I've reformatted and fixed the references section. Reference [17] is missing.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1cCmABTIhV5ZdJwEoYUaOvEGkpJ2ZLsEW8plgQuddNJo/edit?usp=sharing

On Thu, Jun 18, 2020 at 3:36 PM Moody, Dustin (Fed) <dustin.moody@nist.gov> wrote:

> I don't have one picked out. As long as we're consistent, it should be okay.
>
> The first 10 or 12 were in our 1st round report, so they should be okay. I think everything else after that is new.
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Thinh Dang (b) (6)
> **Sent:** Thursday, June 18, 2020 3:34 PM
> **To:** Moody, Dustin (Fed) <dustin.moody@nist.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: References
>
> Ok. Is there a specific format we're following?
>
> On Thu, Jun 18, 2020 at 3:06 PM Moody, Dustin (Fed) <dustin.moody@nist.gov> wrote:
>
>> Thinh,
>>
>> Thanks again. If you have more time, I'd like to ask you to another favor. If you don't have the time - that's fine.
>>
>> Quynh formatted the references to look more uniform, but I still don't think they are all consistent. Could you take a crack at it?
>>
>> Dustin