Thanks!

On Thu, 23 Jun 2011 07:30:25 -0400
Ken Berman <   (b)(6)   > wrote:

> Andrew, looks OK:
>
> Ken,
>
> Please clarify, will references be used on your solicitation or will
> references be used for another government agency. Potential
> contractors can site in their solicitation the work history with BBG,
> contract number, date of award and dollar amount. If references will
> be used for another government agency then that agency would send me
> a form to be fill out and return to them.
>
> Hope this helps.
> Diane
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Andrew Lewman [mailto: (b) (6)   ]
> Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2011 1:36 PM
> To: Kelly DeYoe; Ken Berman
> Subject: Reference for Tor?
>
> Hello Kelly and Ken,
>
> As you're aware, BBG has an open call for proposals. Can Tor use you
> as a reference for this proposal? You've been be a major influence
> and funder of circumvention work at Tor.
>
> Thanks!
>

--
Andrew
pgp 0x74ED336B

Andrew, looks OK:

Ken,

Please clarify, will references be used on your solicitation or will references be used for another government agency. Potential contractors can site in their solicitation
the work history with BBG, contract number, date of award and dollar amount. If references will be used for another government agency then that agency
would send me a form to be fill out and return to them.

Hope this helps.
Diane

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew Lewman [mailto: ████████ (b)(6) ████████
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2011 1:36 PM
To: Kelly DeYoe; Ken Berman
Subject: Reference for Tor?

Hello Kelly and Ken,

As you're aware, BBG has an open call for proposals. Can Tor use you
as a reference for this proposal? You've been be a major influence and
funder of circumvention work at Tor.

Thanks!

--
Andrew
pgp 0x74ED336B

On Tue, 19 Apr 2011 18:10:48 -0400
Kelly DeYoe < _____ wrote:

> Andrew, I know you're traveling overseas right now, but just wanted
> to remind you to be sure to return the counter-signed copy of the
> contract renewal modification as soon as possible if you haven't
> already done so. Thanks.

Done. Thanks!

--
Andrew
pgp 0x74ED336B

On Wed, Sep 19, 2007 at 10:02:34AM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> sure. How about this Friday at 1:30? Ken

Works for me.

Thanks,
--Roger

sure. How about this Friday at 1:30? Ken

Roger Dingledine wrote:

> On Tue, Aug 14, 2007 at 06:08:45PM -0400, Kelly DeYoe wrote:
>
> > I don't think there is anything that we need to schedule
> > a call for
> > right now, let's plan for the next call sometime after
> > September 10th
> > and the August report. We can pin down the details the
> > first week in
> > September.
>
> Shall we plan for a call sometime? I'm available Sep 20-24 and Sep
> 28-Oct 1.
>
> If we do it this week I'll be able to tell you about some the
> great
> things I'm about to do now that I'm back, and if we do it next
> week I'll
> be able to tell you about some of the great things I've done now
> that
> I'm back. Either works for me. :)
>
> After-noon works better for me on each of these days, but I can
> also do
> mornings if needed.
>
> --Roger

On Tue, Aug 14, 2007 at 06:08:45PM -0400, Kelly DeYoe wrote:
> I don't think there is anything that we need to schedule a call for
> right now, let's plan for the next call sometime after September 10th
> and the August report. We can pin down the details the first week in
> September.

Shall we plan for a call sometime? I'm available Sep 20-24 and Sep
28-Oct 1.

If we do it this week I'll be able to tell you about some the great
things I'm about to do now that I'm back, and if we do it next week I'll
be able to tell you about some of the great things I've done now that
I'm back. Either works for me. :)

After-noon works better for me on each of these days, but I can also do
mornings if needed.

--Roger

On Tue, Aug 14, 2007 at 06:08:45PM -0400, Kelly DeYoe wrote:
> I don't think there is anything that we need to schedule a call for
> right now, let's plan for the next call sometime after September 10th
> and the August report. We can pin down the details the first week in
> September.

Sounds good, except for the little detail that I'm getting married on
Sept 2, and won't be answering much mail for the week or two after that.

