### Section C. Decision Review Officer (DRO) Review Process

#### Overview

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In This Section | This section contains the following topics: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Topic Name |
| 1 | Overview of the DRO Review Process |
| 2 | DRO Duties and Responsibilities |
| 3 | DRO Jurisdiction and Authority |
| 4 | *De Novo* Review |
| 5 | Informal Conferences |
| 6 | Making the Decision |
| 7 | Exhibit 1: Informal Conference Report |
| 8 | Exhibit 2: Appeals Satisfaction Notice |

#### 1. Overview of the DRO Review Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | June 5, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. DRO Review Process | The table below describes the stages of the Decision Review Officer (DRO) review process. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stage | Description |
| 1 | The appellant elects the DRO review process. |
| 2 | The DRO conducts a *de novo* review of the prior decision.  ***Reference***: For more information on *de novo* review, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.4. |
| 3 | Based on a review of the evidence of record, is there enough evidence to make a new decision?   * If yes, the DRO makes a new decision. * If no, the DRO * pursues additional evidence considered necessary to resolve the claim, and/or * conducts an informal conference to obtain additional evidence from the appellant and his/her representative. |
| 4 | Based on evidence gathered, the DRO   * upholds or overturns the original decision * works with the appellant and his/her representative to * identify and clarify the issue(s), and * fully explain the decision in an effort to resolve the appellant’s disagreement, and * begins to prepare the appeal for Board of Veterans’ Appeals (BVA) review by sending a Statement of the Case (SOC), unless there is a full grant of the benefit(s) sought.   ***Reference***: For more information on sending an SOC, see M21-1, Part I, 5.D.3. |

#### 2. DRO Duties and Responsibilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction | This topic contains information on DRO duties and responsibilities, including   * DRO duties * Veterans Service Center Manager (VSCM) or Pension Management Center (PMCM) duties * DRO work measurement responsibilities * which work measurement codes apply to DRO actions, and * the acting DRO. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | December 3, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. DRO Duties | The table below lists the duties of a Decision Review Officer (DRO).  ***Notes***:   * The DRO is a member of the appeals team and the appeals team coach may assign work to the DRO. * The composition of the local appeals team may vary. At some regional offices (ROs), the team may consist of only DROs, while at others, it may include * DROs * Rating Veterans Service Representatives (RVSRs) * Veterans Service Representatives (VSRs), and * Claims Assistants. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Duty | Description |
| 1 | Hold informal conferences and formal hearings. |
| 2 | Evaluate the evidence of record, including the need for additional evidence as a result of information obtained during the conference or hearing. |
| 3 | Make a decision based on the entire evidentiary record. |
| 4 | Make direct contact with appellants and their representatives. |
| 5 | Provide feedback to each RVSR as to the cases handled and appealed without regard to whether the decision was   * upheld * reversed, or * modified. |
| 6 | Perform Master Rating Specialist duties, including   * acting as a resource for other employees, and * directing management of the appellate workload. |
| 7 | Play a central role in employee development, including   * mentoring new rating specialists or appeals rating activity employees * participating in the training of RVSRs * coordinating training opportunities with BVA and local medical centers, and * providing feedback to Compensation Service or Pension and Fiduciary Service managers at all levels. |
| 8 | Certify and coordinate the transfer of appeals to BVA. |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Reference***: For more information on the definition of DRO, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.c. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| b. VSCM or PMCM Duties | The Veterans Service Center Manager (VSCM) or Pension Management Center Manager (PMCM) (or assistant VSCM or PMCM)   * may exercise all duties and authorities of the DRO * assigns duties that are appropriate to the DRO’s grade level and position, as time allows, provided such duties do not conflict with the DRO’s status as an impartial and independent decision maker * appoints acting DROs during the temporary absence or disqualification of a DRO, and * assigns a rating or authorization panel, whose members did not participate in the decision, to hold a personal hearing in * cases where the traditional appellate review process has been elected by the appellant, and * unusual or emergency circumstances. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| c. DRO Work Measurement Responsibilities | The DRO   * maintains an accurate record of the actual hours spent performing DRO duties at different ROs, should the need arise, and * prepares a report for the VSCM, PMCM, or appeals team coach at the RO where the service was performed.   ***Note***: ROs borrow or loan the corresponding amount of time. Charge the DRO’s time against the cost center for the rating activity. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| d. Which Work Measurement Codes Apply to DRO Actions | Use the table below to determine which work measurement codes to take when completing DRO actions. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| If … | Then take end product (EP) … |
| * the appellant did not elect *de novo* review, and * the appeals rating activity * prepares an SOC, or * issues a full grant of the benefit(s) sought on appeal | 172. |
| a DRO holds an informal conference and no further action is required | 173.  ***Note***: Annotate the informal conference report when taking the EP. |
| a DRO   * conducts a *de novo* review and issues a decision * prepares a clear and unmistakable error (CUE) decision, and/or * holds a traditional hearing | 174. |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Note***:Complete EP credit continues to be recorded by the RO having jurisdiction of the claim. Maintain these reports under RCS VB-1, Part 1, Item 13-005.000.  ***References***:For more information on   * the definition of *de novo* review, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.e, and * which EP credit to take, see M21-4, Appendix C. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| e. Acting DRO | When the DRO is temporarily absent or disqualified because he/she participated in the decision under review and there are no other qualified DROs available, the VSCM or PMCM of the RO where the hearing is scheduled appoints an acting DRO.  The acting DRO   * shall have considerable understanding of the issue that is the subject of the hearing * shall not be less than a GS-12, except in extraordinary circumstances, and * cannot have participated in the decision being reviewed. |

