



MANCHINE AI TECHNOLOGY LLC

R E B - 0 1

Runtime Execution Boundary

Architecture Specification v1.0

PUBLIC RELEASE EDITION — PENDING FINAL BINARY VERIFICATION

2 SEPTEMBER 2026 · PENDING FINAL BINARY VERIFICATION & PAR-001 REBINDING

Publication Edition	<i>PUBLIC RELEASE EDITION — PENDING FINAL BINARY VERIFICATION AND PAR-001 REBINDING</i>
Edition Date	2 September 2026
Architecture	FROZEN — CONTROLLED ARCHITECTURE BASELINE
Formal Proof	REB-H1 FORMAL PROOF CLOSURE — CLOSED — 34/34 claims SUPPORTED
Implementation / Deployment	NOT ESTABLISHED by this publication
Frozen Baseline SHA-256	8f884b4d90bbf9a4ac0af12cfa4bc99bad275166eeec7abe3243a42864455992
Public-Release-Edition SHA-256	<i>PENDING INDEPENDENT COMPUTATION — not embedded in this file to avoid a self-referential binary</i>
Publication Authorization	<i>REB-01-PAR-001 — PENDING REBINDING TO THIS EXACT (NEW) BINARY</i>
Independent Gate	AFFIRM FOR PUBLICATION
Public Release	<i>NOT YET POSTED</i>
Publisher	Richard R. Colimon, ManChine AI Technology LLC

PUBLIC RELEASE EDITION — PENDING VERIFICATION



RiCo

RUNTIME INTEGRITY CONTROL

Humans First. Continuity Always. Architecture Must Survive.

Prepared for General · ManChine AI Technology LLC · Public Release Edition — Pending Final Binary Verification

Publication Status and Historical Preservation

Controlling publication status

This document is the PUBLIC RELEASE EDITION of REB-01 v1.0, dated 2 September 2026, prepared for final independent binary verification by General. Its own exact SHA-256 is PENDING INDEPENDENT COMPUTATION and is not embedded in this file, to avoid a self-referential binary; the independently computed hash will be recorded externally, in a new REB-01-PAR-001 binding specific to this exact binary. This edition is a new, distinct binary from the prior FINAL PUBLICATION MASTER CANDIDATE reviewed on 1 September 2026 (SHA-256 41b3b0c069bc191269fbb588cf201a9bbfe3cfbb96bf5405c80a273aea37e9db); that prior candidate's authorization status does not extend to this edition. This edition requires its own independent SHA-256 computation and its own PAR-001 rebinding before authorization can be considered established for it. Public release has not occurred and remains NOT YET POSTED.

Frozen normative body

The 30-page REB-01 body that follows is the preserved frozen controlled architecture baseline. Every frozen-body page is an exact, unmodified content-stream copy carried over from the prior reviewed candidate identified by the Frozen Baseline SHA-256 on the cover page. No text, structure, pagination, or content within the frozen body has been altered, reflowed, or redesigned for this edition.

Historical lifecycle language

The frozen body intentionally retains statements including “PRE-FREEZE,” “NOT PUBLISHED,” “independent review pending,” and the Section 27.15 next-step language, together with the document's own historical self-description as a “Controlled Architecture Review Candidate.” Those statements record the historical state of the frozen source when created. They are superseded for present lifecycle status by the completed architecture freeze and formal proof closure, and by the controlling status stated on this and the preceding page. Historical “candidate” or “not published” language retained inside the frozen normative body records only that body's own earlier lifecycle state; it does not alter, and is not altered by, the controlling front matter of this edition. They are not deleted or retroactively rewritten.

Proof scope

REB-H1 formal proof closure is complete with 34/34 registered claims SUPPORTED against its controlled reference subject-under-test and frozen proof contracts. This does not certify a production implementation, deployed system, commercial product, or every future implementation claiming REB-01 conformance. RiCo activation, implementation, deployment, and production validation are not prerequisites for, and are not established by, publishing this architecture specification.

