



THE SYNERGY HALL

RESEARCH SERIES

AN INITIATIVE OF THE SHEYENE GERARDI FOUNDATION
STRATEGIC SECURITY · SCIENCE · SOCIETY

No. 4

August 2026

ISSN [pending]

Syzygy

**The Alignment of Personnel Reliability Systems
in High-Consequence Domains**

By Sheyene Gerardi

PUBLISHED BY THE SHEYENE GERARDI FOUNDATION

Research, Systems, and Institutional Studies
Washington, D.C.

ABOUT THE SYNERGY HALL RESEARCH SERIES

The Synergy Hall Research Series is the scholarly monograph series of the Sheyene Gerardi Foundation. It advances interdisciplinary research in institutional design, strategic security, artificial intelligence, systems science, governance, and collective human capability.

Each volume presents original analysis intended to connect scientific knowledge, technological development, and institutional design. The series examines how independent systems may be intentionally coordinated to produce outcomes greater than the sum of their individual contributions.

Each monograph is issued as a separately numbered volume within an ongoing research program intended to develop durable institutional models in service of human flourishing.

PUBLICATION DETAILS

Series title: Synergy Hall Research Series

Series type: Scholarly Research Monographs

Publisher: Sheyene Gerardi Foundation

Research Division: Research, Systems, and Institutional Studies

Place of publication: Washington, D.C., United States

Editor: Sheyene Gerardi

Frequency: Irregular

Language: English

ISSN: *[pending — U.S. ISSN Center, Library of Congress]*

Inaugural Volume: Monograph No. 4, August 2026

Contact: contact@sheyene.org · www.sheyene.org

COPYRIGHT

© 2026 Sheyene Gerardi Foundation. All rights reserved. The Synergy Hall Research Series is an independent scholarly publication of the Sheyene Gerardi Foundation. The views expressed in each monograph are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of any government, international organization, academic institution, or private entity.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the publisher, except for brief quotations used for scholarly, educational, or review purposes with appropriate attribution.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Gerardi, S. (2026). *Syzygy: The Alignment of Personnel Reliability Systems in High-Consequence Domains*. **Synergy Hall Research Series**, Monograph No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Sheyene Gerardi Foundation.

SYNERGY HALL RESEARCH SERIES

Intelligence acquires its highest value when it improves the institutions that serve humanity.



Syzygy

The Alignment of Personnel Reliability Systems in High-Consequence Domains

By Sheyene Gerardi

Sheyene Gerardi Foundation · Washington, D.C. · August 2026

Institutional alignment emerges when independent systems converge upon the same principles of responsibility.

Executive Summary

Personnel reliability systems have evolved independently across multiple high-consequence domains, including civil aviation, military service, and the management of nuclear weapons. Although developed under different legal authorities, operational requirements, and institutional cultures, these systems exhibit a remarkable convergence around a common principle: as the potential consequences of human failure increase, the rigor of personnel evaluation increases proportionally.

This monograph examines three representative institutional models within the United States: the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) medical certification system, the medical and psychological qualification standards of the U.S. Army, and the Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) governing access to nuclear weapons. Rather than comparing procedures alone, the analysis seeks to identify the underlying institutional logic shared by these apparently independent systems.

The study demonstrates that all three frameworks integrate physical health, psychological stability, behavioral reliability, and continuous evaluation according to the level of operational responsibility entrusted to the individual. The principal differences among them lie not in their fundamental philosophy, but in the degree of rigor required by the magnitude of the potential consequences associated with each role.

This convergence is described as **Syzygy**: the institutional alignment of independent personnel reliability systems around the common principle of proportional evaluation. The concept illustrates that proportional reliability is not a theoretical aspiration but an operational reality already implemented across multiple high-consequence domains.

Rather than proposing an entirely new certification model, this monograph argues that existing institutional practice provides empirical support for the broader frameworks developed in *The Survival Blueprint*. The evidence suggests that proportional personnel reliability constitutes a

general principle of institutional governance capable of informing future international standards for the management of catastrophic risk.