#### 3. DRO Jurisdiction and Authority

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction | This topic contains information on DRO jurisdiction and authority, including   * DRO jurisdiction over appellate issues * DRO jurisdiction over downstream issues * when a decision on a downstream issue confers new appeal rights * issues not under the jurisdiction of the DRO * the jurisdiction of the visiting DRO * DRO decisional authority * DRO authority in subsequent hearing request * DRO requirement to follow BVA decisions, and * prohibition on DRO bargaining. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | June 5, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. DRO Jurisdiction Over Appellate Issues | Once the DRO assumes jurisdiction of a case, he/she works in partnership with the appellant and representative to resolve all issues covered by the notice of disagreement (NOD) in accordance with the laws and facts in that particular case.  The appeal remains with the DRO until it is forwarded to BVA.  ***Notes***: The DRO has   * *de novo* review jurisdiction only over appeals for benefits governed by * [38 CFR Part 3](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=8c7082e19cda14a9b27a827ad4957667&mc=true&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title38/38cfr3_main_02.tpl), and * [38 CFR Part 4](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=589e2f39e8c9bc479b92c6244d3eccc4&mc=true&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title38/38cfr4_main_02.tpl) * limited jurisdiction over a rating issue raised during an informal conference or formal hearing, provided the issue was part of the rating decision that is the subject of the hearing, and * no jurisdiction over an appeal on a rating decision made by the DRO him/herself.   ***Important***: The DRO must review the record to ensure that any issues that are inextricably intertwined with the issue(s) on appeal are addressed.  ***Reference***: For more information on the definition of inextricably intertwined, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.g. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| b. DRO Jurisdiction Over Downstream Issues | When a DRO issues a favorable decision on an appealed issue, the DRO assumes jurisdiction over and decides any downstream issues, including   * disability evaluation * effective date, and * any inferred or ancillary issues that are encompassed by that favorable decision.   ***Important***: The *de novo* review of a downstream issue must be conducted by a DRO who *did not* render the initial decision on the downstream issue.  ***References***: For more information on   * the definition of downstream issues, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.f * when a decision on a downstream issue confers new appeal rights, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.3.c * considering subordinate or ancillary issues, see M21-1, Part III, Subpart iv, 6.B.2 * ancillary benefits, see M21-1, Part IX, Subpart i * handling new issues raised on a substantive appeal, see M21-1, Part I, 5.E.3, and * review of benefit claims decisions, see [38 CFR 3.2600](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=566fabcd995e6f673a6316e625055acc&node=se38.1.3_12600&rgn=div8). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **c. When a Decision on a Downstream Issue Confers New Appeal Rights** | Use the table below to determine whether a decision made on a downstream issue confers new appeal rights. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **If the appeal is for…** | **And…** | **Then** |
| service connection (SC) for a disability | the DRO renders a full grant  ***Note***: When the underlying appeal action is contesting SC, there are no partial grants. | * the grant of SC satisfies the underlying appeal action, and * the evaluation and effective date are separately appealable issues.   ***Note***: A new, timely NOD is required to appeal any issue impacted by the grant of SC. |
| evaluation of a service-connected (SC) disability | the DRO renders a full grant | * the grant of the increased evaluation satisfies the underlying appeal action, and * the evaluation(s) and effective date(s) are separately appealable issues.   ***Note***: A new, timely NOD is required to appeal any issue impacted by the grant of the increased evaluation. |
| evaluation of an SC disability | the DRO renders a partial grant | * the underlying appeal action remains contested, and * the evaluation and effective date are *not* separately appealable issues.   ***Note***: This includes when SC is established on the basis of aggravation and the Veteran alleges a higher evaluation would result from a different theory of SC, such as direct or secondary. |

|  |
| --- |
| ***References***: For more information on   * the definition of a full grant, for appeals of evaluations in addition to appeals for SC, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.h * the definition of a partial grant of an appellate issue, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.i * the definition of a downstream issue, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.f, and * timely NODs, see M21-1, Part I, 5.B.2. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| d. Issues Not Under the Jurisdiction of the DRO | The DRO does *not* have jurisdiction over   * Committee on Waivers and Compromises (COWC) issues * loan guaranty * insurance, and * hearing requests concerning a denial of benefits from a medical determination rendered by a Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) medical activity for * clothing allowance * automobile and adaptive equipment, and * specially adapted housing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| e. Jurisdiction of the Visiting DRO | If the DRO at the host RO participated in the decision being reviewed, a visiting DRO may be requested to hold hearings or conduct *de novo* review. The visiting DRO will render a decision in such claims, but not maintain jurisdiction of the appeal.   * ***Important***:The VSCM or PMCM at each RO has the authority to grant the issue on appeal based on a *de novo* review or clear and unmistakable error (CUE) without referral to the visiting DRO. The VSCM or PMCM is *not* permitted to delegate this authority to anyone else.   ***Note***: Submit a written request to Compensation Service or Pension and Fiduciary Service when a specific delegation of the VSCM’s or PMCM’s authority is necessary. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| f. DRO Decisional Authority | The DRO may   * amend, reverse, or modify a decision * based on *de novo* review, or * based upon new evidence, or * exercise single signature CUE authority.   ***Exceptions***:   * Unless a CUE exists, the DRO cannot revise the decision in a manner that is less advantageous to the appellant than the decision under review. * VSCM or PMCM signature is required for all decisions citing a CUE if the decision involves * reduction of SC evaluation(s), or * severance of SC for a disability(ies).   ***Note***: The VSCM’s or PMCM’s signature is required on the rating even if the reduction or severance based on a CUE would not cause a reduction or termination of total benefits paid.  ***References***: For more information on   * DRO decisional authority, see [38 CFR 3.2600](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=566fabcd995e6f673a6316e625055acc&node=se38.1.3_12600&rgn=div8), and * CUEs, see M21-1, Part III, Subpart iv, 2.B.5. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| g. DRO Authority in Subsequent Hearing Request | The DRO has *no* authority to participate in a formal hearing if he/she participated in the decision now under appeal.  ***Example***: If the DRO issued or second-signed the rating decision on appeal, the DRO does *not* have authority to conduct a hearing requested in connection with the NOD.  ***Reference***: For more information on authority to conduct hearings, see   * [38 CFR 3.103(c)(1)](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=566fabcd995e6f673a6316e625055acc&node=se38.1.3_1103&rgn=div8), and * M21-1, Part I, 4.1. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| h. DRO Requirement to Follow BVA Decisions | A BVA decision is binding; therefore, the DRO is required to follow a BVA decision for an individual claim and *cannot* recommend a change based on *de novo* review authority.  ***Exception***: A DRO is *not* bound by a BVA decision if new and material evidence is received and requires a different decision. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i. Prohibition on DRO Bargaining | A DRO cannot make a bargain with an appellant or his/her representative by requesting or requiring him/her to withdraw a claim or take any action in exchange for the granting of any benefit.  ***Example***: A DRO cannot tell an appellant’s representative that she will grant a 50-percent evaluation for posttraumatic stress disorder if the appellant withdraws the claim for secondary SC for hypertension.  ***Important***:A DRO is *not* prohibited, however, from   * discussing the lack of merit in any particular case, or * from encouraging the claimant or his/her representative to withdraw a meritless appeal. |

