|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1. Review Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1a. Contractor’s Name: | |  | | | | | 1b. Site Office Name: | | | | |  | | | |
| 1c. Contractor’s Location: | |  | | | | | 1d. Type of Review: | | | | |  | | | |
| 1e. Dates of Review: | |  | | | | | to | | | | |  | | | |
| 1f. PMSO: | |  | | | | | 1g. Org Leading Review: | | | | |  | | | |
| 1h. Process Area: | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| 1i. Contractor EVM System Description & Revision Number: | | | | | | |  | | | | 1j. EVMSD Dated: | | |  | |
| 1k. Date of Preparation: | | |  | | | | 1l. Review Director: | | | | | | |  | |
| 1m. Date Sent to Contractor: | | |  | | | | 1n. Requested Contractor Response Date: | | | | | | |  | |
| PART 2. CAR/DR/CIO Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2a. CAR, DR or CIO: | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2b. Type: | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2c. Guideline: | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2d. Subject: | | |  | | | | | 2e. Attribute # | | | |  | | | |
| 2f. Control Number: | | | [Naming convention for CARs, DRs is Contractor abbreviation, YYMM space CAR[DR] space GL#.Attribute#. Example: Contractor LEMR, written in Sep 2018, CAR  for GL1, Attribute 2 would be LEMR1809\_CAR\_1.2. CIOs are numbered sequentially, LEMR1809\_CIO\_1, LEMR1809\_CIO\_2, etc.] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2g. System Description: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2h. Discussion/Intent: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2i. Findings: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2j. Impact: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2k. Prepared By: |  | | | 2l. Date: |  | | | | 2m. Reviewed By: | | | |  | | |
| 2n. Reviewed Date: |  | | | | | 2o. Out-brief Date: | | | |  | | | | |