I'll aim to get you an August summary before I vanish, and then I'll
be happy to do a follow-up call anytime the week of the 17th. Shava and
Andrew can handle any questions that arise in the meantime. How's that? :)

--Roger

Roger - Kelly can make the call re a July telcon. Ken

Roger Dingledine wrote:

> On Mon, Aug 13, 2007 at 02:45:02PM -0400, Shava Nerad wrote:
>
>> Thanks for the weekend of slack, Kelly -- here's our
>> report for July.
>
> Great. Should we schedule a conf call for July's status, or was my
> visit
> good enough to keep us on track?
>
> Also, Kelly, here's your reminder about the "gathering docs" item
> that
> IBB can be helpful with:
> - Gather up the current advocacy docs for Tor, especially in
> censored
> areas, into a useful collection of links and/or guides.
> - Write good guides for the gaps in the above collection. How
> should
> you set up your Tor client to be safe? What should you keep in
> mind
> if you need to do various activities, and various protocols? Are
> some
> applications safer than others? "How to secure your online
> behavior if
> you're a blogger/corporation/whistleblower/etc."
>
> Thanks!
> --Roger

On Mon, Aug 13, 2007 at 02:45:02PM -0400, Shava Nerad wrote:
> Thanks for the weekend of slack, Kelly -- here's our report for July.

Great. Should we schedule a conf call for July's status, or was my visit good enough to keep us on track?

Also, Kelly, here's your reminder about the "gathering docs" item that IBB can be helpful with:
- Gather up the current advocacy docs for Tor, especially in censored areas, into a useful collection of links and/or guides.
- Write good guides for the gaps in the above collection. How should you set up your Tor client to be safe? What should you keep in mind if you need to do various activities, and various protocols? Are some applications safer than others? "How to secure your online behavior if you're a blogger/corporation/whistleblower/etc."

Thanks!
--Roger

At 12:19 PM 9/19/2007, Roger Dingledine wrote:
>On Wed, Sep 19, 2007 at 10:02:34AM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> > sure. How about this Friday at 1:30? Ken
>
>Works for me.

Me too!

Thanks!

--

Shava Nerad
Development Director
The Tor Project
http://tor.eff.org/
http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/anonymous/
(b) (6)
(b) (6)
(b) (6)   (cell)
skype: (b) (6)

On Thu, May 31, 2007 at 03:47:36PM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> Monday, June 4th @ 10:00 works for us.

Sounds good. Do I dial-in somewhere or will you call me (███████
I have a short memory for how these things work. :)

>I just want to chat about some
> of the discovery (Help someone in China) buttons/features. Ken

Great. I'll make sure those are fresh in my mind, then.

We don't actually have any interface at all for them right now, since
the discovery mechanisms are not finished. I've been focusing mostly on
making it really convenient to run a Tor bridge, that is, to let somebody
else relay through your Tor when you're also using it yourself. But
you're right, that's only one of the steps that we need to tackle. On
the other hand, this is the best time to describe the plans and see if
they are still plans you like.

--Roger

Monday, June 4th @ 10:00 works for us. I just want to chat about some of the discovery (Help someone in China) buttons/features. Ken

Roger Dingledine wrote:

> On Wed, May 30, 2007 at 09:50:18AM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
>
>> Kelly - pls arrange a telcon so we can get more
>> details. Ken
>
> Great.
>
> I'm available any of June 4, June 5 11am-1pm, June 6 11am-2pm, any of
> June 8, or any of June 11-15.
>
> Feel free to give me hints about what 'more details' you want, so I
> can gather them together. :)
>
> --Roger

On Wed, May 30, 2007 at 09:50:18AM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> Kelly - pls arrange a telcon so we can get more details. Ken

Great.

I'm available any of June 4, June 5 11am-1pm, June 6 11am-2pm, any of
June 8, or any of June 11-15.

Feel free to give me hints about what 'more details' you want, so I
can gather them together. :)

--Roger

On Thu, May 24, 2007 at 08:33:07AM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> Roger/Shava - we need them, regularly, before we will approve
> invoices........Ken

Hi Ken, Kelly,

Good point, sorry for leaving you in the dark. Here's a brief update
since mid March:

There are two major pieces of forward progress:

A) We finally declared the Tor 0.1.2.x branch stable:
http://archives.seul.org/or/announce/Apr-2007/msg00000.html
The features in 0.1.2.13 that you will be most interested in are:
 - It's a lot easier to run it as a server now: it does rate limiting
   in a more intuitive way, it automatically detects your IP address
   so you don't have to configure that, and it does a brief bandwidth
   test when it starts up so it's useful to the network more quickly.
 - It comes with a much newer version of Vidalia (0.0.11 vs 0.0.7):
   http://trac.vidalia-project.net/browser/releases/vidalia-0.0.11/CHANGELOG
   which includes a Farsi translation now as well as the traditional
   Chinese translation, and also includes a new more intuitive interface
   that makes it easier to opt to become a Tor server.
 - The Windows Tor bundle now ships with Torbutton and installs it
   automatically during the bundle install process.
 - Servers no longer demand the particular Tor TLS handshake we
   currently use -- so now we can change it down the road and they will
   still accept the connections.
 - A new "AvoidDiskWrites" config option that you can set when you're
   running on media that's slow or shouldn't get rewritten often --
   like a USB key or a linksys router. Still has a lot of room for
   improvement.
and then last week we put out our first bugfix release for 0.1.2.x:
http://archives.seul.org/or/announce/May-2007/msg00000.html

B) We've been hard at work on the new development release too:
http://tor.eff.org/svn/trunk/ChangeLog
We haven't put out any snapshots yet since we keep adding more features
(and no doubt more bugs), but here's a glimpse of what's already in:
 - Encrypted directory connections: If you add two lines to your Tor
   configuration file, all your directory connections happen over
   TLS-encrypted links. There's no need for plaintext http connections
   anymore. Not enabled by default yet, because we need to think about
   strategy in the arms race: how many cards do we play vs how many do
   we hold in reserve?
 - Rate limiting that only applies to relayed connections -- now
   servers can set a bandwidth rate on traffic they carry for other
   people, without that limit applying to their own Tor traffic.
   This is a critical step for making it easy to run a bridge.
 - Tor can now resolve DNS requests itself: just enable your DNSPort
   in the Tor configuration file. This feature makes it a lot easier
   to ship a self-contained Tor on a LiveCD, USB bundle, etc.

- Separate out a few of the biggest entries in Tor server descriptors and put them in a different "extrainfo" descriptor that most clients will never need to fetch. This should save about 60% for directory fetching overhead.
- The 0.2.0 branch uses way less memory to run a Tor server. Hopefully this will let things scale to a larger Tor network, and it may also mean people can run bridges on lighter hardware.

In other news, Google gave us four interns for the summer as part of their Google Summer of Code project, and one of them is working directly on the Tor-server-on-Windows-XP stability bug.

In other other news, I've been trying to coordinate the growing number of people working on Tor LiveCDs. I'm hoping to get them to come together and produce a "best practices" document for how to securely configure the common applications, so they don't have to independent discover it each time (or more accurately, so they're not all so darn insecure).

There are some more things I hope will become more solid in the next month or two -- a new version of Torbutton that handles a few more security pieces like turning off Java applets; a research paper on our proposed incentives design ("you get better performance if you relay traffic for others"); a dns-blacklist-style service that answers questions of the form "is this connection I just got from a Tor exit node?", so places like Wikipedia will be able to integrate with Tor in a more friendly manner; a consensus voting protocol so the directory authorities can produce a single unified network status rather than publishing N separate ones and letting each user fetch them all and figure it out; work towards getting an Arabic translation for Vidalia; and no doubt some other items I'm forgetting to list. Stay tuned. :)

As always, please let me know if you have any questions or thoughts.

Thanks!
--Roger

Here's how things work, Roger: you have to make us feel good and comfortable about continuing to fund Tor; anything else is just details......Ken

Roger Dingledine wrote:

On Thu, May 31, 2007 at 03:47:36PM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:

Monday, June 4th @ 10:00 works for us.

███ good. Do I dial-in somewhere or will you call me (██(b)(6)██
███ a short memory for how these things work. :)

I just want to chat about some
of the discovery (Help someone in China)
buttons/features. Ken

Great. I'll make sure those are fresh in my mind, then.

We don't actually have any interface at all for them right now, since
the discovery mechanisms are not finished. I've been focusing mostly on
making it really convenient to run a Tor bridge, that is, to let somebody
else relay through your Tor when you're also using it yourself. But
you're right, that's only one of the steps that we need to tackle. On
the other hand, this is the best time to describe the plans and see if
they are still plans you like.

--Roger

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 20:59:47 +0000
Diane Sturgis <_____ wrote:

> Because RFQ was competed I cannot at this time due an adjustment.
> Each contractor must have an equal opportunity to bid on RFQ that was
> submitted. Since we are unable to come to agreement I will have to
> cancel this requirement.