#### 4. *De Novo* Review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction | This topic contains information on a ***de novo* review,** including   * who may receive a *de novo* review * who conducts a *de novo* review * what may be reviewed during a *de novo* review, and * *de novo* review of contested claims. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | January 22, 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Who May Receive a *De Novo* Review | An appellant has a right to *de novo* review of his/her claim if he/she files a timely NOD with the decision on a benefit claim, and ***either***   * requests *de novo* review at the time of submission of NOD, or * requests *de novo* review within 60 days of the date VA sends the notice of the right to *de novo* review.   ***Notes***:   * The 60-day time limit *cannot* be extended. * An appellant *cannot* have more than one *de novo* review of the issue on appeal.   ***References***: For more information on   * *de novo* review, see * [38 CFR 3.2600](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=76786917085047bf038898ea382039ed&mc=true&node=se38.1.3_12600&rgn=div8), and * M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.i * definition of appellant, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.a * DRO jurisdiction and authority, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.3, and * downstream issues, see * M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.f, and * M21-1, Part I, 5.C.3. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| b. Who Conducts a *De Novo* Review | At VA discretion, the *de novo* review is conducted by the   * VSCM * PMCM, or * DRO.   ***Note***: Only an individual who did *not* participate in the original decision being appealed may conduct the *de novo* review.  ***References***: For more information on   * who conducts a *de novo* review, see [38 CFR 3.2600](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=566fabcd995e6f673a6316e625055acc&node=se38.1.3_12600&rgn=div8) * DRO jurisdiction and authority, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.3 * acting DROs, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.2.e, and * visiting DROs, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.3.e. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| c. What May Be Reviewed During a *De Novo* Review | Review only those decisions that have not become final by   * appellate decision, or * failure to timely appeal.   The review will encompass *only* the decision with which the appellant has expressed disagreement in the NOD. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| d. *De Novo* Review of Contested Claims | The DRO, VSCM designee, or PMCM designee conducts one hearing or *de novo* review for each of the different appellants in contested claims.  In some cases, the appellant requests a hearing or *de novo* review but does not live in the same jurisdiction as the station having jurisdiction over the appeal.  The table below describes the process for reviewing contested claims when the appellant does not live in the same jurisdiction as the station having jurisdiction over the appeal. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Stage | Who Is Responsible | Description |
| 1 | DRO/VSCM/PMCM at RO closest to the appellant’s residence | * Holds a hearing * prepares a transcript * uploads the transcript into the appropriate electronic claims folder (eFolder), and * provides notification to the DRO/VSCM/PMCM at the station with jurisdiction over the appeal once the transcript is uploaded.   ***Reference***: For more information on uploading documents into the eFolder, see the [*VBMS User Guide*](http://vbaw.vba.va.gov/VBMS/docs/VBMS_Release_8_1_UserGuide_UsersEdition.pdf). |
| 2 | DRO/VSCM/PMCM with jurisdiction over the appeal | * Reviews the transcript, and * makes a decision. |

