life expectancy.

\*4.5.3. Processing Invention and Patent Awards. Process these awards under the provisions of AFI 51-303, *Intellectual Property - Patents, Patent Related Matters, Trademarks and Copyrights*. The Air Force will grant an invention award after an application for a patent or Statutory Invention Registration (SIR) is filed in the US Patent and Trademark Office (PTO). Grant patent awards when the Government issues a patent or SIR or when the PTO issues a notice of allowance for an application covering an invention with an outstanding Secrecy Order. Pay these awards in addition to any awards paid for suggestions or scientific achievements, which result in savings to the ANG, Air Force, or Federal Government, or all.

\*4.5.3.1. AFLSA/JACP processes inventions and patents and authorizes invention awards of \$100 to each inventor and patent awards of \$300 (to be shared equally when there is more than one inventor).

\*4.5.3.2. After receiving the authorization for an invention or patent award from the Air Force Center for Quality and Management Innovation, the ANG SPM initiates action for payment.

#### **4.6. Processing Awards Based on Tangible Savings:**

4.6.1. The OPR must document manpower or work-hour savings to show that the suggestion will eliminate manpower authorizations from the Unit Manpower Document (UMD) or will save work-hours by reducing or eliminating documented overtime or work backlog.

4.6.1.1. A reduction in time to complete a task that will not reduce manning or overtime does not qualify as tangible savings.

4.6.1.2. OPRs must get manpower savings confirmation from manpower officials to support the award. Base savings on "authorized" grades. Support with documentation the deletion of overtime requirements or the realignment of duties to specific positions. When savings affect contracts, the administrative contracting officer will act as the certifying official for manpower or work-hour savings incurred by a contractor.

4.6.2. If available, use unit-labor costs or an estimate using average cost center labor rates to compute work-hour savings. Include in all labor rates the leave and other personnel benefit costs as shown for civilian and military personnel in AFI 65-503, *US Air Force Cost and Planning Factors*. Base standard rates for calculating military work-hour savings on an 8-hour day. Do not include overhead costs.

\*4.6.3. When a suggestion is adopted for optional use or as an alternate method, compute the award based on intangible benefits. EXCEPTION: If another unit implements the suggestion, base the award on total validated tangible savings or intangible benefits. The implementing OPR may survey other bases with like equipment or procedures to determine actual benefits.

**\*4.7. Determining Job Responsibility.** The ANG SPM investigates job responsibility based on the merits of each case. The supervisor makes the determination of job responsibility on a Job Responsibility Determination Statement. ANG needs and encourages suggestions relating to the suggester's work environment.

\*4.7.1. If a suggestion can be implemented by an individual without approval of higher authority, including the reporting official, the action is considered within job responsibility.

\*4.7.2. If the suggester's primary responsibility is to make recommendations on the subject matter contained in the suggestion, the action is considered to be within job responsibility.

\*4.7.3. If a suggestion is developed by a team/group and can be implemented without approval of higher authority, or if the team has been officially chartered, in writing, to make recommendations on the subject matter contained in the suggestion, the action is considered to be within job responsibility.

\*4.7.4. As a general rule, if not addressed above, suggestions from unit level that must be approved and implemented at command or higher level normally are not job responsibility. The same rationale applies for command personnel when approval authority is at Air Force or higher.

4.7.5. All other suggestions are considered to be outside job responsibility.

#### **4.8. Processing Contributions and Awards by Other DoD Components or Federal Agencies:**

4.8.1. Air National Guard personnel may receive cash awards from other DoD components or government agencies. These components or agencies evaluate Air National Guard contributions on the same basis and by the same standards applied to contributions from their personnel.

\*4.8.1.1. When more than one DoD component or Federal agency adopts a suggestion, benefiting agencies fund their pro rata share of the total award. ANG/XPME will obtain benefits derived by each agency.

