Minutes 13/02/22

Shan: Said the methodology looks fine from the feedback from the professor. Will reference the github issues. False positives look fine. Vulnerability mapping needs to just be checked. Need to check what the thresholds are for the scoring. Should we change Figure 7 as it is hard to understand. Should we stay with the ids or replace them with the name of the vulnerability?
Hendrik: Could be inconveniens scrolling up
Wimal: We should consider the word count and be mindful about that.
Shan: Asking if we should update the graph. Suggest improving labels on the graph.
Wimal: Agrees that we should improve the labeling
Shan: We should improve the wording on the comparison section (compared to the original paper). Perhaps, we can use a table?
Wimal: We might have to look at the first paper so that we are not contradicting ourselves.
Shan: Should be fine if there are differences
Wimal: If there are, we should explain so that the second report continues from the first report.
Wimal: Elaborated on the technical as well as the business limitations.
Shan: Converting the recommendation table into lists.
Hendrik: Mentioned concern about the environmental modifier for cvss.
Shan: Think we can do without the environmental score.
Hendrik: Perhaps we can use the cvss base scores from tenable?
Shan: Yes, we can have a look at it.
Shan: We need to clean up the GDPR section a bit. Limitation should talk about how we could improve the report. Should be a short list.
Shan: Will summarise the gdpr, security recommendation and the results. We need to improve the graphs.
Wimal: Will look to see how we improve the graphs
Shan: We need to improve the appendix. Sharon can you expand the reference and update it in the reference.
Hendrik: Will look into updating the CVSS scores and referencing.
Shan: Should just be consistent with the scoring. Will continue working on the general structure. Summarising should be the biggest priority today and then everyone should just read through and make sure everything is fine.