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**Review Completed by**: Roger Metcalf
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Is a secondary code review necessary for this enhancement? YES

If answered “NO”, provide an explanation.

# Secondary Developer Review Item

| Routine Review | Reviewed  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Review code to ensure it meets the current M Standards and Conventions (SAC). | Yes | None |

| Data Dictionary Review | Reviewed  (Yes/No) | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Perform Technical Review of Data Dictionary changes. | No | No Data Dictionary updates |

| **Review of Other Components** | **Reviewed**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Other components may include, but are not limited to, RPCs, input templates, print templates, security keys, menus, options, and mail groups. | Yes | None |

| **Product Build** | **Reviewed**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Are there any features of the Product Build that need to be reviewed?  When determining whether a secondary review of the Product Build is needed consider things like Required Build decisions, Packman versus Host File, environment checks, etc. | Yes | None |

| **Ad Hoc Testing** | **Reviewed**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Are any new features of a complexity that ad hoc testing by the reviewer is needed? | Yes | None |