UNCLASSIFIED

Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

OCTA Defense · UNCLASSIFIED Series

Document 001: Variant Theory (VT)

OCTA Defense Analytic Framework for Patent-Derived Multiplicity, Resilience, and Design-Space Control

(No diagrams; sanitized analytic template suitable for broad release)

Document Control (UNCLASSIFIED Series)

Series	OCTA Defense · UNCLASSIFIED Series
Document ID	OD-U-001
Title	Variant Theory (VT)
Version / Date	v1.2 January 26, 2026
Maintaining Organization	OCTA Defense
Release Posture	Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.
Point of Contact	[Point of Contact / Office]
Review Authority	[Review Authority / Release Office]
Changelog	Added Executive Abstract page after Contents; added MP_d weighting rubric + worked example; added explicit pivot delta gloss; made Hoeffding section staff-product oriented while retaining rigor.

OPSEC DISCIPLINE (UNCLASSIFIED): Purpose and Boundaries

This UNCLASSIFIED document provides a structured analytic method and disciplined terminology. It intentionally avoids: (i) vulnerabilities, exploitable configurations, or step-by-step disruption guidance; (ii) targeting, interdiction, sabotage, or evasion procedures; (iii) supplier identities, quantities, schedules, facility details, or test vectors that could enable reverse engineering or operational misuse.

Contents

Executive Abstract (UNCLASSIFIED)

What this is: Variant Theory (VT) is an OCTA Defense analytic framework that quantifies *implementation multiplicity* under explicit constraint regimes. It evaluates whether a technology has multiple *feasible* and *supportable* implementations, how quickly an organization can pivot among them, and how resilient that portfolio is to constraint-driven collapse.

Why it matters: In real programs, "many options" frequently collapse to a small set of feasible paths once manufacturing, supply posture, sustainment, policy, and validation burdens are applied. VT prevents rhetorical multiplicity by requiring: (1) scenario-defined regimes, (2) a bounded assumptions register, (3) evidence discipline, and (4) non-actionable reporting.

Primary output: Multiplicity Potential (MP) — reported per regime as qualitative bands (Low/Medium/High), with confidence (Low/Medium/High), and a short evidence summary. When authorized, MP can be reported numerically using bounded estimation methods.

Secondary outputs: Portfolio posture (baseline + alternates + pivot plan), pivot tempo class, validation burden class, and fragility indices (dependency concentration and validation bottlenecks) expressed as bands.

Operating rule: Multiplicity is an advantage only when it is *real*: buildable, producible, supportable, and validatable within timelines under the regime.

UNCLASSIFIED discipline: This document is designed for broad release. It excludes actionable content: specific vulnerabilities, disruption mechanisms, targeting details, interdiction/evasion guidance, and sensitive procurement or facility information. Sensitive specifics, if required internally, belong in controlled annexes and need-to-know briefings.

At-a-Glance (UNCLASSIFIED)

Framework question	What is the feasible variant set under regime $\mathcal{R}$, and how independent are those variants?
MP output	Low / Medium / High (with confidence and evidence chain)
Pivot output	Tempo class + validation burden class, with a pivot package checklist
Fragility output	Dependency concentration and validation bottleneck bands
Decision use	Downselect support, portfolio design, resilience posture, and review-ready reporting

OPSEC DISCIPLINE (UNCLASSIFIED): UNCLASSIFIED "Do Not Include" List

Do not include in this series: unique supplier names, quantities, procurement schedules, facility identifiers, exact tolerance values, specific acceptance thresholds, test vectors, detailed failure modes, or operational tactics.

UNCLASSIFIED

1. Executive Summary

Variant Theory (VT) is an OCTA Defense analytic framework for evaluating technology advantage through quantified *implementation multiplicity*: the number of meaningfully distinct, mission-relevant implementations that remain feasible under defined constraints (engineering, manufacturing, supply, operational environment, and policy).