Implementation boundary

Neither this publication edition nor the REB-H1 proof closure establishes production implementation, deployment, external certification, or automatic future implementation conformance.

Non-retroactivity

The historical architecture-review candidate, architecture freeze record, proof chain, and publication-readiness records remain valid records of their respective lifecycle states. This publication edition does not alter their historical truth.

Publication sequence

Final PDF → independent SHA-256 → REB-01-PAR-001 bound to that exact PDF hash → explicit authorization → PAR-001 freeze/hash → archive → PUBLIC RELEASE.

This document is the Public Release Edition prepared for the independent SHA-256 computation step. Every remaining step — independent hash computation of this exact binary, PAR-001 rebinding to that exact hash, explicit authorization, PAR-001 freeze, archive, and PUBLIC RELEASE — is PENDING and is not represented as complete by this document.

Locked terminology: REB = Runtime Execution Boundary; RiCo = Runtime Integrity Control.

REB-01 — Runtime Execution Boundary

Controlled Architecture Review Candidate

Version 1.0 | 28 August 2026

Lifecycle Status: CONTROLLED ARCHITECTURE REVIEW CANDIDATE — PRE-FREEZE

Publication State: NOT PUBLISHED

Architecture State: REB-D01 through REB-D07 internally adjudicated; independent review pending

Controlling Purpose: Independent adversarial architecture review against the verified ManChine architecture baseline

Candidate Control Note

This candidate is the controlled consolidation required by the REB-01 internal architecture gate. Obsolete development-skeleton instructions and open-ended prompts from Sections 1–19 of the internal development artifact are intentionally excluded from this review candidate. For traceability and semantic-drift control, the adopted architecture sections retain their original numbering (Sections 20–27) and substantive text. The internal development artifact remains the historical record of how the decisions were reached and is not replaced or retroactively rewritten by this candidate.

Section 27.15 is preserved as the historical internal-gate disposition that ordered consolidation, freeze, and independent review. Creation of this candidate fulfills the consolidation step only. It does not itself constitute freeze, independent affirmation, publication, implementation, proof closure, or normative maturity.

Independent Review Boundary

- Review the adopted REB-D01 through REB-D07 architecture as a coherent set; do not redesign REB.
- Challenge contradictions, responsibility collapse, unsupported authority creation, retroactivity, authority-by-inertia, bypass paths, cGate promotion, implementation leakage, and traceability gaps.
- Do not treat unresolved downstream implementation choices as defects merely because they remain deliberately open.
- Any correction must be the narrowest correction necessary to resolve a demonstrated conflict with a controlling source.

20. Internal Architecture Gate — Inherited Obligations and Open-Decision Reconciliation

Gate status: COMPLETE — INTERNAL MANCHINE RECONCILIATION CANDIDATE

Control date: 28 August 2026

Purpose. This section completes the pre-draft internal gate required by Section 18. It reconciles REB-01 against the established REA-01 and RGE-01 boundaries and against the RGRA-01 / RGAF-01 architectural propositions expressly carried into the current RGE-01 and RGV-01 source chain. It does not convert unresolved choices into approved architecture. Items not established by the controlling source chain remain PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION.

20.1 Source-Control Note

REA-01 v1.6 and RGE-01 v1.2 are treated according to their current lifecycle status. RGE-01 identifies RGRA-01 as its primary controlling architectural source and cites RGAF-01 for separation of governance responsibilities, present-condition justification, governance before consequence, governance during execution, evidence-based accountability, and architecture–implementation separation. Where this reconciliation relies on an RGRA-01 or RGAF-01 proposition, it does so only where that proposition is expressly reproduced, attributed, or relied upon by the current developed standards-family source chain. Historical white papers and implementation-oriented material are not used to create normative REB obligations.