Part I. The Emergence of Proportional Reliability

Personnel reliability systems did not emerge from a single institutional design or centralized policy. Instead, they evolved independently within different sectors confronting different operational risks. Civil aviation, military service, and nuclear security each developed their own certification procedures in response to distinct missions, legal authorities, and organizational cultures.

Despite these differences, a striking pattern emerges. As the potential consequences of human failure increase, institutions consistently adopt more comprehensive methods of evaluating physical health, psychological stability, behavioral reliability, and continuing fitness for duty.

This convergence suggests the existence of a broader institutional principle extending beyond any individual profession. The following analysis examines three representative systems to identify the common logic underlying their independent evolution.

1.1 Civil Aviation: Reliability Through Medical Certification

Commercial aviation depends upon continuous human performance under conditions where even minor errors may produce catastrophic consequences. For this reason, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has developed a comprehensive medical certification system that evaluates pilots according to the operational responsibilities associated with their licenses.

Rather than applying identical standards to every aviator, the FAA employs a proportional model in which certification requirements increase alongside operational responsibility. Airline transport pilots undergo the most rigorous medical evaluation, reflecting the greater public risk associated with commercial aviation.

The certification process integrates multiple dimensions of human performance, including cardiovascular health, neurological conditions, vision, hearing, mental health, substance use, and other medical factors capable of affecting safe flight operations. Certification is therefore based not upon isolated diagnoses but upon the overall capacity to perform operational duties safely and consistently.

Equally important, the FAA recognizes that reliability is not a permanent characteristic. Medical certification requires periodic renewal, acknowledges the possibility of changing health conditions, and incorporates mechanisms for ongoing evaluation throughout a pilot's professional career. Reliability is therefore understood as a continuously maintained institutional condition rather than a one-time qualification.

1.2 Military Service: Expanding the Concept of Reliability

Military service extends the concept of personnel reliability beyond medical fitness alone. Soldiers must demonstrate not only physical capability but also psychological resilience, adaptability, discipline, ethical conduct, and the capacity to perform effectively under conditions of sustained uncertainty and operational stress.

Accordingly, military qualification integrates comprehensive medical examination, physical fitness assessment, psychological screening, and continuous evaluation throughout an individual's service. Specialized occupations involving greater operational responsibility often require additional assessment procedures reflecting the unique demands of those positions.

This broader approach illustrates an important institutional transition. As operational environments become increasingly complex, reliability expands from medical competence toward integrated human performance. Physical health remains essential, but behavioral stability, judgment, and sustained professional performance assume progressively greater importance.

The military model therefore demonstrates that personnel reliability is multidimensional. Effective institutional evaluation requires the integration of biological, psychological, physical, and behavioral evidence rather than reliance upon any single indicator of suitability.

1.3 Nuclear Security: Reliability as Continuous Institutional Assurance

Among the personnel reliability systems examined in this monograph, the standards governing access to nuclear weapons represent the most comprehensive expression of proportional institutional evaluation. The catastrophic consequences associated with nuclear systems justify correspondingly rigorous requirements for personnel certification, continuous monitoring, and behavioral accountability.

The Personnel Reliability Program (PRP), together with related security-clearance procedures, extends evaluation beyond medical qualification to include trustworthiness, emotional stability, professional conduct, judgment, responsibility, and sustained behavioral reliability. Background investigations, medical examinations, behavioral assessment, and continuous evaluation function together as complementary components of an integrated assurance system.

A defining characteristic of the nuclear model is its recognition that reliability cannot be permanently certified. Individuals remain subject to ongoing observation, periodic review, self-reporting obligations, and supervisory oversight throughout the duration of their responsibilities. Institutional trust is therefore maintained through continuous assurance rather than presumed from prior qualification.

