

File 20090901.2207: Insight (maybe in the direction of conclusions) based on the context diagram of R-prime in the second confirmation of status paper: we shouldn't have stopped the CC evaluation of RTG 1.0. Oh, it had problems, major ones, but those were unrelated to the finding of 'not fit for purpose' and there was no reason why we should have been tarred with the same brush. What we should have done is backed up, re-done the FFBDs the way Hal Forsberg at CSC wanted them, and continued to submit to NIAP. It might have been hairy; we probably would've had to explain, hat in hand, what NIAP had already heard from their CESG buddies, but we totally could have pulled it off. The only reason we didn't is money. When the project was cancelled there was no money to continue independently because our management had coveted a CC evaluation done on the cheap from the beginning, and we lacked the internal will to push forward when that source of funding went away.

References