#### 5. Informal Conferences

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction | This topic contains information on an informal conference, including   * the purpose of an informal conference * when to schedule and conduct an informal conference * requesting, canceling, or rescheduling an informal conference * where and how to conduct an informal conference * who may attend an informal conference * presenting evidence during an informal conference * the Informal Conference Report, and * handling new issues raised during an informal conference. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | June 5, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Purpose of an Informal Conference | The purpose of an informal conference is to   * clarify the issues the appellant wishes to appeal * provide explanations regarding * the rating decision(s) * which evidence was considered, and * how the evidence was considered, and * identify additional sources of pertinent information.   ***Reference***: For more information on the definition of informal conference, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.j. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| b. When to Schedule and Conduct an Informal Conference | Informal conferences are scheduled and conducted at the discretion of the DRO. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| c. Requesting, Canceling or Rescheduling an Informal Conference | A claimant may request, cancel or reschedule an informal conference in writing, by e-mail, by fax, by telephone, or in person.  ***Important***:If the claimant communicates by telephone or in person, the DRO or employee receiving the request should promptly complete a *VA Form 27-0820, Report of General Information,* to document the request. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| d. Where and How to Conduct an Informal Conference | Conduct an informal conference   * in person at the station * of jurisdiction, or * nearest to the appellant’s residence * by telephone, or * by videoconference.   Informal conferences may be conducted in work areas as long as all participants agree on the location. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| e. Who May Attend an Informal Conference | The appellant and his/her representative may attend an informal conference at their discretion.  ***Note***: If the appellant’s representative is an attorney, emphasize   * the informality of the conference * that rules of evidence do *not* apply, and * that leading questions are permissible. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| f. Presenting Evidence During an Informal Conference | During an informal conference, the appellant or his/her representative may   * introduce evidence into the record, and * make arguments and contentions with respect to the facts and applicable law. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| g. Informal Conference Report | Use the *Informal Conference Report* to   * document the informal conference, and * describe * all the issues in detail (***Example***: The Veteran seeks a rating increase from 50 percent to 70 percent for posttraumatic stress disorder.) * specific additional evidence required * a summary of the discussion during the informal conference, and * the course of action agreed upon by the parties.   ***Note***: The *Informal Conference Report* should be placed in the claims folder.  ***Reference***: For a sample of the *Informal Conference Report*, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.7. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| h. Handling New Issues Raised During an Informal Conference | If a new issue is raised during the informal conference and a decision on that issue has not been made, refer it to the appropriate activity for development and a decision. |