Primary output: **Multiplicity Potential (MP)**, reported per scenario/regime with:

- a regime definition (what constraints apply),
- an assumptions register,
- a confidence grade,
- an evidence chain suitable for audit and discussion at an appropriate level of detail, and
- a portfolio posture recommendation (baseline, alternates, pivot discipline).

Document 001 is the first publication in the OCTA Defense UNCLASSIFIED Series. It is structured for broad distribution while preserving operational discretion through explicit disclosure controls.

1.1. Key Claims (Bounded)

- Multiplicity is an advantage when it is feasible, producible, supportable, and validatable.
- Multiplicity collapses under common-mode dependencies and validation bottlenecks.
- Portfolio posture can be evaluated and improved without revealing sensitive implementation details.

2. Audience, Intended Use, and Terminology

2.1. Audience

This document is written for:

- program leadership and technical leads requiring a defensible analytic vocabulary,
- acquisition and engineering staff evaluating resilience posture, and
- analysts developing scenario-driven assessments suitable for review.

2.2. Glossary (Core Terms)

Table 1: Glossary (Selected)

Term	Meaning
Variant	A feasible implementation path defined by scope and constraints.
Multiplicity	Measure of distinct feasible implementations under a regime.
Regime	A defined set of constraints for a scenario (mfg/supply/ops/policy).
Pivot	An approved transition between variants under change control.
Validation burden	Effort class required to establish evidence for a variant/pivot.
Common-mode	Shared dependencies causing correlated collapse across variants.
Evidence chain	Traceable support for claims (sources, tests, analyses, reviews).

3. Scope, Use Conditions, and Release Discipline

3.1. Purpose

VT supports decision-quality assessment of:

- feasible implementation diversity under constraint regimes,
- pivotability between implementations under stress and timeline pressure,
- portfolio resilience to constraint-driven collapse in a non-actionable, releasable manner, and
- comparative posture across competing approaches at a controlled level of detail.

3.2. Non-Goals

VT is not:

- a legal opinion on patent enforceability or litigation outcomes,
- a substitute for verification, validation, certification, or test evidence,
- a method for describing operational interdiction, evasion, targeting, sabotage, or exploitation, or
- a substitute for security engineering, threat modeling, or classified intelligence analysis.

OPSEC DISCIPLINE (UNCLASSIFIED): UNCLASSIFIED Release Rules (Practical)

For wide release, keep conclusions at the level of: scenario definitions, qualitative bands, and portfolio posture. Move sensitive specifics (unique suppliers, part numbers, tolerances, test vectors, locations, schedules) to controlled annexes.

4. Explanation and Details (Comprehensive, UNCLASSIFIED)

4.1. What VT Is (and Is Not)

Variant Theory is a regime-driven analytic framework: it requires explicit scenario constraints and produces bounded outputs (bands, confidence grades, and evidence chains). VT is a portfolio method: it evaluates whether multiple variants exist that are truly feasible and independent in their dependency classes and validation burdens. VT is not an operational manual; this UNCLASSIFIED series excludes step-by-step disruption narratives, vulnerabilities, targeting detail, and sensitive implementation specifics.

4.2. The Core Claim: Multiplicity Is an Advantage Only When It Is Real

A concept can appear diverse yet collapse to a narrow set of feasible implementations when constraints are applied. VT enforces that multiplicity must be feasible, producible, supportable, and validatable within timelines under the regime.

4.3. Why VT References Patents (UNCLASSIFIED Framing)

Patent families are treated as design-space signals that can indicate branching through claim structure and refinements. VT does not assume claim scope equals feasibility; feasibility is determined by regime constraints and evidence posture.

