

**From:** [Chen, Lily \(Fed\)](#)  
**To:** [Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob \(Fed\)](#); [Moody, Dustin \(Fed\)](#); [Kerman, Sara J. \(Fed\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Perlner, Ray \(Fed\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Slides  
**Date:** Monday, December 4, 2017 4:20:00 PM

---

That is all right. We can stay on 82.

Lily

---

**From:** Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 04, 2017 4:05 PM  
**To:** Moody, Dustin (Fed) <[dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)>; Chen, Lily (Fed) <[lily.chen@nist.gov](mailto:lily.chen@nist.gov)>; Kerman, Sara J. (Fed) <[sara.kerman@nist.gov](mailto:sara.kerman@nist.gov)>  
**Cc:** Perlner, Ray (Fed) <[ray.perlner@nist.gov](mailto:ray.perlner@nist.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Slides

I Tweeted today about the down to 80 since people wanted a breakdown by basic problem category and nobody seemed perturbed by that difference.

---

**From:** "Moody, Dustin (Fed)" <[dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)>  
**Date:** Monday, December 4, 2017 at 4:03 PM  
**To:** "Chen, Lily (Fed)" <[lily.chen@nist.gov](mailto:lily.chen@nist.gov)>, "Kerman, Sara J. (Fed)" <[sara.kerman@nist.gov](mailto:sara.kerman@nist.gov)>  
**Cc:** "Perlner, Ray (Fed)" <[ray.perlner@nist.gov](mailto:ray.perlner@nist.gov)>, "Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)" <[jacob.alperin-sheriff@nist.gov](mailto:jacob.alperin-sheriff@nist.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Slides

He is right, however we've already publicly said 82, so it might be simplest to just stick to that. In future updates we can clarify.

Dustin

----- Original Message -----

From: "Chen, Lily (Fed)" <[lily.chen@nist.gov](mailto:lily.chen@nist.gov)>  
Date: Mon, December 04, 2017 11:39 PM +0800  
To: "Moody, Dustin (Fed)" <[dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)>, "Kerman, Sara J. (Fed)" <[sara.kerman@nist.gov](mailto:sara.kerman@nist.gov)>  
Cc: "Perlner, Ray (Fed)" <[ray.perlner@nist.gov](mailto:ray.perlner@nist.gov)>, "Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)" <[jacob.alperin-sheriff@nist.gov](mailto:jacob.alperin-sheriff@nist.gov)>  
Subject: RE: Slides

Hi, Dustin,

Everything is fine with the slides. Jacob said that it is down to 80, considering the withdraws. You can keep it as you presented or you can change it to 80. Anyway, these are how many we received.

Please let Sara know.

Lily

---

**From:** Moody, Dustin (Fed)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 04, 2017 9:29 AM  
**To:** Kerman, Sara J. (Fed) <[sara.kerman@nist.gov](mailto:sara.kerman@nist.gov)>  
**Cc:** Chen, Lily (Fed) <[lily.chen@nist.gov](mailto:lily.chen@nist.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Slides

Sara,

Thanks for noticing. I updated it, and it's attached now. It's of course fine to wait till Lily approves it.

Dustin

---

**From:** Kerman, Sara J. (Fed)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 4, 2017 8:52:27 AM  
**To:** Moody, Dustin (Fed)  
**Cc:** Chen, Lily (Fed)  
**Subject:** RE: Slides

I will post this at some point today. Lily wanted to look through the slides first. BTW – on page 38 you talk about the pqc-forum but have the old address (w/out “list.”nist.gov). Do you want me to correct that?

---

**From:** Moody, Dustin (Fed)  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 03, 2017 10:37 PM  
**To:** Kerman, Sara J. (Fed) <[sara.kerman@nist.gov](mailto:sara.kerman@nist.gov)>  
**Cc:** Chen, Lily (Fed) <[lily.chen@nist.gov](mailto:lily.chen@nist.gov)>  
**Subject:** Slides

Sara,

I gave a talk at Asiacrypt today, and several people asked if the slides will be available. It's probably a good idea to post them on our page. Can you do that? No rush. Thanks!

Dustin

----- Original Message -----

From: Dustin Moody <[dbmoody25@gmail.com](mailto:dbmoody25@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, December 04, 2017 11:31 AM +0800  
To: "Moody, Dustin (Fed)" <[dustin.moody@nist.gov](mailto:dustin.moody@nist.gov)>

Subject: Slides