#### 6. Making the Decision

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introduction | This topic contains information on making the decision, including   * considering the *Informal Conference Report* * the VSCM’s or PMCM’s responsibility for the quality of the DRO’s decision * the decision to * award full benefits * award partial benefits, and * uphold the previous decision * implementing the decision, and * the appellant withdrawing the NOD. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | June 5, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. The Informal Conference Report | Consider the information recorded in the *Informal Conference Report* when making a new decision.  ***Reference***: For a sample of the *Informal Conference Report*, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.7. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| b. VSCM’s or PMCM’s Responsibility for the Quality of the DRO’s Decision | The VSCM or PMCM is responsible for the quality of decisions in the Veterans Service Center (VSC). This responsibility extends to ensuring that DROs properly apply all laws, regulations, and instructions to decisions rendered.  In some cases, where the VSCM or PMCM disagrees with the substantive decision of a DRO, the VSCM or PMCM may   * request reconsideration in the decision, or * seek an advisory opinion, administrative review, or administrative appeal.   ***Important***: The VSCM or PMCM may *not* direct a change in the DRO decision   * unless a CUE is cited, and * the existing DRO decision would * reduce an SC evaluation(s), or * sever SC for a disability(ies).   ***References***: For more information on   * requesting advisory opinions, see M21-1, Part III, Subpart vi, 1.A.2 * requesting administrative reviews, see M21-1, Part III, Subpart vi, 1.A.3 * administrative appeals, see M21-1, Part I, 5.J.2, and * preparing a CUE decision, see M21-1, Part III, Subpart iv, 2.B.4. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| c. Decision to Award Full Benefits | If all benefits sought are awarded for the entire period covered by the appeal   * consider the appeal resolved * advise the appellant that the appeal is considered resolved, and * update Veterans Appeals Control and Locator System (VACOLS).   The decision notice *must* be comprehensive and include   * a discussion of evaluations, as necessary * a discussion of effective dates, as necessary, and * a statement that the decision * is an award of all benefits sought on appeal, and * the appeal is considered satisfied in full.   ***Note***: When SC is the issue under appeal, a grant of SC, regardless of the evaluation, satisfies the appeal in full.  ***References***: For more information on   * appeals, see [38 CFR 3.2600](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=566fabcd995e6f673a6316e625055acc&node=se38.1.3_12600&rgn=div8), *Review of Benefit Claims Decisions*, and * definition of full grant, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.h. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| d. Decision to Award Partial Benefits | The DRO may make a decision that awards the benefit in part but which *may*still require an SOC/SSOC.  In this case, the DRO   * sends the appellant the * new rating decision * an SOC/SSOC * the *Appeals Satisfaction Notice*, and * notice of appeal rights. * makes every attempt to contact the appellant and the representative directly to explain his/her decision and the options available.   ***Note***: If the appellant withdraws the appeal prior to receiving an SOC, the DRO does not have to send the appellant an SOC. In cases where the conference is conducted by telephone, written confirmation of the withdrawal must be made.  ***Example 1***:A Veteran files an NOD with a decision denying an increased evaluation for a knee condition. After a review of the record, the DRO decides to award a partial rating increase. The DRO prepares a   * decision that will implement the rating increase, and * an SOC.   The SOC is required unlessthe appellant has withdrawn the appeal.  ***Example 2***: A Veteran files NODs with two decisions. The DRO decides to grant one of the claims, but deny the other. The DRO prepares a   * decision that will implement the award, and * an SOC for the claim that was denied.   ***References***: For more information on   * the definition of partial grant, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.1.i * the *Appeals Satisfaction Notice*, see M21-1, Part I, 5.C.8.a and * sending an SOC, see M21-1, Part I, 5.D. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| e. Decision to Uphold Previous Decision | If the DRO confirms the previous decision, he/she sends   * an SOC * confirming the decision on appeal, and * explaining the reasons and bases for the VA decision, and * *VA Form 9, Appeal to Board of Veterans’ Appeals,* to the appellant.   ***Reference***: For more information on issuing an SOC, see M21-1, Part I, 5.D.3. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| f. Implementing the Decision | The DRO routes the completed decision to the appropriate activity for implementation.  ***Important***: A DRO’s decision is final and binding on all ROs and is not subject to revision on the same factual basis, except by BVA or as provided under [38 CFR 3.105(a)](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=566fabcd995e6f673a6316e625055acc&node=se38.1.3_1105&rgn=div8). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| g. Appellant Withdrawing the NOD | If an appellant contacts the DRO by telephone to indicate satisfaction with the decision and a desire to withdraw his/her NOD, the DRO must   * explain VA’s need to obtain written confirmation of the withdrawal, and * inform the appellant that an SOC/Supplemental Statement of the Case (SSOC) will be sent if written confirmation is not received in 10 business days.   If the DRO does not receive written confirmation within 10 business days, he/she issues an SOC.  ***Note***: An appellant and/or his/her representative may withdraw an appeal at any time, subject to the restrictions of [38 CFR 20.204](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=566fabcd995e6f673a6316e625055acc&node=se38.2.20_1204&rgn=div8).  ***Reference***: For more information on withdrawing an NOD, see M21-1, Part I, 5.A.3. |

#### 7. Exhibit 1: Informal Conference Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | August 4, 2009 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Informal Conference Report | An example of an *Informal Conference Report* is below. |

|  |
| --- |
| Short description:  Informal Conference Report  Long description:  Form used by the DRO to document an informal conference with an appellant. |

#### 8. Exhibit 2: Appeals Satisfaction Notice

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Date | September 22, 2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Appeals Satisfaction Notice | A sample of the *Appeals Satisfaction Notice* is below. |

|  |
| --- |
| Short Description: Appeals Satisfaction Notice  Long Description:  Document to be completed by appellants to inform VA that they are satisfied with the decision made on their appeal. |