

From: [Moody, Dustin \(Fed\)](#)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: Re: Candidate list
Date: Tuesday, December 18, 2018 7:42:28 AM

Daniel,

Thank you. I agree with your assessment and your advice for how we can do better in the future.

Dustin

From: Daniel Smith (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, December 17, 2018 5:26:08 PM
To: Moody, Dustin (Fed)
Subject: Candidate list

Hi, Dustin,

I would have been happy to keep KINDI, but I think that I would prefer to respect the opinions of those who have consistently wanted it out at this point. It is unlikely that their impressions will be swayed so much to make it or LIMA a strong candidate in the future.

I think it would be best at this point to merely leave ourselves open to influence from new information, since we seem to have established a collective position on the given data. By this I mean that the group position has been consistent. Sort of three strikes and you're out.

I think we need to discuss our decision process in more detail in advance for the next round. What I would like to change is to specify what our priorities are for drawing comparisons for various schemes ahead of time as well as to discuss our target for the next round(if needed). In this round, I think that we did not communicate very well our priorities for use cases and performance. This approach is fine probably for this round, in particular it allows us to keep our options open in a way, but I think we need to be specific in the next round. Also, we had a very ad hoc approach to prioritizing security or performance which I am not sure will be the right approach for subsequent rounds, though it may have been the right approach this time. In short, I think that we have done a decent job with the massive array of candidates given to us, but I think the approach is likely too loose on organization and direction to be appropriate in the future. I want to get this thought out there before it escapes me.

Cheers,
Daniel