

From: [Moody, Dustin \(Fed\)](#)
To: [Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob \(Fed\)](#); [Perlner, Ray A. \(Fed\)](#)
Subject: RE: classifying submission
Date: Thursday, November 30, 2017 2:44:56 PM

Yeah, not expecting them to go far, but I think we have to call it 2 submissions, since 2 different functionalities.

From: Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2017 2:44 PM
To: Moody, Dustin (Fed) <dustin.moody@nist.gov>; Perlner, Ray (Fed) <ray.perlner@nist.gov>
Subject: Re: classifying submission

These guys are also missing clear parameters in their document so they have to fix anyway.

From: "Moody, Dustin (Fed)" <dustin.moody@nist.gov>
Date: Thursday, November 30, 2017 at 2:43 PM
To: "Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)" <jacob.alperin-sheriff@nist.gov>, "Perlner, Ray (Fed)" <ray.perlner@nist.gov>
Subject: RE: classifying submission

We didn't require pqRSA to do that. Perhaps we should follow precedent?

Also, LUOV has a logo at the front. Nothing too exciting though.

From: Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2017 2:42 PM
To: Moody, Dustin (Fed) <dustin.moody@nist.gov>; Perlner, Ray (Fed) <ray.perlner@nist.gov>
Subject: Re: classifying submission

Why don't we ask them to separate them out into 2 separate documents and get it to us by, say, Monday or Tuesday?

From: "Moody, Dustin (Fed)" <dustin.moody@nist.gov>
Date: Thursday, November 30, 2017 at 2:40 PM
To: "Alperin-Sheriff, Jacob (Fed)" <jacob.alperin-sheriff@nist.gov>, "Perlner, Ray (Fed)" <ray.perlner@nist.gov>
Subject: classifying submission

FAPKC does encryption and signatures. When pqRSA did this, we counted it as two submissions, even though they were both in the same package. Should we do the same with FAPKC?