Ok. If I understand correctly, this SoW goes back out to bid by all
four respondents. Tor will then bid an appropriate amount in response
to the new RFQ. Correct?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

From:	Diane Sturgis
To:	Andrew Lewman
Cc:	Kelly DeYoe
Subject:	RE: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012
Date:	Monday, April 23, 2012 4:47:50 PM

Andrew,

Unfortunately, I cannot accept a revise SOW from you, I will be closing out this RFQ.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)   ]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 4:41 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 20:31:45 +0000
Diane Sturgis <   (b) (6)   > wrote:
> I spoke will Kelly and as you know we wanted to discuss your proposal
> which was significantly higher than our estimate. Base on the
> conversation I had with Kelly we only have $890,000 for this
> project. Are you willing to accept this offer of $890,000.

We cannot do everything proposed for that amount. Can I send over an
adjusted SoW this week for that amount?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 20:47:48 +0000
Diane Sturgis < (b) (6) wrote:

> Unfortunately, I cannot accept a revise SOW from you, I will be
> closing out this RFQ.

How about an adjusted RFQ response as discussed in March? We've had it
written since March 14.

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Andrew,

I spoke will Kelly and as you know we wanted to discuss your proposal which was significantly higher than our estimate. Base on the conversation I had with Kelly we only have $890,000 for this project. Are you willing to accept this offer of $890,000.

Diane

From: Diane Sturgis
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 4:17 PM
To: Andrew Lewman
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: RE: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

Andrew,

Let me talk with Kelly.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)   ]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:57 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 19:39:13 +0000
Diane Sturgis <   (b) (6)   > wrote:
> We will have to reschedule the second week of May, as I will be in
> training the 1st week of May.

No chance for this afternoon or doing this over email?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Andrew,

Let me talk with Kelly.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:57 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 19:39:13 +0000
Diane Sturgis < (b) (6) > wrote:
> We will have to reschedule the second week of May, as I will be in
> training the 1st week of May.

No chance for this afternoon or doing this over email?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

From: Andrew Lewman

To: Diane Sturgis

Cc: Kelly DeYoe

Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

Date: Monday, April 23, 2012 4:42:38 PM

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 20:31:45 +0000
Diane Sturgis < _____ wrote:
> I spoke will Kelly and as you know we wanted to discuss your proposal
> which was significantly higher than our estimate. Base on the
> conversation I had with Kelly we only have $890,000 for this
> project. Are you willing to accept this offer of $890,000.

We cannot do everything proposed for that amount. Can I send over an
adjusted SoW this week for that amount?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Kelly/Andrew,

We will have to reschedule the second week of May, as I will be in training the 1st week of May.

Diane

From: Kelly DeYoe
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:22 PM
To: Diane Sturgis; Andrew Lewman
Subject: RE: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

I'll be away on leave on Friday I'm afraid, and will be on the road driving that day, so not really able to call in even.

-k

From: Diane Sturgis
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:18 PM
To: Andrew Lewman
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: RE: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

Andrew/Kelly,

Let's schedule for Friday in the afternoon, I will be in class on the 3rd. I will do an invite.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:14 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 18:58:39 +0000
Diane Sturgis < (b) (6) > wrote:
> Can we meet at 2:30-3:00 on Tuesday, please confirm.

I cannot for I'll be on an airplane. Today is it. My next availability
is Friday Apr 27 in the afternoon and then May 3rd after that.

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 19:39:13 +0000
Diane Sturgis < ████ (b), (6) ████ > wrote:
> We will have to reschedule the second week of May, as I will be in
> training the 1st week of May.

No chance for this afternoon or doing this over email?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

I'll be away on leave on Friday I'm afraid, and will be on the road driving that day, so not really able to call in even.

-k

From: Diane Sturgis
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:18 PM
To: Andrew Lewman
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: RE: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

Andrew/Kelly,

Let's schedule for Friday in the afternoon, I will be in class on the 3rd. I will do an invite.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)   ]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:14 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 18:58:39 +0000
Diane Sturgis <   (b) (6)   > wrote:
> Can we meet at 2:30-3:00 on Tuesday, please confirm.

I cannot for I'll be on an airplane. Today is it. My next availability
is Friday Apr 27 in the afternoon and then May 3rd after that.

