

File 20101218.0552 (GMT): I have been taking too much risk; I need to go with the lowest-risk alternative now, which is to do precisely what the assessors told me to do. If I do that, and go back to the same two assessors—which they also told me to do—with exactly what they told me to bring them, then they can't very well say no.

They promised to send out their report right away, instead of waiting until after Christmas. That report, combined with the notes I took from it and emailed out to everyone to make sure there was no misunderstanding on either side, comprises my instructions for the next six months or so.

The review article is Chapter 1 (?), although Dr Jirotko said to make sure it is consistent with the literature review, and that is Chapter 2.

Write those chapters.

More thoughts from the meeting with Dr Ashbourn: it is twelve months, not fifteen. My funding is at risk after nine months (October 2011). Case study number 3 is a risk, because its documentation, dating from 1999, is less well preserved. I will do the RM 5.0 case study first, because I understand that one the best. Next, RTG 1.0. Priority One is to fix this, then I'll apply for a postdoc fellowship and do the other, more interesting research.

Dr Jirotko said to forget the ethnomethodological study. I think I gave her sufficient evidence why the accreditors stopped talking to me. Unfortunately, going back this way to the data is going to cause that effect again, but it can't be helped.

References