

Ten lines of rule for every line of code.

What it is actually like to build the engine underneath 9,853 posture rules.



9,853 posture rules exist without 9,853 code paths.

The platform loads and evaluates rules. It never hardcodes them.

- **27,682 YAML to 2,590 Python** a 10.7:1 ratio of declarative rule to implementation code
- **A new detection** a file, not a deployment. That is why the catalog can be this large
- **CSPM** cloud security posture management: the rules that say a configuration is unsafe

Source: `git ls-files (threat-engine, 2026-08-07) · facts/product.yaml`

You would not write rules. You would build the engine that evaluates them.

The rules are content. The engine, the graph, and the pricing model are the work.

- **Rule authoring** a catalog problem with its own pipeline, and not the engineering role
- **The engineering role** traversal, cross-cloud correlation, and pricing what the graph finds
- **The consequence** the interesting bugs live in the engine, worth fixing once

Source: fact-base.md §1

The shape of the system, measured.

The graph is the hard part, and it was rebuilt from scratch this year.

attack-path-v2 is the second-largest body of code in the repo.

- **288 tracked files** second only to vulnerability at 400
- **A path** not a list of findings, but a reachability question across identity and data
- **A choke point** the one node on the most paths, where one fix beats ten

261ac6736

**the commit that finished retiring attack-path v1 — phases 1
through 6, July 2026**

engines/attack-path/ now contains nothing but build caches. The old thing is
actually gone.

A finding is a row. A path priced in dollars is a decision.

The last mile is not detection — it is making the output rankable against everything else a business funds.

- **FAIR** the open standard, published by The Open Group, for putting a dollar value on cyber risk
- **ALE** annualised loss expectancy: the figure a board already knows how to weigh
- **The difference** severity compares findings to each other, dollars compares them to a budget

A 10-to-1 data-to-code ratio makes data quality the engineering problem.

And it is not solved. This is the honest state of it.

- **Azure alone** 422 duplicate rows across 225 repeated rule_ids in the registry
- **Found 2026-08-07** by a lint step that did not exist the week before
- **The catch** a data defect ships exactly like a code defect, with none of the tooling

Source: catalog/rule/all_rule_ids.csv (2026-08-07)

No runtime agent. If you want to build eBPF enforcement, that work is not here.

The honest limit, stated the way we would want it stated to us.

- **Read-only and agentless by design** nothing is deployed on the workload
- **The category fact** Wiz, Orca, Cortex Cloud and Microsoft all ship runtime agents
- **A real boundary** on the problem space, not a positioning choice

Source: fact-base.md §4.1

Three things to take away.

- 1 The platform is data** 10 lines of rule per line of code, deliberately
- 2** The engineering is the engine, the graph and the pricing model
- 3 The unsolved problem is data quality at catalog scale** and we said so first

Find your true north.

If the interesting part of that was slide 8, we should talk.
onamsecurity.com

onamsecurity.com