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 18:58:39 +0000
Diane Sturgis < ▮▮▮▮(b) (6)▮▮▮▮ > wrote:
> Can we meet at 2:30-3:00 on Tuesday, please confirm.

I cannot for I'll be on an airplane. Today is it. My next availability
is Friday Apr 27 in the afternoon and then May 3rd after that.

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

On Tue, 17 Apr 2012 11:01:38 +0000
Diane Sturgis < ▮▮▮▮▮(b) (6)▮▮▮▮▮ > wrote:
> Are you available for 2:30-3:30.

Did we ever confirm this for today?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Andrew/Kelly,

Let's schedule for Friday in the afternoon, I will be in class on the 3rd. I will do an invite.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 3:14 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 18:58:39 +0000
Diane Sturgis < (b) (6) > wrote:
> Can we meet at 2:30-3:00 on Tuesday, please confirm.

I cannot for I'll be on an airplane. Today is it. My next availability
is Friday Apr 27 in the afternoon and then May 3rd after that.

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Andrew,

Can we meet at 2:30-3:00 on Tuesday, please confirm.

Diane

From: Diane Sturgis
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 1:07 PM
To: Andrew Lewman
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: RE: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

Andrew,

I am working from home today, I have a 2:00-2:30 telephone conference today. I am trying to reach Kelly to see if we can still meet today. I will let you know.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 1:03 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Tue, 17 Apr 2012 11:01:38 +0000
Diane Sturgis < (b) (6) > wrote:
> Are you available for 2:30-3:30.

Did we ever confirm this for today?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

On Tue, Apr 17, 2012 at 11:01:38AM +0000, _(b) (6)_ wrote 2.2K bytes in 72 lines about:
: Are you available for 2:30-3:30.

Yes.

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Andrew,

I am working from home today, I have a 2:00-2:30 telephone conference today. I am trying to reach Kelly to see if we can still meet today. I will let you know.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 1:03 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Tue, 17 Apr 2012 11:01:38 +0000
Diane Sturgis < (b) (6) > wrote:
> Are you available for 2:30-3:30.

Did we ever confirm this for today?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

On Mon, 16 Apr 2012 19:31:29 +0000
Diane Sturgis <▆▆▆▆▆▆▆(b)(6)▆▆▆▆▆▆▆> wrote:
> I would like to set-up a meeting with you to discuss your price
> proposal for subject RFQ, I am available this week. I will send an
> invite to you and Kelly.

I'm not generally available this week because I'm booked all week in
Sweden. I have next Monday available and then I'm locked away by the
FBI all next week for more work. I return May 3rd.

Any chance we can do this over email?

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Andrew,

Are you available for 2:30-3:30.

Diane

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Kelly DeYoe
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2012 4:21 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Subject: Declined: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012
When: Monday, April 23, 2012 1:00 PM-2:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Office of Contracts

I have another meeting at this time that cannot be moved, can we do 2pm or later instead?

-k

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 21:23:04 +0000
Kelly DeYoe <​   (b) (6)   ​> wrote:

> And what Diane failed to say is that you should expect that we will
> reevaluate our requirements and may choose to re-advertise a new RFQ.

Has there been a decision as to which way BBG wants to proceed with
the next steps? I haven't seen anything appear on fbo.gov in the past
month.

Thanks!

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

Andrew,

Because RFQ was competed I cannot at this time due an adjustment. Each contractor must have an equal opportunity to bid on RFQ that was submitted. Since we are unable to come to agreement I will have to cancel this requirement.

Diane

From: Andrew Lewman [(b) (6)   ]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 4:55 PM
To: Diane Sturgis
Cc: Kelly DeYoe
Subject: Re: RFQ #BBG50-Q-12-0015 date 2/23/2012

On Mon, 23 Apr 2012 20:47:48 +0000
Diane Sturgis <   (b) (6)   wrote:

> Unfortunately, I cannot accept a revise SOW from you, I will be
> closing out this RFQ.

How about an adjusted RFQ response as discussed in March? We've had it written since March 14.

--
Andrew
http://tpo.is/contact
pgp 0x6B4D6475

On Fri, Jan 16, 2009 at 08:43:06AM -0500, Ken Berman wrote:
> Perfect, Roger. Friday Feb 6th at 1:30 sound OK?

Sounds fine. 1:00 would sound even better, if that's possible on your end.

