

AUTHORITY ENGINEERING RC-2

A practical profile for evaluating authority claims in a defined domain

Version: 0.2

Status: Draft - synthetic consistency checked

Relationship to RC-1: RC-2 applies the RC-1 theory. It does not change RC-1.

RC-1 establishes Authority Engineering's core theory. RC-2 shows how that theory can be used to evaluate evidence-backed authority claims within one declared application profile.

1. What RC-2 is

RC-2 introduces an Authority Admissibility Profile (AAP): a clear, versioned set of rules for one domain. An AAP states what evidence is required, how a case is evaluated, and what the result may mean.

The first profile is AAP-AI-DEPLOY-001. It concerns normal production software deployments and asks whether a named person, role, service, agent, or control can actually cause, approve, delay, hold, block, or release a specific production transition.

2. What RC-2 returns

Verdict	Meaning
ADMITTED	The evidence shows an effective, current control-path capability for the exact named production transition.
NOT ADMITTED	Complete evidence shows that the bearer does not have an effective control-path capability for that transition.
INDETERMINATE	The case is in scope, but required evidence is missing, stale, unresolved, or not linked to the exact transition.
OUT OF SCOPE	The case belongs to another domain or authority regime, such as emergency incident authority.

Publication Record

Authority Engineering RC-2 v0.2: Authority Admissibility Profile

Author: Rob Caswell

Publisher: Cyber Terrain LLC

Published: 2026-01-01

Zenodo version: v1.0

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21742394>

Website: <https://cyberterrain.ai/papers/rc2-authority-admissibility-profile-v0.2.pdf>

Corpus Context

Corpus: Authority Engineering

Document ID: AE-RC2-AAP-0001

Object family: AE-RC2-AAP-0001

Publisher-imprint edition prepared for versioned republication.

The prior Zenodo record remains the citable record until its new version is published.

3. What evidence the first profile requires

A case must identify the bearer, the named production transition, the decision time, and evidence showing that the capability was active. The evidence must be current, traceable, and connected to the actual release path.

Required	Why it matters
Resolved bearer	Shows who or what is claimed to hold the capability.
Current policy or configuration	Shows that the capability is actually granted.
Exact control-path link	Shows that the capability applies to this named production transition.
Active-time evidence	Shows that the capability was active when the decision mattered.

4. Scope of AAP-AI-DEPLOY-001

The profile applies only to normal production deployment authority. It does not evaluate emergency-only authority. If an incident is declared and emergency authority is invoked, that case requires a separate incident-response profile.

This means a normal release supported only by an emergency-only privilege is OUT OF SCOPE. The profile is not saying the release is impossible; it is saying that emergency authority must be evaluated under a different profile.

5. What RC-2 does not claim

RC-2 does	RC-2 does not
Produce a profile-local, evidence-based verdict.	Redefine Authority Engineering's core concept of Authority.
Make evidence gaps visible through INDETERMINATE.	Turn every authority question into a universal decision procedure.
Apply the RC-1 theory in one stated domain.	Automatically prove the core RC-1 relation $A(s,t)$.
Support repeatable use of a written profile.	Claim real-world or human validation from synthetic testing alone.

6. Current status

RC-2 v0.2 has been tested on structured synthetic cases, including isolated agent reviews and two available model variants. Those tests found consistent results across the cases used.

This is useful evidence that the written profile can be applied consistently to those cases. It is not a claim that RC-2 has been validated against real organizational deployment records.