This approach represents the highest level of proportional reliability identified within the systems examined. It demonstrates that as the potential consequences of human failure increase, institutions naturally evolve toward broader, more integrated, and more continuous models of personnel evaluation.

Part II. Discovering Institutional Convergence

The three personnel reliability systems examined in this study were developed independently, under different statutory authorities, organizational cultures, and operational environments. Yet despite these differences, they reveal a striking institutional convergence.

Each system evaluates individuals according to the magnitude of the responsibilities entrusted to them. Each integrates multiple dimensions of human performance rather than relying upon isolated indicators. Each recognizes that reliability must be maintained through continuing evaluation rather than assumed after initial certification.

These common characteristics suggest that proportional reliability is not merely an administrative preference but a general institutional principle emerging wherever human error carries extraordinary consequences.

2.1 A Shared Institutional Logic

At first glance, civil aviation, military service, and nuclear security appear to address fundamentally different operational challenges. One protects commercial transportation, another national defense, and the third strategic deterrence. Their certification procedures were designed independently and are administered by separate institutions.

Closer examination, however, reveals that these systems are guided by remarkably similar reasoning. All seek to reduce catastrophic risk by increasing confidence in the reliability of the individuals entrusted with critical responsibilities. Differences among the systems arise primarily from the magnitude of the potential consequences associated with failure rather than from fundamentally different philosophies of personnel evaluation.

This observation represents the central finding of the comparative analysis. Independent institutions confronting different risks have nevertheless converged upon the same governing principle: the greater the potential harm, the greater the rigor required for personnel certification.

The emergence of this common logic constitutes the institutional phenomenon described in this monograph as **Syzygy**—the alignment of independent reliability systems around shared principles of proportional responsibility.

2.2 The Principle of Proportional Responsibility

The comparative analysis demonstrates that personnel reliability systems are neither arbitrary nor uniform. Instead, certification requirements increase in proportion to the potential consequences associated with each operational role.

Commercial aviation illustrates this principle through progressively more demanding medical standards for pilots exercising greater responsibility. Military service expands evaluation to include physical readiness, psychological resilience, and sustained operational performance.

Nuclear security extends the principle further by incorporating continuous behavioral assurance, comprehensive background investigation, and ongoing institutional oversight.

Although the specific procedures differ, the governing logic remains remarkably consistent. Institutions calibrate the rigor of evaluation according to the magnitude of potential harm rather than according to the profession itself.

This observation suggests that proportional responsibility constitutes a general principle of institutional governance. Reliability standards should therefore be understood not as isolated administrative requirements but as risk-management mechanisms designed to preserve public trust where the consequences of failure are greatest.

2.3 Syzygy: Institutional Alignment Without Central Coordination

Perhaps the most significant finding of this analysis is that institutional convergence occurred without centralized design. The Federal Aviation Administration, the U.S. Army, and the Personnel Reliability Program evolved under different legal authorities, operational missions, and historical circumstances. Yet each independently developed increasingly rigorous approaches to personnel reliability as operational risk increased.

This phenomenon is described in this monograph as **Syzygy**: the spontaneous alignment of independent institutional systems around the same governing principle.

The concept extends beyond personnel certification. Throughout the history of institutional development, organizations confronting comparable risks frequently arrive at similar solutions despite limited direct coordination. Such convergence suggests that certain principles emerge naturally when institutions seek to balance operational effectiveness, public safety, and human responsibility.

Syzygy therefore represents more than an observation about three certification systems. It illustrates how institutional design itself evolves toward common patterns when independent organizations confront equivalent challenges.

Part III. Implications for Institutional Design

The convergence identified throughout this analysis carries implications extending well beyond the specific systems examined. If independent institutions consistently organize personnel reliability according to proportional responsibility, this principle may provide a broader foundation for institutional governance in other high-consequence domains.

Rather than viewing personnel certification as an isolated administrative function, institutions may instead understand it as one component of a comprehensive architecture designed to preserve trust, reduce catastrophic risk, and strengthen organizational resilience.