4.4. Constraint Regimes: The Central Mechanism

VT outputs are undefined without a constraint regime. In practice, VT uses a small set of regime frames:

Table 2: Regime Frames (Expanded UNCLASSIFIED Definitions)

Regime	!Meaning (UNCLASSIFIED)
$\mathcal{R}_{\text{LAB}}$	!Development context. Controlled environment and high flexibility. Used for exploring possible variants.
$\mathcal{R}_{\text{MFG}}$	!Production context. Applies yield, process capability, and tolerance-class

4.5. Variant Representation (Text-Only, OPSEC-Disciplined)

A variant v is recorded using a controlled descriptor:

$$v \equiv \langle \text{scope class},\ \text{interface class},\ \text{dependency classes},\ \text{constraint profile},\ \text{validation class} \rangle.$$

4.6. Multiplicity Potential: Operational Meaning

VT uses a practical discrete form:

$$\mathrm{MP}_d(\mathcal{R}) \triangleq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{R})} w_v,$$

where $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{R})$ is the feasible set under regime $\mathcal{R}$ and $w_v \in [0,1]$ is mission relevance.

5. Formal Definitions and Core Objects

Definition 1 (Design Space)**.** *Let Θ denote the design space comprising architecture choices, materials, algorithms, manufacturing routes, interfaces, tolerances, and controllable parameters. A candidate implementation is a point $\theta \in \Theta$.*

Definition 2 (Feasibility and Capability)**.** *Let $F(\theta) \in \{0,1\}$ denote feasibility under a regime (manufacturable, supportable, reliable). Let $K(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}$ denote mission capability, with threshold $K_{\min}$. A design is mission-feasible if $F(\theta) = 1$ and $K(\theta) \geq K_{\min}$.*

Definition 3 (Constraint Regime)**.** *A constraint regime $\mathcal{R}$ is a tuple:*

$$\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{C}_{claim},\ \mathcal{C}_{physics},\ \mathcal{C}_{mfg},\ \mathcal{C}_{supply},\ \mathcal{C}_{ops},\ \mathcal{C}_{policy}),$$

where each $\mathcal{C}_\cdot$ is a set of constraints restricting feasible implementations. Define the feasible set:

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{R}) \triangleq \{\theta \in \Theta : \theta \text{ satisfies all constraints in } \mathcal{R}\}.$$

Definition 4 (Multiplicity Potential (MP))**.** *Multiplicity Potential is an operationally weighted measure of feasible implementations:*

$$\mathrm{MP}(\mathcal{R}) \triangleq \int_\Theta \mathbf{1}\{\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{R})\}\, w(\theta)\, d\theta,$$

where $w(\theta)$ weights mission relevance (cost, producibility, maintainability, survivability).

5.1. Discrete MP (Practical Form)

In most assessments, Θ is approximated via a finite set of candidate variants. Let $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{R})$ be the feasible subset under regime $\mathcal{R}$. Define:

$$\mathrm{MP}_d(\mathcal{R}) \triangleq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{R})} w_v.$$

6. Mission Relevance Weighting for MP_d (Rubric + Worked Example)

6.1. Purpose

This section converts the conceptual statement "mission relevance via capability/producibility/sustainment/independence bands" into a small, reviewable rubric suitable for UNCLASSIFIED reporting.

6.2. Band-to-Score Mapping

Each band is mapped to a normalized score:

$$s(\textbf{Low}) = 0.0, \quad s(\textbf{Medium}) = 0.5, \quad s(\textbf{High}) = 1.0.$$

This mapping is intentionally coarse to support broad release and reduce sensitivity.

6.3. Component Bands

For each feasible variant v, assign the following bands under regime $\mathcal{R}$:

- $B_C(v, \mathcal{R})$ — **Capability band:** margin relative to the mission threshold.
- $B_P(v, \mathcal{R})$ — **Producibility band:** ability to produce at scale under regime constraints.
- $B_S(v, \mathcal{R})$ — **Sustainment band:** maintainability/support posture within the regime.
- $B_I(v, \mathcal{R})$ — **Independence band:** degree of non-overlap with common-mode dependency classes of other variants.

6.4. Default Weight Formula

Define mission relevance weight:

$$w_v \triangleq \alpha\, s(B_C) + \beta\, s(B_P) + \gamma\, s(B_S) + \delta\, s(B_I),$$

with default coefficients (sum to 1):

$$(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = (0.40,\ 0.25,\ 0.25,\ 0.10).$$

Interpretation: capability is primary; producibility and sustainment are co-equal; independence provides incremental value.