20.2 Inherited REB Obligations

- [SUPPORTED] REB is the Runtime Execution Boundary. Enforcement is its architectural responsibility/behavior; the component is not renamed Runtime Enforcement Boundary.
- [SUPPORTED] REB consumes the Admissibility Determination and applies/enforces it immediately prior to consequential execution.
- [SUPPORTED] REB SHALL NOT redefine, modify, or re-evaluate the Admissibility Determination merely in order to enforce it.
- [SUPPORTED] RGE owns Evaluation and produces the Admissibility Determination; REB owns enforcement. REB therefore does not originate Authority, grant Authorization, or perform RGE's governance evaluation.
- [SUPPORTED] Consequential Execution, not RGE or REB, performs the operational activity. Consequential Execution depends on REB's enforcement before consequence proceeds.
- [SUPPORTED] RiCo retains runtime-integrity verification throughout consequential execution. REB does not absorb RiCo's ongoing integrity-verification responsibility.
- [SUPPORTED] A later material governance-basis change does not retroactively rewrite an earlier determination, but an earlier determination or historical artifact does not independently establish present applicability or current Admissibility.

- [SUPPORTED] Authority loss, suspension, expiry, revocation, or material narrowing must not be bypassed through queues, retries, recovery paths, alternate routes, delegated actors, replicas, failover, or functionally equivalent execution paths. Enforcement of this invariant is routed to REB-01 / applicable behavioral specifications / implementation.
- [SUPPORTED] Partial execution under changed conditions is outside RGE-01 and is an REB/execution-boundary behavioral question.
- [SUPPORTED] REB must preserve architecture–implementation separation: conformance must concern externally meaningful boundary behavior, not a mandated product, SDK, language, topology, algorithm, or cGate implementation.
- [RECONCILED] REB requires enough correspondence between the determination and the proposed consequential action to apply the determination to the action actually attempting to cross. This does not authorize REB to inspect and reinterpret the complete governance basis.
- [RECONCILED] A determination that is not presently applicable to the attempted crossing cannot be treated as a current positive basis merely because it was historically valid. The mechanism by which present applicability is represented remains unresolved below.

20.3 Candidate Input Disposition

- Admissibility Determination — REQUIRED. This is the established REB governance input.
- Execution request / proposed consequential action — REQUIRED BY RECONCILIATION. REB must know what attempted crossing the determination is being applied to; exact representation is not yet frozen.
- RGE result metadata / determination provenance — CONDITIONAL / MINIMUM FORM UNRESOLVED. Some binding or traceable correspondence is needed to avoid applying a determination to the wrong action or decision point, but REB must not use metadata as a pretext to re-perform RGE.
- Authority / Authorization / Evidence / Policy / Context — RELATED ONLY as governance basis behind RGE's determination unless another governing specification explicitly requires a direct REB-side check. REB does not ordinarily re-evaluate these inputs.
- Prior governance state / event / receipt — NOT A GENERAL REQUIRED INPUT. Historical artifacts cannot independently substitute for the governance basis applicable at the current decision point.
- cGate state / signal — UNSUPPORTED pending a Manchine architectural decision defining cGate's identity and relationship to REB.

20.4 Disposition of the Twelve Open REB Questions

1. What exact architectural responsibility does REB own?

[SUPPORTED] REB owns enforcement/application of the Admissibility Determination at the Runtime Execution Boundary immediately prior to consequential execution. It gates consequential execution without becoming Evaluation, Determination, Authority, Authorization, execution, integrity verification, or governance recording.

2. What does REB explicitly not own?

[SUPPORTED] REB does not originate Authority, grant Authorization, produce observations, perform RGE evaluation, create or redefine Admissibility, perform the consequential operational action, absorb RiCo runtime-integrity verification, or become the persistent governance-recording responsibility.

3. Is REB itself an enforcing component, a boundary at which another component enforces, or both?

[SUPPORTED] At the standards-family architecture level, REB owns enforcement. The architecture may be implemented by a component, service, interceptor, SDK, or other mechanism, but the normative responsibility remains REB's. A separate unnamed enforcing component is not required by the current source chain.