The following sections explore how the principle of proportional reliability may inform future institutional development while respecting scientific evidence, ethical safeguards, and national sovereignty.

3.1 Beyond Comparative Analysis

The value of comparative institutional research extends beyond identifying similarities and differences among existing systems. Its broader purpose is to reveal the governing principles that explain why independent institutions repeatedly adopt comparable solutions when confronting equivalent risks.

The FAA, the U.S. Army, and the Personnel Reliability Program were not designed as components of a unified framework. Each evolved independently in response to distinct operational requirements. Yet all three progressively expanded personnel evaluation as the potential consequences of failure increased.

This convergence suggests that proportional reliability is not unique to any particular profession or regulatory authority. Rather, it represents a general principle of institutional adaptation emerging wherever human performance becomes inseparable from public safety and strategic security.

Comparative analysis therefore serves not merely as a descriptive exercise but as a method for discovering enduring principles of institutional design.

3.2 From National Practice to International Standards

Although the systems examined in this monograph are primarily based within the United States, the principle of proportional reliability is not inherently national. The relationship between responsibility and institutional oversight reflects a broader logic applicable across legal systems, political traditions, and organizational structures.

International organizations have already recognized elements of this principle within sectors such as civil aviation, nuclear security, maritime operations, and public health. While implementation differs among jurisdictions, the underlying objective remains remarkably consistent: individuals entrusted with responsibilities carrying extraordinary consequences require correspondingly rigorous standards of qualification, evaluation, and continuing oversight.

This observation suggests that future international cooperation need not begin by creating entirely new personnel reliability systems. Instead, it may build upon principles already demonstrated across existing institutional practice, adapting them to diverse legal and cultural environments while preserving national sovereignty.

Syzygy therefore represents not institutional uniformity, but institutional compatibility grounded in shared principles of responsibility.

3.3 Syzygy as an Institutional Principle

The concept of **Syzygy** extends beyond the specific domains examined in this study. It describes a recurring pattern in institutional evolution whereby independent organizations confronting comparable challenges converge upon similar governing principles without centralized coordination.

Within personnel reliability, this convergence is expressed through proportional evaluation, multidimensional assessment, continuous oversight, and the integration of behavioral as well as medical evidence. Similar patterns may be observed across numerous areas of institutional governance whenever the consequences of human failure become sufficiently significant.

Recognizing Syzygy as an institutional principle carries important implications. Rather than designing governance frameworks from first principles, policymakers may identify successful patterns already emerging across independent institutions and refine them through evidence-based collaboration.

In this sense, Syzygy represents both a descriptive observation and a methodological approach to institutional design. It encourages researchers to seek alignment among independently evolving systems as evidence of underlying organizational principles capable of informing future governance.

Part IV. Toward a Universal Principle of Personnel Reliability

The comparative analysis presented in this monograph suggests that proportional personnel reliability is neither accidental nor confined to specific institutional settings. Independent organizations repeatedly strengthen evaluation as operational responsibility increases, indicating the emergence of a broader principle applicable across high-consequence domains.

The significance of this observation extends beyond personnel certification itself. It suggests that institutional design evolves toward common patterns when organizations confront equivalent risks. Recognizing these patterns may provide a foundation for future international cooperation while preserving the diversity of national legal systems and institutional traditions.

The following principles summarize the broader implications of Syzygy for institutional governance.

4.1 Reliability as a Universal Institutional Principle

Reliability should not be understood as a profession-specific requirement but as a universal institutional principle. Whenever individuals exercise responsibilities capable of producing extraordinary consequences, institutions develop mechanisms to evaluate competence, trustworthiness, judgment, and continuing suitability.

The specific methods vary according to operational context, technological requirements, and legal authority. Nevertheless, the underlying objective remains consistent: reducing catastrophic risk by strengthening confidence in the individuals entrusted with exceptional responsibility.