\*4.8.1.1.1. ANG/XPME prorates the award, advises each adopting component of its award obligation, and furnishes the fund citation to the HRO SPM.

\*4.8.1.1.2. After receiving determination of the Air National Guard share of the award, follow normal award procedures. The HRO SPM must process the award for all shares.

\*4.8.1.2. When another DoD component or Federal agency adopts a suggestion from an Air National Guard participant, the benefiting DoD component or other Federal Agency funds the award.

4.8.1.3. The suggester's agency makes the job responsibility determination.

\*4.8.2. The Air National Guard may also pay other DoD or Federal personnel for suggestions that help its operation. If a DoD or Federal agency suggestion has Air National Guard-wide application, pay the award from funds available to ANG. ANG/XPME arranges for payment of these awards. If it primarily benefits a particular ANG unit, pay the award from funds available to that unit.

**\*4.9. Requesting Award Reconsideration.** The suggester must send a written request for award reconsideration and the HRO SPM must receive that request before the 1-year ownership period expires. The reconsideration request must contain reasons for the review. The HRO SPM will accept only one award reconsideration per suggestion. Since one year is ample time to prepare a reconsideration, only one request will be accepted.

---

## \*Chapter 5

### AIR NATIONAL GUARD SUGGESTION AWARDS COMMITTEE

#### \*5.1. Responsibilities:

\*5.1.1. Responsibilities are established at the State HRO's discretion. The HRO SPM serves as the executive secretary, but is not a voting member.

\*5.1.2. Responsibilities should be made by ANG personnel for ANG suggestions.

\*5.1.3. Include reviewing all suggestions, inventions, and scientific achievements that need a decision on the final award. If the suggestion is approved by the Air Force and the ANG/XPME SPM has negotiated a final award amount with the Air Force (AFCQMI), the suggestion does not need to be reviewed by the Suggestion Awards Committee. The unit must pay the ANG share of the award. A fund citation will be forwarded for the Air Force portion of the award.

\*5.1.4. Include assisting the HRO SPM to resolve problem cases and disputed decisions when requested.

\*5.1.5. Include recommending awards to the awards approval authority (TAG or Unit Commander).

\*5.1.6. Include recommending job responsibility only when requested by the HRO SPM.

\*5.1.7. Include not changing evaluations completed by the office of primary responsibility (OPR). Will review suggestion awards based on the merits of the suggestion.

\*5.1.8. Include ensuring that all suggestion awards are presented in a timely manner, normally within 30 calendar days for military personnel (5 CFR 451.205(a)(3)).

**\*5.2. Awards Phase.** The Suggestion Awards Committee does not evaluate suggestions. The Committee does not get involved until the award phase; they are responsible for determining if the anticipated savings were realized. This is done for them on Air Force-approved suggestions by AFCQMI/MQDC.

**\*5.3. Membership.** To expedite processing and reduce time required for committee meetings, a quorum may review and act on a suggestion (in writing) individually, without a formal committee meeting. A formal meeting will

be required only when there is not a unanimous agreement to approve or disapprove an award or other problems are encountered that cannot be resolved without a meeting. A committee quorum consists of 3 voting members. The chairperson or alternate is considered a part of the quorum. The quorum should consist of at least one member who is qualified in the subject matter.