6.5. UNCLASSIFIED Rubric Guidance

Table 3: Band Assignment Guidance (UNCLASSIFIED, Non-Actionable)

Component	Band	Guidance (qualitative)
Capability	**High**	Meets threshold with margin under regime; stable performance posture.
Capability	**Medium**	Meets threshold with limited margin; sensitivity to regime assumptions.
Capability	**Low**	Does not reliably meet threshold under regime constraints.
Producibility	**High**	Scales under regime constraints with multiple feasible paths.
Producibility	**Medium**	Scales with constraints; requires careful management or limited paths.
Producibility	**Low**	Scaling is unlikely under regime constraints.
Sustainment	**High**	Supportable with standard posture; predictable maintenance burden.
Sustainment	**Medium**	Supportable with additional constraints; increased burden or complexity.
Sustainment	**Low**	Sustainment posture is weak or unproven under regime constraints.
Independence	**High**	Meaningfully distinct dependency classes versus portfolio peers.
Independence	**Medium**	Some shared classes; partial common-mode overlap.
Independence	**Low**	Largely shares dependency classes; high common-mode coupling.

6.6. Worked Example (Coarse, UNCLASSIFIED)

Assume three feasible variants under $\mathcal{R}$ with bands:

Table 4: Example Bands

Variant	B_C	B_P	B_S	B_I
v_1	High	Medium	High	Medium
v_2	Medium	High	Medium	High
v_3	High	Low	Medium	Low

Compute weights using $(0.40, 0.25, 0.25, 0.10)$:

$$w_{v_1} = 0.40(1.0) + 0.25(0.5) + 0.25(1.0) + 0.10(0.5) = 0.40 + 0.125 + 0.25 + 0.05 = 0.825,$$

$$w_{v_2} = 0.40(0.5) + 0.25(1.0) + 0.25(0.5) + 0.10(1.0) = 0.20 + 0.25 + 0.125 + 0.10 = 0.675,$$

$$w_{v_3} = 0.40(1.0) + 0.25(0.0) + 0.25(0.5) + 0.10(0.0) = 0.40 + 0 + 0.125 + 0 = 0.525.$$

Thus:

$$\mathrm{MP}_d(\mathcal{R}) = w_{v_1} + w_{v_2} + w_{v_3} = 2.025.$$

OPSEC DISCIPLINE (UNCLASSIFIED): UNCLASSIFIED Reporting Note

In broad release products, report MP_d as a band derived from rubric totals (e.g., Low/Medium/High) with confidence, rather than publishing raw values, unless numeric disclosure is approved by the release authority.

7. Pivot Discipline and Change Control

7.1. Pivot Relation and Delta Gloss

Define a pivot relation $\rightsquigarrow$ on $\mathcal{V}$ such that $v \rightsquigarrow v'$ indicates an allowable transition under approved change control. Associate a bounded delta vector:

$$\Delta(v \to v') \equiv (\Delta C,\ \Delta T,\ \Delta K,\ \Delta S,\ \Delta V),$$

where:

- ΔC — **Cost delta:** relative cost posture change (banded).
- ΔT — **Time delta:** relative pivot/implementation timeline change (banded).
- ΔK — **Capability delta:** expected change in mission capability band.
- ΔS — **Sustainment/Supply delta:** sustainment and supply risk posture change (banded).
- ΔV — **Validation delta:** change in validation burden class (Low/Med/High).

7.2. Pivot Package (Operational Definition)

A pivot package is the minimal, controlled artifact set required to execute an approved pivot: change-control summary (class-level), validation plan class, sustainment impacts (class-level), and risk/assumption updates.

7.3. Pivot Tempo (Banding)

Pivot tempo is reported as Rapid (days to weeks), Moderate (weeks to months), or Extended (months+).

8. Multiplicity Collapse (Fragility) and Resilience Controls

Multiplicity collapses when variants share common-mode dependencies or validation bottlenecks.

