

From: [Robinson, Angela Y. \(Fed\)](#)
To: [Smith-Tone, Daniel C. \(Fed\)](#)
Subject: RE: Another HQC section draft
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2020 9:20:43 AM

Yes, I think that paragraph makes sense. It does open a can of worms. If we explain why it is an alternate, we need to explain why all the other alternates aren't finalists. I'm fine with that.

Thanks,
Angela

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Smith-Tone, Daniel C. \(Fed\)](#)
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 4:08 PM
To: [Robinson, Angela Y. \(Fed\)](#)
Subject: RE: Another HQC section draft

Okay. Is the paragraph I added about why it is an alternate okay with you? I was worried that it was a more negative message than you wanted to convey. (It seems to me like it kind of reads like, "unless BIKE fails HQC is out.")

From: Robinson, Angela Y. (Fed) <angela.robinson@nist.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 4:07 PM
To: Smith-Tone, Daniel C. (Fed) <daniel.smith@nist.gov>
Subject: RE: Another HQC section draft

It looks fine to me. We can just replace what I have with what you have as it already includes the key points I wanted to make.

Thanks,
Angela

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Smith-Tone, Daniel C. \(Fed\)](#)
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 4:03 PM
To: [Robinson, Angela Y. \(Fed\)](#)
Subject: Another HQC section draft

Hi, Angela,

I want to offer another way of framing the HQC section (and to address the comments on the sharepoint file). I've attached a word file with your current HQC section and another draft. I'd like

to know what you think of it and how we can blend them together into a single message. Please let me know when you can.

Cheers,
Daniel