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CU submits Rules or Amendments to ANS HQ. HQ sends to BRC Chair, who forwards the submittal to the Proper Review Subcommittee Lead. (See Note 1)

Review Subcommittee Lead distributes the submittal to the reviewers and sets an approximate time for the review and revision period. Subcommittee provides comments to the Lead. (See Note 2)

Review period: Lead forwards comments to CU Rep. ‘Requested’ changes must be addressed before the final BRC vote.
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CU Rep incorporates changes into document and returns it to the Subcommittee Lead.

Full BRC review before final vote. Any requests for substantial changes may trigger further review and modification if endorsement by one or more BRC members is withheld.

Subcommittee Lead forwards (revised) submittal and recommendation to BRC. A summary of changes recommended to the original submittal should be included.

Call final vote on (revised) submittal. Report results to ANS BRC Liaison.

HQ Liaison records vote (in BRC minutes) and notifies the CU Rep as to the outcome.

1 The BRC Chair may appoint a different Review Committee Lead for each submittal to be reviewed, possibly a BRC member who is also a member of the respective CU. The Lead ‘owns’ the review and resolution process; guiding the resolution of comments and communicating with the CU Rep.

2 ‘Comments’ can be either ‘suggestions’ or ‘requests’ for additions, deletions, or clarifications. A BRC member may ‘suggest’ a change but does not require its acceptance for endorsement. Acceptance of a ‘request’ for addition, deletion, or clarification is required for an affirmative vote of endorsement by the requestor.

HQ refers to the ANS BRC Liaison
BRCC: Bylaw & Rules Committee Chair
Review Subcommittee Lead also acts as the Point of Contact for the Constituent Unit.