4. What minimum input is required before consequential execution may cross REB?

[RECONCILED / PARTIALLY OPEN] A validly reached Admissibility Determination applicable to the attempted consequential action is the minimum governance input. The attempted action/crossing must also be identifiable. The exact minimum binding/provenance envelope needed to establish determination-to-action and decision-point correspondence is a genuine ManChine decision.

5. Does REB consume Admissibility only, or must it also inspect Authority/Authorization/Evidence/Policy/Context?

[SUPPORTED] REB consumes Admissibility as the determination it enforces and does not re-evaluate the underlying governance basis. Direct inspection of Authority/Authorization/Evidence/Policy/Context is not established as a general REB responsibility. Trace/provenance references may accompany the determination without transferring RGE's evaluation responsibility.

6. What happens when the required governance determination is missing, stale, invalid, or indeterminate?

[SPLIT] A current NOT_ADMISSIBLE determination cannot permit crossing. A genuine RGE non-determination condition is not a positive Admissibility determination and therefore cannot be silently converted by REB into permission. A historically valid determination that is no longer applicable cannot independently authorize present crossing. However, the exact REB boundary outcome taxonomy for missing/non-determination/stale/unverifiable/invalid inputs — prevent, hold/defer, error, escalation handoff, or other bounded treatment — is not fully established and requires ManChine decision.

7. What is the exact relationship between REB and cGate?

[PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION] Unresolved. Developed sources do not establish cGate's identity, role, hierarchy, or relationship to REB. REB must not depend on cGate until ManChine defines that relationship.

8. What event marks successful crossing of REB?

[PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION] The architecture establishes a boundary immediately prior to consequential execution, but the exact externally meaningful crossing event/condition has not been frozen. It must be defined without equating REB with the internal execution mechanism.

9. Where does REB responsibility end and RiCo responsibility begin?

[SUPPORTED WITH NARROW RECONCILIATION] REB owns enforcement at the execution boundary; RiCo verifies continuing conformance throughout consequential execution. Successful boundary crossing is therefore the natural architectural handoff point, but the exact event used to evidence that handoff depends on the unresolved crossing definition in Question 8. RiCo findings may later feed a new discrete RGE evaluation.

10. What trace/evidence must REB preserve for Governance Events/Receipts?

[RECONCILED / PARTIALLY OPEN] The standards family requires reconstructable governance relationships and distinguishes recording from enforcement. REB should expose or contribute traceable information sufficient to show what determination was applied to what attempted crossing and what boundary action occurred, without becoming the persistent receipt store. The exact minimum REB trace contribution and whether it emits a Governance Event directly remain genuine ManChine decisions.

11. Can an action cross REB more than once during a multi-stage execution?

[PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION] The current architecture supports re-entry into governance evaluation when governance-relevant conditions change and routes partial/multi-stage execution behavior to REB, but it does not establish a universal rule for repeated boundary crossing. REB-01 must define when a later stage constitutes a new consequential crossing/decision point rather than assuming one initial crossing governs all later consequence.

12. Which REB concepts need normative definitions added back to RGV-01?

[RECONCILED] RGV-01 v2.3 already represents Runtime Execution Boundary as the enforcement boundary and states that REB enforces a determination rather than evaluating one. REB itself therefore does not require reinvention in vocabulary. 'Enforcement' remains an unresolved vocabulary dependency even though RGRA-01 supplies sufficient architectural meaning. Any new REB-local term such as a formally named boundary-crossing event should be added to RGV-01 only if REB-01 ultimately establishes it as standards-family vocabulary.

20.5 Genuine ManChine Architectural Decisions Remaining

REB-D01 — Determination-to-Crossing Binding Envelope

Define the minimum information by which REB establishes that the Admissibility Determination being enforced corresponds to the proposed consequential action and relevant decision point, without re-evaluating the governance basis.

