

File 20101206.0946: Notes from discussion with M on the way to school this morning. She asked me what my thesis was.

Notes for viva: the research, from the perspective of ‘now’, can be seen to have progressed in the classical manner. (It did not seem to be so clean while it was happening.)

- Collect observations. The following subjects were studied: CT&E and ST&E efforts: RTG 1.0 CT&E, RM 5.0 CT&E and ST&E.
- Look for patterns. The patterns that were seen included long time to certification, back-and-forth negotiation between developer and certification authority, inter-accreditor noncommunication in CDS accreditations, and possibly others.
- Formulate hypothesis. The hypothesis is that the process of a years-long negotiation might be short-circuited—to the satisfaction of all concerned—if the final configuration could be predicted in a way that is obvious to stakeholders.

How to falsify that hypothesis?

1. Show that a non-optimal or intermediate configuration satisfies all participants.
2. Successfully predict the final outcome, but participants are not convinced.
3. Hmm...

The model of the hypothesis is that of risks and risk mitigations considered as massive objects in a space—at present a plane, but possibly of larger dimension—which are continuously pulled in different directions according to forces exerted by accreditors who cannot communicate directly.

- Design an experiment to test the hypothesis (not sure if this goes in this section or the preceding one).
- Build apparatus (that is the model).
- Run experiments.
- Analyse the data.
- Write up the results.

This is such an interesting problem...

References