File 20111121.0830: Notes from pink team review, 0730 this morning:

Dan McFarlane, Joe Loughry, Jeff Dutoit, Stephen Dill, Bill Ratliffe, Gary R. Edwards, Tom Cantone, Angela M. Pawlowski, and Jinhong Guo were in attendance on the call. Bill Ratliffe sent a white paper to AFRL a few weeks ago; AFRL replied with request for proposal. Same BAA as CLOAK; had phone call with Mike Mayhew as well. Mr Mayhew believes there is no such thing as a zero-risk document. The process flow diagram does show documents being routed to all of the different tools up front. This scheme is an improvement on current methods because it uses multiple scanning tools and presents the user with aggregate assessment. Customer is concerned about ensuring that the right tools get run in the right order, though.

'We add a service that is between the inspection tools and the guard.'

Send some notes on clarifying the ground truth in the proposal; keep it unclassified; ask customer for ground truth if needed.

It was good to say in the proposal, at the end of the Claims section, a one-sentence summary of what is innovative in this proposal. Question about the second innovative claim.

Idea: show in the proposal a notional user interface?

Mike Mayhew is concerned with reliability, adaptability, audit, metrics, and resistance to subversion by a malicious insider.

Perception of the organisers: that this was the only white paper AFRL chose out of the previous round of white papers, but AFRL are hoping that they will receive additional white papers on the same subject from others.

# References