The convergence documented throughout this monograph therefore supports the conclusion that proportional reliability represents an enduring feature of institutional governance rather than an isolated administrative practice.

4.2 Implications for Future Institutional Governance

Future technological developments—including artificial intelligence, advanced biotechnology, autonomous systems, and other emerging capabilities—will increasingly place unprecedented responsibilities upon individuals and institutions alike. As these technologies expand the potential consequences of human decision-making, the principle of proportional reliability will become progressively more important.

Rather than creating entirely new evaluation systems for each emerging technology, policymakers may benefit from recognizing the common institutional principles already demonstrated across existing personnel reliability programs. Building upon proven practices offers greater continuity, legitimacy, and public confidence than beginning from institutional first principles.

Syzygy therefore encourages an evolutionary approach to governance: institutions learn from one another by recognizing convergent solutions that have independently emerged under comparable conditions of responsibility.

Conclusion

The personnel reliability systems governing civil aviation, military service, and nuclear security were developed independently, under different authorities, and for distinct operational purposes. Yet this comparative analysis demonstrates that they converge upon a common institutional principle: as the potential consequences of human failure increase, the rigor of personnel evaluation increases proportionally.

This convergence constitutes the phenomenon described in this monograph as **Syzygy**—the alignment of independent institutional systems around shared principles of responsibility. The concept extends beyond the specific cases examined here, suggesting that proportional reliability represents a broader pattern of institutional evolution observable wherever catastrophic risk demands exceptional human performance.

Rather than proposing an entirely new model of personnel certification, this study demonstrates that many of the principles advanced in *The Survival Blueprint* are already embedded within successful institutional practice. Existing systems therefore provide empirical support for the broader proposition that proportional evaluation strengthens public trust, organizational resilience, and strategic security.

Syzygy ultimately suggests that some institutional principles emerge naturally because they reflect enduring relationships between responsibility, risk, and human reliability. Recognizing these convergent patterns may enable future institutions to cooperate more effectively while preserving scientific integrity, ethical governance, and respect for national sovereignty.

Disclaimer

This monograph is presented as a scholarly and conceptual contribution intended to stimulate interdisciplinary discussion regarding personnel reliability, institutional governance, and proportional risk management in high-consequence domains. It does not constitute legal, governmental, regulatory, military, or operational policy.

The comparative analysis is based upon publicly available institutional frameworks and is intended to identify general principles of organizational design rather than evaluate the performance of any specific agency or program. References to governmental institutions are included exclusively for scholarly analysis.

The views expressed are solely those of the author and are intended to encourage evidence-based dialogue concerning institutional reliability, strategic security, and responsible governance.

Works Cited

1. Chapter 17: Aeromedical Factors. Federal Aviation Administration. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/regulations_policies/handbooks_manuals/aviation/phak/19_phak_ch17.pdf
2. FAA Medical Certificates — Definition, Privileges, & Requirements. ATP Flight School. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://atpflightschool.com/become-a-pilot/airline-career/faa-medical-certificate.html>
3. FAA Medical Certificates — What Every Pilot Should Know. ByDanJohnson. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://bydanjohnson.com/faa-medical-certificates-what-every-pilot-should-know/>
4. FAA Medical Certificates: Everything You Need to Know. Pilot Institute. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://pilotinstitute.com/faa-medical-certificates-everything-you-need-to-know/>
5. AMAS Newsletter, 2Q 2013. Aviation Medicine Advisory Service. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.aviationmedicine.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/2Q-2013-AMAS-Newsletter.pdf>
6. Medical Certification. Federal Aviation Administration. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.faa.gov/pilots/medical_certification
7. How Do I Get a Medical Certificate and What to Expect During the Exam. Federal Aviation Administration. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.faa.gov/pilots/medical_certification/get
8. How Do I Obtain a Medical Certificate? Federal Aviation Administration. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.faa.gov/faq/how-do-i-obtain-medical-certificate>
9. Eligibility & Requirements to Join. U.S. Army. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.goarmy.com/how-to-join/requirements>
10. What Is Checked During MEPS? UCMJ. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://ucmj.us/what-is-checked-during-meps/>
11. Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS). U.S. Army. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.goarmy.com/how-to-join/steps/processing-station>