REB-D02 — Non-Determination / Invalid-Input Boundary Treatment

Define REB's externally meaningful treatment when no current valid Admissibility Determination is available: e.g. prevent crossing plus any hold/defer/error/escalation handoff semantics. Do not collapse RGE Evaluation Status into a new Admissibility value.

REB-D03 — cGate Relationship

Determine whether cGate is an implementation of REB, a mechanism within REB, a distinct component used by REB, or remains outside the normative REB architecture.

REB-D04 — Boundary-Crossing Event

Define the externally meaningful event or condition that constitutes successful crossing into consequential execution, including its relationship to consequence formation and REA-01's intervention-window/consequence-boundary treatment.

REB-D05 — REB Trace / Governance-Recording Contribution

Define the minimum trace REB must expose or emit for downstream Governance Event/Receipt reconstruction, while preserving the separation between enforcement and persistent governance recording.

REB-D06 — Multi-Stage / Repeated Crossing

Define when a multi-stage, distributed, retried, resumed, delegated, or partially executed action encounters REB again and requires a current applicable determination.

REB-D07 — Changed-Condition / In-Flight Consequence Application

Define REB's behavioral responsibility when governance-relevant conditions change during in-flight execution and a new RGE determination is produced or pending. The decision must preserve REA-01's distinction among already formed consequence, remaining changeable execution, containment/safe-stop possibilities, and non-retroactivity; it must not invent a universal rollback or safety mechanism.

20.6 Items Not Requiring a New ManChine Decision

- [CLOSED / INHERITED] RGE produces the Admissibility Determination.

- [CLOSED / INHERITED] REB owns enforcement and does not re-evaluate or redefine Admissibility.
- [CLOSED / INHERITED] Consequential Execution performs the operational activity and is gated by REB.
- [CLOSED / INHERITED] RiCo owns ongoing runtime-integrity verification after execution begins.
- [CLOSED / INHERITED] Historical validity does not independently establish present applicability after material change.
- [CLOSED / INHERITED] Authority loss/narrowing cannot be bypassed through alternate execution paths.
- [CLOSED / INHERITED] REB remains implementation-independent and is not synonymous with cGate or a particular SDK.

20.7 Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: INTERNAL GATE COMPLETE — SUFFICIENT BASIS TO BEGIN REB-01 ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT, BUT NOT YET SUFFICIENT BASIS FOR FULL NORMATIVE DRAFTING.

The inherited architecture is sufficiently stable to prevent responsibility collapse: RGE determines, REB enforces, Consequential Execution acts, RiCo verifies during execution, and governance recording remains distinct. Seven genuine Manchine decisions remain. These decisions should be resolved deliberately before the skeleton is converted into a mature SHALL/SHALL NOT behavioral specification. No external reviewer is authorized to decide these seven items on Manchine's behalf.

21. REB-D01 — Determination-to-Crossing Binding Envelope

Decision status: ADOPTED — MANCHINE WORKING ARCHITECTURE

Decision class: PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION → ADOPTED FOR REB-01 DEVELOPMENT

Scope: This decision resolves only the minimum semantic binding required between an Admissibility Determination and the consequential action attempting to cross REB. It does not resolve changed-condition/in-flight behavior, cGate, receipt schema, or implementation format.

21.1 Problem

REB is required to consume and enforce an Admissibility Determination immediately prior to consequential execution without redefining, modifying, or re-evaluating it. The architecture therefore requires a way to establish that the determination presented at REB is the determination applicable to the particular attempted consequential action and decision point.

Without that binding, a historically valid or unrelated positive determination could be replayed, substituted, or misapplied to a different action, scope, instance, or decision point.

21.2 Decision

REB SHALL require a Determination-to-Crossing Binding Envelope sufficient to establish semantic correspondence among: (a) the Admissibility Determination being enforced; (b) the decision point at which that determination was made; and (c) the proposed consequential action, action scope, or execution instance attempting to cross REB.