8.1. Fragility Indices (Non-Actionable)

- Dependency Concentration Index (DCI): banded measure of shared dependency classes across feasible variants.
- Validation Bottleneck Index (VBI): banded measure of the fraction requiring high validation burden.
- Common-Mode Correlation Band (CMC): qualitative estimate of correlated collapse across variants.

8.2. Resilience Controls (Non-Exploitative)

Diversify dependency classes, pre-approve pivot packages, invest in evidence re-use/regression discipline, and maintain configuration control.

9. Interaction Model (Game-Theoretic, High-Level)

VT can incorporate a bounded interaction model without describing disruption mechanisms.

9.1. Resource Allocation (Abstract)

Let $x_v \geq 0$ represent pressure allocated against variant v under bounded budget B:

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} x_v \leq B.$$

Theorem 1 (Multiplicity Advantage Under Bounded Disruption)**.** *Assume Blue maintains at least M feasible variants under regime $\mathcal{R}$, each requiring effort at least $\tau_{\min}$ to deny within the operational timeline. If $M \cdot \tau_{\min} > B$, then full denial of all variants is infeasible under the bounded budget model.*

9.2. Interpretation

This supports non-sensitive posture reasoning: multiple independent feasible paths increase coverage burden under bounded pressure.

10. Acquisition Integration: TRL vs MP (Text-Only)

Table 5: TRL vs MP Quadrant Guidance (UNCLASSIFIED)

High TRL / Low MP	**High TRL / High MP**
Harden sustainment; reduce common-mode dependency classes; qualify alternates.	Scale production; maintain pivot drills; preserve independent paths.
Low TRL / Low MP	**Low TRL / High MP**
Terminate or redirect; seek adjacent approaches with better feasibility.	Prototype and downselect; build validation harness and evidence chain.

10.1. Downselect Criteria (Unclassified Form)

MP band under relevant regimes; fragility indices (bands); pivot tempo class; TRL and evidence completeness.

11. Evidence Discipline and Confidence Grading

11.1. Evidence Chain

Each claim must be traceable to: defined regime/scenario, sources, method, and review posture.

11.2. Confidence Grading Rubric

Table 6: Confidence Grading Rubric (UNCLASSIFIED)

Grade	Meaning
High	Multiple independent evidence types; assumptions bounded; method repeatable.
Medium	Some direct evidence; key assumptions remain; method repeatable with caveats.
Low	Limited evidence; heavy reliance on assumptions; exploratory analysis only.

12. MP Estimation and Bounded Error (Audit-Friendly)

12.1. Why this section exists

Most UNCLASSIFIED VT products report MP as bands. However, programs may want numeric estimates internally for sensitivity analysis, trend tracking, or comparing portfolios under the same rubric. This section provides a clean, bounded method for describing estimation error when a sampling approach is used.

12.2. Default: Report as bands unless approved

The default posture for this series is to report MP as bands. Numeric reporting requires explicit release approval.

12.3. Hoeffding Bound (Optional Rigor)

Let $\theta_i \sim p(\theta)$ be samples and $I_i = \mathbf{1}\{\theta_i \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{R})\}$. Define:

$$\widehat{\mathrm{MP}}_N(\mathcal{R}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} I_i\, w(\theta_i).$$

If $0 \le w(\theta) \le w_{\max}$, Hoeffding implies:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{\mathrm{MP}}_N - \mathbb{E}[Iw]| \ge \varepsilon\right) \le 2\exp\left(\frac{-2N\varepsilon^2}{w_{\max}^2}\right).$$

Proposition 1 (Sample Size Requirement)**.** *For error ε with confidence $1-\delta$:*

$$N \ge \frac{w_{\max}^2}{2\varepsilon^2}\ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right).$$

OPSEC DISCIPLINE (UNCLASSIFIED): UNCLASSIFIED Reporting Rule

Even when internal numeric estimates are produced, external/broad-release products should default to banded reporting unless numeric disclosure is explicitly approved.