12. What Tests Are Done During MEPS? UCMJ. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://ucmj.us/what-tests-are-done-during-meps/>
13. DoD Instruction 6130.03, Volume 1: Medical Standards for Military Service. U.S. Department of Defense. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/613003_vol01.pdf
14. Army Regulation 40–501: Standards of Medical Fitness. DACOWITS. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://dacowits.defense.gov/Portals/48/Documents/General%20Documents/RFI%20Docs/June2023/USA%20RFI%202a_AR%2040-501-1.pdf
15. Medical Conditions That Can Keep You from Joining the Military. Military.com. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.military.com/join-armed-forces/disqualifiers-medical-conditions.html>
16. Tips for Meeting Military Fitness Standards. Military OneSource. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.militaryonesource.mil/military-basics/new-to-the-military/meeting-military-fitness-standards/>
17. Army Fitness Test & Requirements. U.S. Army. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.goarmy.com/how-to-join/requirements/fitness>
18. Baseline Physical Activity Behaviors and Relationships with Fitness in the Army Training at High Intensity Study. PMC. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8954232/>
19. What You Should Know About Any Military Physical Fitness Test. Military.com. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.military.com/military-fitness/fitness-test-prep/physical-fitness-test-standards>
20. Army Combat Fitness Test (ACFT). Army National Guard. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://nationalguard.com/basic-combat-training/army-combat-fitness-test>
21. Does the Military Check Your Mental Health Records? Katy Counseling. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://katycounseling.com/military-check-your-mental-health-records/>
22. Military Psychiatric Evaluations for MEPS. Anxiety & Depression Clinic of Columbia. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.comoclinic.com/meps>
23. U.S. Military Enlisted Accession Mental Health Screening: History and Current Practice. ResearchGate. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6530925_US_Military_Enlisted_Accession_Mental_Health_Screening_History_and_Current_Practice
24. Psychological Operations. U.S. Army. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.goarmy.com/careers-and-jobs/specialty-careers/special-ops/psychological-operations>
25. Assessing Psychological Readiness in U.S. Soldiers Following NATO Operations. DTIC. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA388344.pdf>
26. Psychological Operations — Special Operations Recruiting. Army.mil. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.goarmysof.army.mil/PO/>
27. U.S. Military Enlisted Accession Mental Health Screening: History and Current Practice. Oxford Academic, Military Medicine. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://academic.oup.com/milmed/article/172/1/31/4578884>
28. Military Psych Evaluations. Virtual Psych Testing Group. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://psychologicaltesting.net/military-psych-evaluations/>
29. Clinical Psychologist (73B). U.S. Army. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.goarmy.com/careers-and-jobs/science-medicine/physical-mental-health/73b-clinical-psychologist>
30. Does Receiving Psychological Health Care Affect Security Clearance? Military OneSource. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.militaryonesource.mil/health-wellness/mental-health/does-receiving-psychological-health-care-affect-security-clearance/>
31. Psychological & Mental Health Assessment for Security Clearance. ClearancePsych. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.clearancepsych.com/services.html>

