

File 20110301.1130: Notes from Systems Engineering meeting run by Kevin this morning: need to measure the streaming video throughput of RM; we know it can do it, but every time Olav gets asked about it, and he gets asked regularly, he tells prospective customers that RM does not do video. TMAN does streaming video, and they don't do any more or different processing on it than RM does, so RM needs to know the upper limits of what it can do on streaming video.

Eric Chiu is joining Systems Engineering.

Regarding the RM/TMAN umbrella merger, the Systems Engineering manager told the developer's technical staff that what was described recently at the Mike Worden all-hands meeting was not correct. Mr Worden said things at that meeting that were the opposite of reality. It is not the RM programme manager's (OKJ) or TMAN programme manager's (SB) intent that the two CDSs are to be merged into a single (Next Gen) product; they will remain separate software development organisations developing different but complementary products serving mostly, but not entirely, non-overlapping sets of customers. Things had previously to those remarks been going well in getting the two software development organisations together; people were beginning to talk to their counterparts on the other side, asking questions and sharing information, but then this speech of his caused friction within the ranks. The Systems Engineering manager reiterated to his staff that the umbrella organisation, TSS, will result in few visible changes within the closed area.

For example, one specific instance of friction that occurred was the sharp shift in perception around the push to sell the MAG component of RM as a service or library to TMAN. Lots of people got on board with that, RM developers were talking with TMAN developers and information was flowing. When the story changed slightly to say that TMAN would incorporate the MAG library for free, sharing ceased. The rumour was not true; in point of fact MAG will be sold to TMAN just like any other outside entity, and the revenue will be booked to RM under the TSS umbrella. It is not about merging the programmes. In a later conversation, the Systems Engineering manager (KM) had some interesting remarks to say about Lockheed and its competitors in the CDS market. LM, he said, does not understand guards at all, as a corporation. The RM organisation understands them because it makes an extremely flexible guard that has been installed in countless different environments; the TMAN organisation understands them a little, because it makes a special-purpose device that is installed in only one specific kind of environment, for a single customer. Raytheon, the strongest competitor, gets it. At conferences, the Raytheon booth on display is about half the extent of the RM developer's closed area, staffed with dozens of uniformed (business casual) Raytheon employees who will talk to anyone about their product, the Raytheon High-Speed Guard (with the exception of the RM developer; Raytheon will never talk with the RM developer at conferences, despite the RM developer offering to share information). In contrast, Lockheed Martin's booth at conferences is the size of a large closet, and that space is split with TMAN. He listed the main competitors in the CDS space, in order of share, as: RM, Raytheon, Boeing Hardwall, and ISSE. (ISSE seems to be going away.) RM is unique amongst the competitors, being the only single-box solution; all of the others require multiple boxes (space, weight, air and power) and Boeing Hardwall in particular deploys a box for every flow, even in a simple bidirectional flow. An interesting story came out of the discussion that I had not heard all of before: Raytheon lost a lawsuit brought by Lockheed over the Raytheon High Speed Guard; according to the story, some Raytheon engineers 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 one. By unfortunate happenstance, the person who answered the phone that day was the RM programme manager (TF) and the theft was discovered. Raytheon, according to the story, reverse engineered the CDS and later on claimed compatibility with MAG in their advertisements. (I have a copy of that advertisement.) The settlement of the lawsuit, it is said, specifies that should Raytheon offer a CDS, it must be 80 percent code different from RM. To get the whole story, I will go to the source (JP/F).

The post-certification patch, 5.01 is done; testing and CR verification is going on now, but reports are that the build is solid. FAT dry runs will occur before RMUG which takes place the first week of April; FAT will commence after RMUG. The patch fixes a slew of the small bugs that seem only to be discoverable in production; there have been no major problems discovered in production since the first post-certification accreditations were done immediately after UCDMO baselining.

## References