File 20110305.0830: The following email was received from Chip Auten:

```
RE: weekly activity report 178 (loughry)
Chip Auten [chip.auten@comcast.net]
You replied on 10/03/2011 02:58.
Sent: 05 March 2011 08:30
To: Joe Loughry
Attachments:
Hey, Joe.
```

Well, my suspicions and fears from several years ago with Raytheon Garland
have now been confirmed. Back in the day, Raytheon was doing things like
sending people to RM training classes (for IDS-D I believe) that were not
related to the IDS-D program there at Raytheon Garland. These folks
proceeded to ask many questions related to design and design decisions,
rather than implementation specific questions. It was pretty obvious they
were trying to build their own guard. When I later went down to Garland to
support the DCGS Block 10.2 upgrade proposal, many suspicious things
happened. They wanted a lot of info above what I thought was necessary for
the proposal. They also had some strong pre-conceived notions about RM.
Specifically, they were very firm that RM would never be able to be modified
for use as a high-speed low-to-high guard. They wouldn't even discuss an
approach that would make speed improvements to RM to meet the RFP
requirements. They also had a lot of analysis on high-speed guard design
that they wouldn't explain where it came from. They only discussed RM and
ISSE with me. At one point during the IDS-D program, we had to get legal to
send a demand letter to Raytheon. They had repeatedly opened the IDS-D RM
boxes and we believed they were copying the disks so they could see how we
designed them. Raytheon's response was, they didn't copy anything, trust
us.... The specific instant where we had to send the letter was after a
series of suspicious activities by Raytheon engineers with regard to hacking
into the IDS-D RMs, we finally started instructing them in writing that they
were not to open the RMs without contacting LM first. Shortly after
implementing that warning, and right after we installed an upgrade to the
IDS-D box at Garland, and before the RM engineer even made it back to Denver
(while he was on the plane), they broke open the upgraded box, removed the
hard drive and then called the hotline to find out what one of the passwords
was that we had stopped giving them. It was clear that the only reason for
them to remove the hard drives was to copy them. That was when I insisted
that legal get involved and send them a letter demanding they stop trying to
copy our system. (Charles Day was the LM engineer back east that was our
Valley Forge IDS-D POC for the IDS-D program)

Anyway, later, as soon as I left Garland on the 10.2 proposal, they modified
the 10.2 proposal and inserted their own new guard for the HPG (they called
it - High Performance Guard). (a guard that they did not let me know even
existed while I was there - they even had me do a guard comparison between
RM, ISSE, and a couple low rent data diodes, and didn't say anything about
their high speed guard) Their justification for inserting their HPG in the
proposal was that the hardware was cheaper than the RM hardware and that the
HPG was faster (even thought it only existed in prototype, with not
accreditations or certifications). If memory serves, they were using SGI
platforms. I also heard that after they won the 10.2 contract, they used
the 10.2 funds to port the software developed on the SGI to the Sun platform
(which I believe they planned from the start - they just used the common
perception that RM was slow to justify inserting their own product into the
proposal). They wanted to create an RM competitor, and had targeted high
speed low to high implementation. And I believe they used a lot of the
information I provided during the IDS-D proposal and just prior to that, the
info they stole from the IDS-D RM, to design and build their own guard. I
had not heard that we had sued them. I am very glad we did. When I pushed
for further legal action, I was pretty much told that upper management

didn't want to ruffle their feathers for fear they would cut us out of more 10.2 work (which they did anyway).

If you do pursue more info on the IDS-D stuff, call Charles Day in Valley Forge. Since he was the VF guy who managed our IWTA, he should know more about what was done later. Barry Hennegan in our legal department was the main person involved with the demand letter from our end, I believe.

