From:
 Jordan, Stephen P (Fed)

 To:
 Moody, Dustin (Fed)

 Cc:
 Liu, Yi-Kai (Fed)

 Subject:
 Re: polishing the CFP

Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 3:28:34 PM

Attachments: <u>CFP v9.2.docx</u>

Dear Dustin and Yi-Kai,

I have given a once-over to the cfp and attached the result (with changes tracked). Most of the changes were minor, with the most substantial change being to the section about defining bits of quantum security. In that section, some of the sentences seemed extremely confusing, so I simplified the discussion somewhat, at the risk of losing some of the original intended nuance. So, I think, amongst my modifications, those are the ones that should be looked at the most carefully.

The level of formality still varies somewhat from section to section, but I was reluctant to do too much heavy rewriting at this point considering that many of the sentences are the result of negotiation and consensus-reaching at previous meetings.

Best regards,

Stephen

From: Moody, Dustin (Fed)

Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 8:00 AM

To: Jordan, Stephen P (Fed) **Subject:** RE: polishing the CFP

From: Jordan, Stephen P (Fed)

Sent: Monday, May 09, 2016 3:57 PM

To: Moody, Dustin (Fed) <dustin.moody@nist.gov>

Subject: Re: polishing the CFP

Could you send me the current word document? I'm not sure whether I have it.

Thanks, Stephen

From: Moody, Dustin (Fed)

Sent: Monday, May 9, 2016 2:28 PM

To: Jordan, Stephen P (Fed) **Subject:** RE: polishing the CFP

Thanks!

From: Jordan, Stephen P (Fed)

Sent: Monday, May 09, 2016 2:04 PM

To: Moody, Dustin (Fed) < <u>dustin.moody@nist.gov</u>>

Cc: Liu, Yi-Kai (Fed) <<u>yi-kai.liu@nist.gov</u>>

Subject: Re: polishing the CFP

I'd be willing to take a crack at it. I'll make sure that changes are tracked so they can be

reverted easily. Best regards, Stephen

From: Moody, Dustin (Fed)

Sent: Monday, May 9, 2016 1:39 PM

To: Jordan, Stephen P (Fed)

Cc: Liu, Yi-Kai (Fed)

Subject: polishing the CFP

Stephen,

Lily read through the CFP one more time, and asked if we can do a once-over on it to polish it up a bit, so it doesn't appear so much that it was written by different people. She mentioned that some areas are very technical and dry, while in other places the writing is more lively and informal. What do you think? We thought you would do a good job of "polishing" the CFP. Would you be able to do so? I don't think it's an urgent priority, but it would be nice to do before we post it publicly in a month or so. Let me know. Thanks,

Dustin