13. Scorecards and Templates (Ready-to-Use)

13.1. VT Scorecard (0–5)

Table 7: VT Scorecard (0–5) With Non-Actionable Evidence Descriptors

Metric	Score	Evidence Descriptor (UNCLASSIFIED)
Multiplicity Potential (MP)		Scenario MP band, regime definition, rubric totals, confidence.
Pivot Tempo		Tempo band, integration steps class, validation class shifts.
Resilience		Stress survival band, common-mode risk band, sustainment posture band.
Cost-Imposition		Dispersion assessment without mechanism detail.
Fragility (negative)		Dependency concentration band, validation bottleneck band.

13.2. Portfolio Posture Template

Table 8: Portfolio Posture (Fillable, UNCLASSIFIED)

Role	Variant Class	Notes (Non-Actionable)
Baseline (High TRL)		
Alternate Supply		
Low-Signature / Resilient		
Rapid Pivot		

13.3. Pivot Package Checklist

Table 9: Pivot Package Checklist (UNCLASSIFIED)

Item	Status
Change-control summary (class-level)	
Validation burden class and evidence types	
Integration impacts (training/spares class)	
Sustainment posture update	
Risk register update	
Assumptions impacted and confidence change	

14. Scenario Library (UNCLASSIFIED Frames)

14.1. Regime Frames

Table 10: Regime Frames (UNCLASSIFIED, Fillable)

Regime ID	Category	Description (Non-Actionable)
R_LAB	Development	Controlled environment; feasibility exploration.
R_MFG	Manufacturing	Production constraints; yield/tolerance classes.
R_SUP	Supply	Dependency class limitations; substitution posture.
R_OPS	Operations	Environment and sustainment posture constraints.
R_POL	Policy	Export/use constraints; compliance posture.

14.2. Scenario Template

Table 11: Scenario Template (UNCLASSIFIED)

Field	Entry
Scenario ID	
Regime(s)	
Mission capability threshold band	
Key constraints (classes)	
Assumptions (IDs)	
Outputs required (MP band, posture, confidence)	

15. Governance and Review

15.1. Governance

VT products should have: a named owner, review cadence, release authority for external distribution, and change control for rubric revisions.

15.2. Review Checklist (UNCLASSIFIED)

Table 12: Review Checklist (UNCLASSIFIED)

Check	Pass/Fail
No actionable disruption, targeting, or evasion content present	
No supplier names, quantities, schedules, or facility details present	
All claims tied to a regime/scenario and assumptions register	
Confidence grades assigned with rubric justification	
Scorecards consistent with evidence chain	

16. Annex Structure (Series Discipline)

This UNCLASSIFIED Series document remains sanitized. Any sensitive specifics should be separated into: internal technical memoranda, controlled annexes with appropriate markings, or need-to-know briefings with approved release authority.

17. Appendix A: Assumption Register

ID	Confidence	!Assumption Statement (UNCLASSIFIED)
A1	High/Med/Low	!
A2	High/Med/Low	!
A3	High/Med/Low	!
A4	High/Med/Low	!
A5	High/Med/Low	!
A6	High/Med/Low	!

18. Appendix B: Evidence Register

ID	Type	!Description (UNCLASSIFIED)
E1	Patent family	!
E2	Open literature	!
E3	Test summary	!
E4	Manufacturing assessment	!
E5	Analyst judgment (bounded)	!

19. Appendix C: Scenario Set

Scenario ID	Regime ID	!Notes (UNCLASSIFIED, Non-Actionable)

S1	R_LAB	!
S2	R_MFG	!
S3	R_SUP	!
S4	R_OPS	!
S5	R_POL	!

20. Conclusion

Variant Theory provides OCTA Defense with a formal, review-compatible method to evaluate technology advantage through multiplicity, constraint-driven collapse risk, and pivot posture. Document 001 is the first publication in the OCTA Defense UNCLASSIFIED Series and is structured for broad distribution with disciplined disclosure boundaries.

UNCLASSIFIED