Anyway, I am very glad to hear we finally nailed them on that. What they did was blatant and really got under my skin. I kept trying to get someone to look into it further when I heard they had "developed" this HPG. I had repeatedly warned management during all the IDS-D shenanigans that I was convinced that Raytheon was trying to copy or steal our product. We had originally delivered source code under IDS-D and I was against that from the start. I was over-ruled by folks including Larry Brown who argued that this was a lab environment, and therefore, we didn't need to worry about having source code on the machine. My argument was that, since it was a lab environment, it was that much more important to not leave source code on the box - especially with an obvious competitor who had an unusual interest in our design information. And after going down there for the 10.2 proposal, it only confirmed my suspicions. They were a nest of slimy thieves that we should not have trusted like we did to that point. There were a couple lower level folks that I dealt with that seemed ok, but in retrospect, I understand why they shied away from me now - they were uncomfortable with what was going on, I believe. The management was clearly trying to take advantage of our experience and knowledge for their benefit. Turns out, I was right and they were worse than I suspected. I didn't think they would be blatant enough to actually copy our code.

To be fair, I have to also point out that I had to file an ethics complaint against one of our LM PHX folks in regards to the 10.2 proposal. There was a PHX guy there in Garland who kept trying to get me to lower the proposal cost for the RM efforts (he said he was trying to meet target goals that Raytheon had set and now I believe Raytheon was trying to cut our bids so that Raytheon would have more fund to apply to their HPG development.) I refused to lower the estimates without cutting back the task scope so we could meet the lower cost. They would not let me de-scope the tasks, so I refused to cut the estimates. Anyway, after I turned in all my sheets for the RM work estimates, the LM PHX guy changed my numbers, but used my task descriptions and then signed my name to the new bids (he had to actually type my name back in because the form had changed and he copied my name and tasks to the new form, but then inserted the numbers that he and Raytheon had wanted all along, knowing that I had refused to submit the bids with those numbers.) I filed the ethics complaint against the PHX guy for a couple reasons. First, I was absolutely convinced that we could not do the work for the target budget. And I knew that both PHX and Raytheon would look for a scapegoat when we over-ran the budget. I didn't want our program/people to get raped for over-running the budget that I had not approved and we could not have stayed within.

Well, I am getting pissed off at Raytheon all over again, now, so I should stop typing at this point I guess.
Anyway, let me know if you want to talk a bit more about what I know about those slimy bastards. (excuse the French)
Chip
PS the only redeeming info from all of this is that from what I hear, Raytheon screwed up 10.2 so bad overall that the customer (DCGS) is going to cut Raytheon out of future major DCGS work. They are really, really unhappy with Raytheon and by comparison with us, they know how much better we are than Raytheon is now.

```
-----Original Message-----
From: Joe Loughry [mailto:joe.loughry@stx.ox.ac.uk]
Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2011 9:50 PM
To: Niki Trigoni; Andrew Martin; Joanna Ashbourn
Cc: otaschner@aol.com; anniecruz13@gmail.com; andrea@hpwtdogmom.org;
chip.auten@comcast.net; edloughry@aol.com; diane@dldrncs.com; Joe Loughry;
mmcauliffesl@comcast.net; tom.a.marso@lmco.com
Subject: weekly activity report 178 (loughry)

Weekly activity report no. 20110303.1615 (GMT-7) sequence no. 0178, week 7
HT

...  An interesting story came out of the discussion that I had not heard
all the details of before: a few years ago, Raytheon lost a lawsuit brought
by Lockheed over the Raytheon High Speed Guard; according to the story, some
Raytheon engineers had called the RM technical support telephone number
asking for help with the RM software, but according to Lockheed Martin's
records, they did not have such a unit.  By unfortunate happenstance, the
person who answered the phone that day was the RM programme manager (TF) and
the industrial theft was discovered.  Raytheon, according to the story,
later reverse engineered the RM CDS and subsequently claimed compatibility
with MAG in their advertisements.  (I have a copy of that advertisement.)
The settlement of the lawsuit, it was related, specifies that should
Raytheon ever offer a CDS, it must be built of components 80 percent
code-different from RM.  (I would like to get more formal definition of
those terms.)  To get the whole story, I plan to go to the sources (JP/F and
TF); I have one meeting arranged so far to get the details.  I am not
completely sure it is relevant, but one of the tenets of GT is to feed in
everything.

...
```

Chip later sent the following postscript:

```
BTW, my cell phone is 303-909-0765.  Feel free to call me if you want to
talk about this.  I would aim for after 3PM, though, since I spend a lot of
time sleeping late, these days. (it's hell getting old and decrepit, but it
sure beats the alternative!)
Chip
```

References