32. Radioactive Materials & Waste Regulations. U.S. EPA, I-WASTE DST. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://iwaste.epa.gov/guidance/radiological-nuclear/regulations>
33. Mangano, M. Nuclear Regulation in the U.S.: A Short History (Nuclear Materials and Disaster Research). Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.amazon.com/Nuclear-Regulation-U-s-Materials-Disaster/dp/1614708711>
34. Nuclear Surety. Nuclear Matters Handbook 2020 (Revised), Chapter 8. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.acq.osd.mil/ncbdp/nm/NMHB2020rev/chapters/chapter8.html>
35. Personnel Reliability Program. Wikipedia. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Personnel_Reliability_Program
36. Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Program (NSIAD-92-193R). U.S. Government Accountability Office. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.gao.gov/assets/nsiad-92-193r.pdf>
37. Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) Questionnaire and Processing Guide. Massachusetts National Guard. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.massnationalguard.org/images/documnets/EMPL/prp-questionnaire_processing-guide_naoc.pdf
38. BUMEDINST 8120.1B. U.S. Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.med.navy.mil/>
39. Sources of Human Instability in the Handling of Nuclear Weapons. NCBI Bookshelf. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK219146/>
40. DOE Classification and Clearances. Federation of American Scientists, Project on Government Secrecy. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://sgp.fas.org/classdoe.htm>
41. Access Authorization. DOE Directives. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www.directives.doe.gov/terms_definitions/access-authorization
42. 10 CFR Part 11 — Requirements for Special Nuclear Material Access Authorization. eCFR. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-10/chapter-I/part-11>
43. Information Security. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.nrc.gov/security/info-security.html>
44. Security Clearances in the Nuclear Security Enterprise. U.S. Department of Energy. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.energy.gov/nnsa/security-clearances-nuclear-security-enterprise>
45. The U.S. Nuclear Weapons Stockpile. U.S. Department of Energy. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.energy.gov/nnsa/us-nuclear-weapons-stockpile>
46. Safety Standards. International Atomic Energy Agency. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.iaea.org/resources/safety-standards>
47. Security of Nuclear and Other Radioactive Material in Transport. International Atomic Energy Agency. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/p15617-PUB2090_web.pdf
48. Nuclear Security Officer (INSServ) (P4). International Atomic Energy Agency. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.impactpool.org/jobs/923836>
49. Objective and Essential Elements of a State's Nuclear Security Regime. International Atomic Energy Agency. Accessed March 24, 2025. https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/Pub1590_web.pdf
50. Nuclear Security Series. International Atomic Energy Agency. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.iaea.org/resources/nuclear-security-series>
51. RD-363: Nuclear Security Officer Medical, Physical, and Psychological Fitness. Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.cnsccsn.gc.ca/eng/acts-and-regulations/regulatory-documents/published/html/rd363/>
52. Regulatory Guide 5.75: Training and Qualification of Security Personnel at Nuclear Power Reactor Facilities. U.S. NRC. Accessed March 24, 2025. <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ml0916/ml091690037.pdf>
53. Army Fitness Test (AFT). U.S. Army. Accessed June 4, 2026. <https://www.army.mil/aft/>

54. Army Introduces New Fitness Test for 2025. U.S. Army. Accessed June 4, 2026.
https://www.army.mil/article/285501/army_introduces_new_fitness_test_for_2025
 55. BasicMed. Federal Aviation Administration. Accessed June 4, 2026.
https://www.faa.gov/licenses_certificates/airmen_certification/basic_med
 56. Guide for Aviation Medical Examiners. Federal Aviation Administration. Accessed June 4, 2026.
https://www.faa.gov/ame_guide/
 57. Pilots Gain Greater Flexibility, Faster Recertification in New FAA Medical Guidance Update. National Business Aviation Association. Accessed June 4, 2026.
<https://nbaa.org/flight-department-administration/personnel/medical/pilots-gaingreater-flexibility-faster-recertification-new-faa-medical-guidance-update/>
 58. FAA Modifies Medical Certification Policies for Antidepressants, Insulin. National Business Aviation Association. Accessed June 4, 2026. <https://nbaa.org/flight-department-administration/personnel/medical/faa-modifies-medical-certification-policies-for-antidepressants-insulin/>
 59. DoD Instruction 5210.42: DoD Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Assurance. U.S. Department of Defense. Accessed June 4, 2026.
<https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/521042p.pdf>
- une 5, 2026. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.22401>