|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S-98 | SM | Annex C |  |  |  | Para C-4-2.7 references MSC 232(82), which does not apply to S-101 ECDIS and may cause confusion, or even be incorrect. Recommend all MSC 232(82) references are re-seated to MSC.530(106). |  |
| S-98 | SM | Annex C |  |  | S-98 Annex C is written in a conversational style, without distinguishing descriptive text from requirements. (IMO uses *should* for mandatory requirements, IEC uses *shall*.) I appreciate this is not a new situation, but it does make it more difficult to identify which requirements require a corresponding S-164 test. In the past, we have used machine tools to parse printed documents to identify requirements, but this is only practical when a standardised style is in use. |  |  |
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