The Binding Envelope SHALL be sufficient for REB to establish correspondence and integrity of the presented determination-to-crossing relationship. It SHALL NOT require REB to re-perform Runtime Governance Evaluation, reinterpret Authority, Authorization, Evidence, Policy, or Context, or independently determine Admissibility.

21.3 Minimum Semantic Content

- Determination reference or equivalent identity sufficient to distinguish the Admissibility Determination being enforced.
- Decision-point reference or equivalent semantic identity sufficient to associate the determination with the governance decision point for which it was produced.
- Proposed-action / execution-instance reference, scope, or equivalent binding sufficient to establish that the attempted consequential crossing is the action to which the determination applies.
- Integrity/provenance linkage sufficient to detect substitution, mismatch, or reuse of a determination outside the relationship for which it was produced.

REB-01 does not freeze UUIDs, hashes, timestamps, signatures, URIs, serialization, field names, transport protocols, or any other wire-format representation for these semantics. Those are implementation or later receipt/interface decisions unless another controlling specification makes them normative.

21.4 Present-Applicability Constraint

A Binding Envelope establishes correspondence; it does not manufacture continuing authority or continuing Admissibility. Historical validity of the bound determination SHALL NOT, by itself, establish present applicability after a material governance-relevant change. Where the architecture has established that a new decision point or renewed evaluation is required, REB SHALL NOT treat the earlier envelope as a substitute for the resulting current determination.

The exact behavior when a governance-relevant change occurs after determination but before or during consequential execution remains REB-D07. The exact treatment of missing, invalid, stale, unverifiable, or otherwise unusable binding material remains REB-D02.

21.5 Boundary Protection

- REB validates correspondence; it does not validate the substantive correctness of RGE's evaluation.
- REB may reject a mismatched or unusable binding without converting that condition into a new RGE Admissibility Determination.
- Underlying governance-basis references may be carried for traceability, but they are not general REB evaluation inputs.
- A Governance Receipt may later preserve or reference the binding relationship, but receipt creation/persistence is not assigned to REB by this decision.
- The Binding Envelope is an architecture-level semantic contract, not a ManChine product or cGate implementation.

21.6 Decision Rationale

This decision is the narrowest architecture that allows REB to enforce the correct determination against the correct attempted consequence while preserving the RGE/REB responsibility boundary. It prevents determination replay or substitution from becoming an authority-continuity loophole, but avoids creating a second governance evaluator at the execution boundary.

21.7 Effect on Open Decisions

REB-D01 is CLOSED for working architecture. Six genuine ManChine decisions remain: REB-D02 through REB-D07.

D01 constrains D02 and D07: a missing or unusable binding cannot silently become permission, and a previously valid envelope cannot be treated as proof of present applicability after a governance-relevant change that requires a new decision point.

21.8 Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: REB-D01 ADOPTED. Proceed to REB-D02 — Non-Determination / Invalid-Input Boundary Treatment.

22. REB-D02 — Non-Determination / Invalid-Input Boundary Treatment

Decision status: ADOPTED — MANCHINE WORKING ARCHITECTURE

Decision class: PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION → ADOPTED FOR REB-01 DEVELOPMENT

Scope: This decision establishes REB treatment when the required current Admissibility Determination or its determination-to-crossing binding cannot be used as a valid basis for boundary crossing. It does not establish domain-specific safety actions, emergency behavior, rollback, or universal fail-open/fail-closed semantics.

22.1 Problem

REB must control whether consequential execution may cross the Runtime Execution Boundary. The architecture must therefore distinguish a current positive determination from conditions in which no usable current determination exists. RGE explicitly separates Admissibility Determination from Evaluation Status and does not fabricate ADMISSIBLE or NOT_ADMISSIBLE when epistemic deficiency prevents a valid determination. REB must preserve that distinction rather than converting missing, stale, invalid, conflicting, or unverifiable material into a new governance determination.