**PAUL A. WEAVER, JR.**  
**Major General, USAF**  
**Director, Air National Guard**

**OFFICIAL**

**DEBORAH GILMORE**  
**Chief**  
**Administrative Services**

**1 Attachment**  
**References, Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Terms**

## REFERENCES, ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS AND TERMS

### *References*

DoD Instruction 1400.25-M	<i>DoD Civilian Personnel Manual, Dec 96</i>
DoD Instruction 5120.15	<i>Authority for Approval of Cash and Honorary Awards for DoD Personnel, 13 Aug 85</i>
DoD Instruction 5120.16	<i>Department of Defense Incentive Awards Program: Policies and Standards, 15 Jul 74</i>
AFI 51-303	<i>Intellectual Property-Patents, Patent Related Matters, Trademarks and Copyrights, Sep 98</i>
AFI 65-503	<i>US Air Force Cost and Planning Factors, Feb 94</i>
AFTO 00-5-1	<i>AF Technical Order System</i>
AFTO 00-25-195	<i>AF Technical Order Source Maintenance and Recoverability Coding of Air Force Weapons, Systems, and Equipments</i>
Standard Form 50-B	Notification of Personnel Action
Standard Form 1034	Public Voucher for Purchases and Services Other Than Personal.
AF Form 1000	Idea Application.
AF Form 1000-1	Idea Evaluation and Transmittal.
AF Form 1046	Zero Overpricing Challenges/Referrals
AF Form 1067	Modification Proposal.
AF Technical Order Form 22	Technical Order Improvement Report and Reply.
AF Technical Order Form 135	Source, Maintenance, and Recoverability Code Change Request
NGB Form 50	Award Certificate.

### *Abbreviations and Acronyms*

ANG	Air National Guard
AGR	Active Guard/Reserve
DoD	Department of Defense
HRO	Human Resources Office
SPM	Suggestion Program Manager
OPR	Office of Primary Responsibility
UMD	Unit Manning Document
ZOP	Zero Overpricing

### *Terms*

Additional Award--Any award, or series of awards, paid in addition to and after the initial award.

Adoption--A contribution that has been evaluated and approved for implementation.

Award--Appropriate recognition for an approved and implemented suggestion.

Award Reconsideration--Suggester's request for additional review of the cash award amount or when no cash award was given.

Contribution--A suggestion, invention, patent, or scientific achievement.

Duplicate Suggestion--A suggestion that duplicates another suggested solution for which someone holds ownership rights.

\*Evaluation--A functional OPR's analysis of a contribution documented on an AF Form 1000.

Evaluator--An individual assigned by the functional OPR to analyze the contribution.

Extension--Written request to referring activity and originating suggestion office asking for additional time to evaluate or implement.

Final Action--Written notification of award action or disapproval.

Final Approval or Disapproval Authority--Person or office with authority to either approve or disapprove a suggestion action.

Group Suggestion--A suggestion that has more than one suggester and is the result of their combined efforts.

Implementation--A contribution put into use by the OPR.

Initial Award--The first cash award paid for an implemented contribution or management's commitment to implement.

Initial Presentation--Presentation of a suggestion which starts the 30 day clock for confirmatory suggestions.

Intangible Benefits--Benefits which cannot be computed in specific monetary terms.

Invention--A new and useful process, machine manufacture, or composition of matter which may be patentable under patent laws of the United States.

Management's Commitment--Written verification of an OPR's intent to implement.

Mandatory Adoption--An adopted contribution that must be put to use as directed by the OPR.

Manpower Savings--Documented elimination of a manpower authorization from the Unit Manpower Document (UMD).

Partial Adoption--A contribution given credit for contributing to a solution but only part of the suggested idea was used or adopted.

Reconsiderations--Suggester's request for further evaluation on a previously disapproved suggestion.

Reevaluation--Request by any office in the evaluation chain for additional review to help clarify the suggestion or previous review.

Responsible Official--An individual at least one supervisory level above the evaluator who, by his or her signature on the NGB Form 7, ensures that the evaluation is valid, meets requirements of this directive, and is in the best interest of the Air National Guard.

Scientific Achievements--Scientific or technological accomplishment contributing to material advances of the Armed Services or an activity, group, project, or service to the public.

Separate Documents--Forms required by interfacing programs to bring about a change.

Tangible Savings--Savings or benefits to the Government that can be measured in dollars.

Work Backlog--A documented progressive growth in backlog which exceeds the past average workload levels.

Work-hour Savings--Hours actually saved by reducing or eliminating overtime, or amount of time to complete a task covered by a labor standard.