

From: David Nelson (HQ-OE) *OE*
To: David Diec; Erasmia Lois; Eva Brown; James Bongarra; Peter Koltay; Phil
Qualls; Ray Gallucci; Renee Pedersen; Richard Dudley; Richard Eckenrode; Sunil
Weerakkody
Date: Thursday, October 09, 2003 9:28AM
Subject: Re: Should vs. Shall *S*

L Dave

✓ >>> Ray Gallucci 10/09/03 09:13AM >>> *MM*

David suggested we have "should" in some of the criteria (Available Indications, specifically) and "shall" in others. I'm thinking we must be consistent and use one or the other exclusively. Comments please. *Release MM*

From: Richard Eckenrode
To: Bongarra, James; Brown, Eva; Diec, David; Dudley, Richard; Gallucci, Ray; Koltay, Peter; Lois, Erasmia; Nelson (HQ-OE), David; Pedersen, Renee; Qualls, Phil; Weerakkody, Sunil
Date: Thursday, October 09, 2003 9:59AM
Subject: Re: Should vs. Shall

You definitely MUST HAVE (shall) available indications. We don't need to specify what they are. I agree with "shall" for all.

<>>> Ray Gallucci 10/09/03 09:13AM >>> *RRR*

David suggested we have "should" in some of the criteria (Available Indications, specifically) and "shall" in others. I'm thinking we must be consistent and use one or the other exclusively. Comments please.

From: Ray Gallucci *RR*
To: David Diec; David Nelson (HQ-OE); Erasmia Lois; Eva Brown; James Bongarra; Peter Koltay; Phil Qualls; Renee Pedersen; Richard Dudley; Richard Eckenrode; Sunil Weerakkody
Date: Thursday, October 09, 2003 4:08PM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Should vs. Shall

I like it - anyone NOT like it? See below.

>>> Richard Eckenrode 10/09/03 04:07PM >>>
How about "if credited to support____?"

✓>>> Ray Gallucci 10/09/03 01:07PM >>>

All feedback so far is to use "shall" exclusively. To account for Dave's feeling that the Available Indications criteria is too strong with shall, how about the following change:

Available Indications

Diagnostic indication, **IF CREDITED** to support operator manual actions, shall be capable of: