

File 20111117.0834: Notes from meeting with Dr Martin:

I reported a return to making progress Thursday in a meeting with Dr Martin. I have been reading to catch up, and following the method of Charmaz to build the grounded theory model that was missing in September. I intend to have the model in shape to show to Dr Fléchais soon. I reported that I have funding until January, but starting now my only priority is to finish in good order in the shortest amount of time possible. Dr Martin asked filing paperwork with the department; I replied that I have already talked to Julie Sheppard about it; she requested that I wait to do that until early December; she is expecting it and there will be no problems with it. We talked about GSS reports which are due next week. I should talk to Dr Fléchais as soon as I have the model in hand. I suggested a report for 29th November's reading group.

We talked about the Siri protocol attack of Applidium and whether their report might make a good topic for reading group, and what might happen to the F-35 (a flying cross domain system, and one on which I have friends who work) in light of the announced sale of 74 UK Harriers, engines, and spare parts to the U.S. I speculated that Congress will terminate the programme, counting on EMALS to make something other than F-35B planes flyable off the Queen Elizabeth class, the F-35C to be abandoned in favour of new F-18s, and the F-35A to be replaced by re-starting production of the F-22. This solution neatly sidesteps the risk of handing the fifth generation over to China's J-20 and Russia's Su-50, follows historical precedent by apportioning work evenly to Boeing and Lockheed, and saves money. An export licence will be quietly issued for the F-22 to Japan. This is what I predict will happen 23rd November.

Dr Martin recommended keeping the GSS report brief. Don't say too much about the Air Force project, just that I am following the assessors' recommendations and making progress.

Notes for email to Dr Fléchais (UPDATE: I sent the email).

Dear Dr Fléchais,

I feel I should update you personally on what is happening. After delivering the final technical report to my funding sponsor, I am back to work and making progress on the model that was missing in September from the grounded theory analysis of CS-1, following the method of ? and ?. As soon as I'm sure the model is complete, I would like to show it to you.

I had an unusual experience earlier this week with the Final Technical Report on the probabilistic redaction project. The Air Force finally approved it, but the sponsor took the time to say specifically that he thought it was one of the best final technical reports they'd ever received. I was surprised by that evaluation because the report was full of 'we tried this and it didn't work, so we did this other thing and that didn't work either; in desperation we thought of another method and that worked spectacularly well, but not in the direction we thought...all our hypotheses were wrong'. Is that common in your experience?

References