Thanks!
--Roger

From:	Ken Berman
To:	Roger Dingledine
Cc:	Kelly DeYoe; Andrew Lewman; Sho Ho
Subject:	RE: Roger and Andrew in DC around Feb 6-8
Date:	Wednesday, January 21, 2009 10:06:44 AM

1:00 it is....

-----Original Message-----
From: Roger Dingledine [mailto:███ (b) (6) ██]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 6:25 PM
To: Ken Berman
Cc: Kelly DeYoe; Andrew Lewman; Sho Ho
Subject: Re: Roger and Andrew in DC around Feb 6-8

On Fri, Jan 16, 2009 at 08:43:06AM -0500, Ken Berman wrote:
> Perfect, Roger. Friday Feb 6th at 1:30 sound OK?

Sounds fine. 1:00 would sound even better, if that's possible on your end.

Thanks!
--Roger

Perfect, Roger. Friday Feb 6th at 1:30 sound OK?

Ken

-----Original Message-----
From: Roger Dingledine [mailto: (b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2009 5:35 PM
To: Ken Berman; Kelly DeYoe
Cc: Andrew Lewman
Subject: Roger and Andrew in DC around Feb 6-8

Hi folks,

Andrew and I will be in DC for Shmoocon, Feb 6-8. We've got a date with Freedom House on Feb 5 to teach them about Tor.

So Feb 6 would be a great day for us to drop by IBB -- say, sometime between 10am and 2pm. Are you around and available then? If not, how do Feb 4 or Feb 5 or Feb 9 look?

Thanks!
--Roger

Perfect, Roger. Friday Feb 6th at 1:30 sound OK?

Ken

-----Original Message-----
From: Roger Dingledine [mailto: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2009 5:35 PM
To: Ken Berman; Kelly DeYoe
Cc: Andrew Lewman
Subject: Roger and Andrew in DC around Feb 6-8

Hi folks,

Andrew and I will be in DC for Shmoocon, Feb 6-8. We've got a date with Freedom House on Feb 5 to teach them about Tor.

So Feb 6 would be a great day for us to drop by IBB -- say, sometime between 10am and 2pm. Are you around and available then? If not, how do Feb 4 or Feb 5 or Feb 9 look?

Thanks!
--Roger

1:00 it is....

-----Original Message-----
From: Roger Dingledine [mailto: ████ (b) (6) ████
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 6:25 PM
To: Ken Berman
Cc: Kelly DeYoe; Andrew Lewman; Sho Ho
Subject: Re: Roger and Andrew in DC around Feb 6-8

On Fri, Jan 16, 2009 at 08:43:06AM -0500, Ken Berman wrote:
> Perfect, Roger. Friday Feb 6th at 1:30 sound OK?

Sounds fine. 1:00 would sound even better, if that's possible on your end.

Thanks!
--Roger

On Fri, Jan 16, 2009 at 08:43:06AM -0500, Ken Berman wrote:
> Perfect, Roger. Friday Feb 6th at 1:30 sound OK?

Sounds fine. 1:00 would sound even better, if that's possible on your end.

Thanks!
--Roger

From:	Roger Dingledine
To:	Ken Berman
Cc:	Andrew Lewman; Kelly DeYoe; Sho Ho
Subject:	Re: Roger in DC in late July / August
Date:	Wednesday, August 04, 2010 6:04:00 PM

On Mon, Aug 02, 2010 at 04:16:44PM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> On Mon, Aug 02, 2010 at 08:02:07AM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> > Roger - the Inspector General for our agency has scheduled meetings
> >with me all day Wed. Does Thursday work, lunch time?
>
> Sure. I just reshuffled my other Thursday lunch to Wednesday, so now
>I will show up on Thursday.

What time is lunch time? I'm going to guess it's noon. Let me know if
you'd prefer that I show up later. :)

--Roger

Good....

-----Original Message-----
From: Roger Dingledine [mailto: ███ (b) (6) ███
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 2:41 PM
To: Ken Berman
Cc: Andrew Lewman; ███ (b) (6) ███   ███ (b) (6) ███
Subject: Re: Roger in DC in late July / August

On Mon, Aug 02, 2010 at 08:02:07AM -0400, Ken Berman wrote:
> Roger - the Inspector General for our agency has scheduled meetings with me all day Wed. Does Thursday work, lunch time?

Sure. I just reshuffled my other Thursday lunch to Wednesday, so now I will show up on Thursday.

--Roger