



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
COMMANDER  
NAVY REGIONAL MAINTENANCE CENTER  
9170 SECOND STREET, SUITE 245  
NORFOLK, VA 23511-2325

4790  
Ser C200/073  
21 Mar 16

From: Commander, Navy Regional Maintenance Center  
To: Distribution

Subj: IMPLEMENTATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3  
(b) CNRMC Fleet Desk Guide (FDG) 741, Corrective Action Request (CAR) Process

Encl: (1) Corrective Action Request Decision Matrix

1. The purpose of this letter is to update the Corrective Action Request (CAR) Decision Matrix to ensure continued commonality in selecting the appropriate CAR Method per reference (a).

2. Review of CAR data has shown a need to revise the current CAR Decision Matrix to better address the differences identified in the Navy's contracted maintenance process. The CAR Decision Matrix, enclosure (1), was developed in conjunction with the RMCs to provide a standardized methodology for selecting the appropriate CAR Method. The matrix has been included in reference (b).

3. The CAR Decision Matrix, enclosure (1), shall be utilized to determine the appropriate level of CAR (i.e., Method); however, the final selection of the CAR method will still remain a judgment call by the RMC based on the circumstances of the events surrounding the specific nonconformance.

4. Additional information on the CAR process can be found in reference (b), FDG 741 at <https://dodcac.portal.navy.mil/navsea/CNRMC/fdg/Documents/avail/741.aspx> or <https://navsea.portal.navy.mil/field/CNRMC/fdg/Documents/avail/741.aspx>.

Subj: IMPLEMENTATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION  
MATRIX

5. Point of contact is Mr. Jon Hillenbrand, Assistant Technical  
Director for Quality, (757) 443-2650 X4174, or by email  
jon.hillenbrand@navy.mil.

  
W. J. GALINIS

Distribution:

MARMC  
SERMC  
SWRMC  
FDRMC

Copy to:

COMPACTFLT N43  
NAVSHIPYD & IMF Pearl Harbor HI (100, 200)  
NAVSHIPYD & IMF Puget Sound WA (100, 200)  
NAVSHIPREPFAC YOKOSUKA JA  
All NRMOS

# CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Area	Method A	Method B	Method C	Method D	
<b>Quality</b>	Any minor nonconformance that can be adjudicated on the spot or within one to three days (depending on complexity and urgency) of discovery or where the remediation cost is ≤\$20K.	Nonconformance where repetitive Method A Corrective Action Requests of similar nature and circumstance have failed to result in a satisfactory product or single nonconformance where remediation cost is >\$20K but ≤\$500K.	A systemic nonconformance where multiple Method B CARs were issued for the same nonconformance, when a previous Method B CAR failed to result in a satisfactory product or a single nonconformance where remediation cost is >\$500K.	In any of the listed situations in which a Method C CAR was ineffective in obtaining satisfactory performance or the event was of such a nature that immediate top level management attention is required to properly and adequately address and correct the nonconformance. Factors to consider are costs >\$1M, significant impact to scheduled completion, multiple areas of failure within the Quality Management System.	1
Failure to properly protect equipment resulting in equipment damage ≤\$20K. Failure to notify government of damage to equipment.	Failure to properly protect equipment resulting in equipment damage >\$20K but ≤\$500K. Repetitive failure to notify government of damage to equipment.	Failure to properly protect equipment resulting in equipment damage >\$20K but ≤\$500K. Repetitive failure to notify government of damage to equipment.	Systemic failure to properly protect equipment resulting in damage to the ship or when the recovery cost is >\$500K.		2
Minor system cleanliness nonconformance that requires remediation that can be corrected on the spot or within one to three days (depending on complexity and urgency) or the remediation cost is ≤\$20K. Failure to properly blank equipment (e.g., wrong material used, failure to maintain a blank/FME log, end of shift cleanup).	System cleanliness nonconformance that was documented via Method A CAR but failed to produce reasonable satisfactory results, repetitive nonconformance related to system cleanliness control or where remediation costs >\$20K but ≤\$500K.	System cleanliness nonconformance that was documented via Method A CAR but failed to produce reasonable satisfactory results, repetitive nonconformance related to system cleanliness control or where remediation costs >\$20K but ≤\$500K.	Systemic cleanliness deficiency that is documented via multiple Method B CARs or where the cost for remediation is >\$500K.		3
Failure to remove blanks which results in damage to equipment/component ≤\$20K and which does not result in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Failure to remove blanks which results in damage to equipment/component >\$20K but ≤\$500K, or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Failure to remove blanks which results in damage to equipment/component of >\$20K but ≤\$500K, or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Systemic failure to remove blanks which results in damage to equipment/component which was previously documented via multiple Method B CARs or where the remediation cost is >\$500K.		4
Performed work on incorrect component (e.g., cut wrong cable, removed wrong pump/valve) where cost to the Government is ≤\$20K and which does not result in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Performed work on incorrect component (e.g., cut wrong cable, removed wrong pump/valve) where cost to the Government is >\$20K but ≤\$500K or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Performed work on incorrect component (e.g., cut wrong cable, removed wrong pump/valve) where cost to the Government is >\$20K but ≤\$500K or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	A systemic failure indicated by multiple instances of performing work on incorrect components and documented via Method B CARs (e.g., cut wrong cable, removed wrong pump/valve) or that results in cost to the Government >\$500K.		5
Any loss or damage to Government material or equipment resulting from work performed where cost to remediate is ≤\$20K and which does not result in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Any loss or damage to Government material or equipment resulting from work performed where cost to remediate is >\$20K but ≤\$500K or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Any loss or damage to Government material or equipment resulting from work performed where cost to remediate is >\$20K but ≤\$500K or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Any repetitive loss or damage to Government material or equipment resulting from work performed where the contractor has been issued multiple Method B CARs or where cost to remediate is >\$500K.		6

# CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Area	Method A	Method B	Method C	Method D
	Any contractor nonconformance resulting in rework where remediation cost borne by the Government is ≤\$20K and which does not result in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Any contractor nonconformance resulting in rework where remediation cost borne by the Government is >\$20K but ≤\$500K or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Any contractor nonconformance resulting in rework where remediation cost borne by the Government is >\$500K.	7
	Personnel performing work that they are not properly trained or qualified with where cost to remediate is ≤\$20K and which does not result in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Personnel performing work that they are not trained, qualified or certified with in compliance to NAVSEA Standard Items and/or Tier 1 references requiring significant adjudication such as a DFS or rework >\$20K but ≤\$500K.	A systemic failure indicated by multiple instances of personnel performing work that they are not trained, qualified or certified with in compliance to NAVSEA Standard Items and Tier 1 references, that was documented via Method B CARs or where cost to the Government is >\$500K.	8
		Work not done but certified complete (isolated incident).	Work not done but certified completed in such volume or significance as to prevent RMC certification of the corresponding Key Event or delay delivery of the ship.	9
	Failure to properly fill out identification tags or properly tag removed equipment for identification.	Loss of Government property where cost to remediate is >\$20K but ≤\$500K or results in delay to a milestone or Key Event.	Repetitive loss or damage to Government material or equipment resulting from work performed where the contractor has been issued multiple Method B CARs or where cost to remediate is >\$500K.	10
	Submission of incorrect PCP, weld procedure or contractor-written work item for re-review after receipt of Government-required changes/revision	Multiple attempts to submit a single incorrect PCP, weld procedure or KTR-written work item for re-review after receipt of Government-required changes/revision	A systemic issue that is documented via multiple Method B CARs for numerous instances of failing to correct PCPs other procedures or contractor-generated work items after receipt of Government-required changes/revision.	11
		Technical authority violations, such as unauthorized substitution of materials or unauthorized changes to ship's systems. Failure to comply with a Work Specification including Tier 0 and Tier 1 references.	Technical authority violations (e.g., unauthorized substitution of materials or unauthorized changes to ship's systems) where the problem results in injury to personnel, system/component failure, or results in missing Key Event dates to accommodate rework.	12

# CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Area	Method A	Method B	Method C	Method D
	Minor Objective Quality Evidence deficiency in documents submitted to the Government (e.g., incorrect pen and ink correction, spelling, use of white out, incorrect data entry, missing signature or data, or inadequate review of PCP/Work Specification).	Lost OQE or an isolated incident of knowingly entering incorrect OQE in a technical work document submitted to the Government.	Multiple instances of entering incorrect OQE in a technical work document that was previously documented via Method B CARs (Systemic).	13
	Failure to make required notifications for (G) checkpoints IAW 009-04.	Failure to make required notifications for (G) checkpoints IAW 009-04 where the inspection or test was accomplished without Government witness.	Repetitive failures to adhere to required notifications for (G) checkpoints IAW 009-04, resulting in re-performance of the checkpoints or rework.	14
	Required work procedures are not present at job site.	Required work procedures are not present at job site and work has been conducted out of compliance with the applicable procedures.	Repetitive instances of work procedures not present at work site and work has been conducted out of compliance with the applicable procedures.	15
<b><u>Safety</u></b>	Flooding as a result of contractor action which does not cause ship to become unstable but causes damage to ship or equipment or where remediation cost to the Government is ≤\$20K.	Flooding as a result of contractor action which does not cause ship to become unstable but causes damage to ship or equipment or where remediation cost to the Government >\$20K but ≤\$500K.	Flooding as a result of contractor action which causes the ship to be unstable, results in loss of a compartment or ship's systems or where remediation cost to the Government is >\$500K.	1
	Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference that results in an occupational injury where a Government or contractor employee requires medical treatment with no lost work days.	Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference that results in an occupational injury where a Government or contractor employee suffers lost work days; employee has work restrictions as result of injury; requires a job transfer; or requires in-patient hospitalization treatment.	Systemic or repetitive Nonconformance with Standard Items or Tier 1 reference that results in an occupational injury where a Government or contractor employee suffers lost work days; employee has work restrictions as result of injury or requires a job transfer; or requires in-patient hospitalization treatment.	2

# CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Area	Method A	Method B	Method C	Method D
	<p>Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference resulting in a minor safety risk (e.g., failure to wear PPE, failure to remove paint 4" from weld, housekeeping violations Shipboard or on Government piers).</p>	<p>Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference poses an immediate or realized threat to personnel safety or danger to ship's equipment (e.g. combustibles stored within 5 feet of hot work), work performed while exposed to a height of greater than 5 feet using an improperly engineered or otherwise deficient fall protection, not wearing PPE during evolutions that could cause serious eye damage, loss of or contamination of breathing air supply respiratory protection that has the potential to injure personnel.</p>	<p>Systemic or repetitive safety violations: hot work, confined spaces, fall protection, rigging or crane operation violations documented via Method B CARs, where preventive actions have not been effective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>
	<p>Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference resulting in improper rigging gear used (e.g., worn, unreadable labels), P-1 Certificate of Compliance not updated or posted. Minor administrative deficiencies such as brief sheet not completed prior to lift.</p>	<p>Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference resulting in rigging gear or crane accident causing damage to the ship, ship's equipment or minor personnel injury. Critical lift brief not conducted prior to lift, operating faulty WHE/crane, use of damaged or uncertified rigging gear. Personnel working under a suspended load.</p>	<p>Significant crane accident resulting in an event such as a derailment, dropped boom, dropped load, crane impact with ship's structure, or serious personnel injury.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>
	<p>Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference resulting in improper use or maintenance of engineering controls (e.g., ventilation not properly tied up or improperly positioned, hot work confinements not properly maintained, scaffolding not in use that is not properly maintained).</p>	<p>Nonconformance with a Standard Item or Tier 1 reference resulting in improper use or maintenance of engineering controls causing uncontrolled spread of a hazard (e.g., smoke/fume migrating into non-work related areas, sparks and slag leaving hot work confinements) not resulting in an overexposure to personnel or damage to equipment &gt;\$20K but ≤\$500K.</p>	<p>Systemic or Repetitive event of improper use or maintenance of engineering controls documented via Method B CARs, or that results in an uncontrolled spread of a hazard causing overexposure to personnel or damage to equipment is &gt;\$500K</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>
	<p>Fire watch not properly trained or positioned. Minor hot work deficiencies resulting in smoldering material extinguished by the fire watch.</p>	<p>Minor shipboard or facility fire, resulting from contractor action, which can be extinguished by the fire watch or ship's force, and is confined to the immediate area of ignition. Hot work conducted without a fire watch in all required spaces.</p>	<p>A shipboard or facility fire, resulting from contractor action, which requires Ship's Force in-port Emergency Response and is not confined to the immediate area of ignition, or requires Fire Department assistance to extinguish. Explosions on-board naval vessels that do not result in catastrophic damage to the ship.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">6</p>

# CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Area	Method A	Method B	Method C	Method D
	Conducting contractor work after failure to isolate the work boundary. Removal of isolation (LOTO, Danger Tags) controls prior to restoring the affected system/equipment to a safe condition, where stored energy exists, resulting in no damage to equipment or potential injury to personnel.	Contractor authorization of the removal of isolation (LOTO, Danger Tags) controls prior to restoring the affected system/equipment to a safe condition, where stored energy exists, resulting in damage to equipment or the potential for injury to personnel.	Contractor authorization for removal of isolation (LOTO, Danger Tags) controls prior to restoring the affected system/equipment to a safe condition, where stored energy exists, resulting in injury to personnel.	
	Electrical shock <30 volts regardless of voltage source (e.g., electrical shock from welding machine).	Electrical shock >30 volts regardless of voltage source.	Repetitive history of electrical shocks that reveal a systemic issue with contractor electrical safety program.	
		Release of any hazardous energy as a result of contractor action, which poses potential injury to personnel or damage to equipment.	Release of any hazardous energy as a result of contractor action which causes injury to personnel or damage to equipment.	
		Failure to implement energized electrical work controls while conducting energized work, including the arc flash requirements.	Failure to implement energized electrical work controls while conducting energized work, including the arc flash requirements, that results in injury, damage to equipment or arc flash.	
	Administrative WAF or tagout issues (e.g., not posted, signed, filled out completely, or description of work to be performed is not clear or well defined) that do not result in work being conducted without boundary isolation.	Tagout violations (removed components with red tags attached) without injury, equipment damage \$50K, or release of hazardous energy. Removing tags from a component. Commencing work without an approved WAF or tagout completed. Clearing WAF prior to work completion except release for operational testing.	Tagout violations resulting in personnel injury or equipment damage >\$50K. Repetitive instances of tagout violations documented via Method B CARs.	
	Entry into a confined space, enclosed space, or other dangerous atmosphere without proper certification.	Work in a confined space, enclosed space, or other dangerous atmosphere without proper certification. A failure to follow requirements as stated on those certificates that creates a hazardous condition (e.g. wrong work process or use of an unauthorized substance).	Entry into or work in a confined space, enclosed space, or other dangerous atmosphere without prior approval which results in injury or need for rescue.	
		Operating Ships equipment resulting in no injury to personnel or damage to Ships equipment where remediation cost is \$500K.	Operating Ships equipment resulting in injury to personnel or damage to Ships equipment or where remediation cost is >\$500K.	

# CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Area	Method A	Method B	Method C	Method D
		Failure to provide report (verbal and/or written) of accident or preserve accident scene.	A significant number or pattern of safety mishaps, injuries, or near misses that were previously documented via Method B CARs.	14
	Temporary service hoses, lines, and leads not properly run, secured, or controlled IAW Standard Item requirements.	Repetitive events of temporary service hoses, lines, and leads not properly run, secured, or controlled IAW Standard Item requirements.	Fire/explosion resulting from temporary service hoses, lines, and leads not properly run, secured, or controlled IAW Standard Item requirements. Systemic safety violations for hot work, line management, or fire zone boundary requirements.	15
	Initial determination of potential personnel exposure to toxic substances per NSI 009-03 requirements not complete, signage not posted, containment not complete.	Work completed without meeting the requirements of 009-03.	Repetitive violations of NSI 009-03 requirements, exposure to personnel resulting from improper removal of toxic/hazardous material.	16
	Deck openings and edges not protected in accordance with Standard Item requirements.	Deck openings and edges left unattended/unprotected or to a fall hazard from exposure to a deck opening or deck edge.	Repetitive issues with deck openings and edges left unattended/unprotected or unguarded and personnel exposed to a fall hazard from exposure to a deck opening or deck edge. Documented via Method B CARs.	17
<u>Environmental</u>	Any spill or discharge to the environment resulting from contractor action that requires the Command to issue a formal report and/or spill message or where remediation costs is \$520K.	Any spill or discharge to the environment that resulted from a failure to follow proper contractor policy and procedures and/or failure to properly report in accordance with laws, rules and regulations. Any repeated spills or discharges to the environment during the contractual time frame. Any spill where remediation costs >\$20K but ≤\$500K.	Any contractor-responsible spill or discharge to the environment that resulted from gross negligence and/or that results in a monetary fine to the Base or Command or which requires assistance from an outside agency or where remediation costs are >\$500K.	1
	Hazardous material improperly labeled, not labeled, or stored improperly.	Improper disposal of hazardous material.	Repetitive violations involving the improper management of hazardous material.	2
	Minor Hazardous Waste deficiencies that are corrected on the spot.	Hazardous Waste improperly labeled, not labeled, or stored improperly.	Improper disposal of Hazardous Waste or repeat violations of improperly labeled or improperly stored Hazardous Waste.	3



# CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

Area Management	Method A	Method B	Method C	Method D	
	Failure to submit schedules in accordance with contract requirements, up to three instances. Failure to meet scheduled contract milestones or Key Events as a result of contractor action/inaction where remediation \$520K.	Repetitive failure to submit schedules in accordance with contract requirements or achieve scheduled contract milestones or Key Events as a result of contractor action/inaction where remediation >\$20K but ≤\$500K, or where availability milestones are missed.	Systemic failure to submit schedules in accordance with contract requirements that were previously documented via Method B CARs, or failure to meet multiple milestones as a result of contractor action/inaction where remediation is >\$500K or where the availability end date is missed.		1
	Up to five non-docking related late reports (e.g., required reports, CFRs) with little impact to the availability.	Multiple (greater than 5) non-docking related late reports (e.g., required reports, CFRs) or docking related late reports.	Accumulation of late required reports, CFRs, etc. that result in a negative impact to the availability or missed milestone dates due to additional work incurred.		2
		Repeated unsatisfactory responses to Method A CARs or demonstrated ineffectiveness of preventive action measures.	Repeated unsatisfactory responses to Method B CARs, continued demonstration of ineffective preventive action measures, or a systemic issue with Method B CARs in the same area.	Continued systemic issues with Method C CAR(s) in the same area indicating ineffective corrective and preventive actions by the contractor.	3
	Event(s) demonstrating ineffective subcontractor control and management exhibited by subcontractor nonconformance with contractual obligations. Failure to direct or take corrective action for subcontractor deficiencies.	Repetitive events demonstrating ineffective subcontractor control and management, exhibited by subcontractor nonconformance with contractual obligations. Demonstration of similar subcontractor control involving multiple subcontractors and indicating deficient Prime contractor action or engagement.	Issued when contractor response (including root cause analysis, corrective action, and preventive action) to Method B CARs fails to produce the desired result.	Issued when contractor response (including root cause analysis, corrective action, and preventive action) to Method C CAR fails to produce the desired result.	4

**Notes:**

- (1) In general, if a nonconformance is discovered by the contractor and is documented in the contractor's nonconformance system, then a CAR need not to be issued by the Government unless the nonconformance results in damage to the ship or injury to personnel. RMC management, at their discretion, may elect to write a government CAR even if the contractor documents the nonconformance in their nonconformance system.
- (2) The RMC Quality Assurance or Safety Department, as applicable, shall ensure each corrective action request clearly describes the nature of the deficiency and that a clear contractual violation exists. Specific paragraphs/subparagraphs of contracts, Standard Items and technical references shall be included to define the nonconformance.
- (3) The term "repetitive" is generally interpreted to mean four or more events of substantially identical nonconformance within a single availability or project and where contractor preventive and corrective actions for earlier events have been demonstrated ineffective. If a trend is indicated by repetitive occurrences, then the RMC should consider elevating to the next higher degree of CAR Method (Ex: after four Method A CARs documenting a repetitive problem, the next occurrence would be documented using a Method B CAR.)

## CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) DECISION MATRIX

- 4) The term “systemic” is generally interpreted to mean ten or more substantially similar nonconformance events documented by a combination of CARs, Unplanned Events, and other attending facts and data. The systemic nature of the nonconformance must be validated by quantifiable analysis, typically conducted by C130. Whenever possible, documentation of systemic issues should be isolated to a single Work Item, single NAVSEA Standard Item, or single NAVSEA PVI/PE Attribute list to keep contractor response and Government administrative burden to a manageable scope.
- 5) In applying either “repetitive” or “systemic” criteria, consideration must be given to the timing of nonconformances. The KTR must be afforded reasonable time for preventive actions to be implemented and have effect. A long lapse between an initial grouping of nonconformance events and a subsequent event of similar nature is more likely indicative of an anomalous situation than a continuation of the original problem.
- (4) Cost is comprised of labor and material and is based on an initial estimate (by the government) of cost to remediate the deficiency.
- (5) A CAR need not be issued where there is a citation or violation documented and issued from an outside organization (e.g., OSHA, EPA, state regulators). These violations should still be tracked and trended for use in CPARs.
- (6) A technical work document is defined as the work procedure that will provide the craftsman with clear, concise and technically correct instructions to complete the maintenance task while conforming to technical specifications (e.g., a PCP or Work Specification).
- (7) This list is not all inclusive. RMCs are expected to identify nonconformances not incorporated into this table. Common, port-wide examples should be identified to CNRMC C/200.
- (8) Each situation is unique and requires management judgment. If an unplanned event (UPE) investigation is conducted for a significant nonconformance, a CAR should normally be issued for the event leading to the UPE, however additional problems and actions identified during the UPE investigation would typically be tracked and reported via the UPE Fact Finding Report in accordance with NAVSEA Standard Item 009-120.
- (9) The RMC Commanding Officer reserves the right to manage the CAR program and issue CARs based on circumstances in their respective ports.