22.2 Decision

Consequential execution SHALL NOT cross REB unless REB is presented with a current, applicable, usable Admissibility Determination whose Determination-to-Crossing Binding Envelope satisfies REB-D01.

When no such usable current determination is available, REB SHALL prevent the attempted consequential crossing from proceeding on the basis of that absent or unusable governance state. This rule is a boundary precondition, not a universal system-wide fail-closed policy.

REB SHALL NOT convert the absence, invalidity, staleness, unverifiability, mismatch, contradiction, or other unusability of a required determination/binding into either ADMISSIBLE or NOT_ADMISSIBLE. Those conditions remain distinct from an Admissibility Determination.

22.3 Boundary Outcome Classes

- CROSSING PERMITTED — only where a current applicable ADMISSIBLE determination and valid D01 binding are available.
- CROSSING PREVENTED — where a current applicable NOT_ADMISSIBLE determination governs the attempted crossing.

- **CROSSING NOT AUTHORIZED BY AVAILABLE GOVERNANCE STATE** — where no usable current determination/binding is available. This is a REB boundary condition, not an RGE Admissibility value.

REB-01 may later define subordinate handling dispositions such as hold/defer, return-for-governance, error, bounded containment handoff, or escalation handoff. Those dispositions describe what the surrounding system may do after crossing is not authorized; they do not change the rule that the consequential crossing itself lacks a usable positive governance basis.

22.4 Conditions Covered by the Third Outcome Class

- No Admissibility Determination is presented.
- The presented determination cannot be shown to correspond to the attempted crossing under REB-D01.
- The determination or binding is stale or superseded for the relevant decision point.
- The determination or binding is invalid, malformed, outside applicable scope, or otherwise unusable.
- Required integrity/provenance for the determination-to-crossing relationship cannot be established.
- Conflicting governance state prevents REB from establishing which determination is applicable.
- A governance-relevant change has created a new decision point for which no current determination is yet available.

22.5 Why This Is Not Universal Fail-Closed

This decision governs only whether a particular consequential crossing may proceed through REB without a usable positive governance basis. It does not require the entire system to stop, shut down, roll back, enter a specific safe state, or choose a single failure policy.

REA-01 preserves degraded-mode and protective/emergency behavior as governed architectural questions and explicitly warns that both fail-open and fail-closed behavior can be harmful. Accordingly, after REB prevents an unauthorized crossing, another applicable behavioral, safety, continuity, or emergency specification may govern what action is permitted next. That subsequent behavior must itself possess an applicable authority/governance basis where required; it is not created by REB's refusal to permit the original crossing.

22.6 Treatment of RGE Evaluation Status

RGE Evaluation Status SHALL NOT be treated by REB as a substitute Admissibility Determination. Statuses such as missing, stale, conflicting, insufficient, or unverifiable identify why a determination was not validly reached or why governance material cannot presently support one. REB may consume sufficient status or provenance information to classify the boundary input as unusable, but SHALL NOT reinterpret that status into a substantive governance judgment.

22.7 Retry, Re-evaluation, and Recovery

REB SHALL NOT manufacture permission through retry, queueing, alternate routing, failover, delegation, replica use, or repeated presentation of the same unusable governance state.

A later crossing attempt may proceed only if the governing architecture produces a current applicable determination and a valid binding for that later decision point or attempted crossing. Whether and how the surrounding system requests renewed evaluation, waits, escalates, recovers, or abandons the action is outside the narrow D02 decision unless assigned to REB by later approved architecture.

22.8 Non-Retroactivity

A later valid determination does not retroactively authorize a crossing that lacked a usable governance basis when attempted. Likewise, later discovery that a prior input was defective does not silently rewrite the historical record of what REB received or did. Governance history and present authority remain distinct.

22.9 Boundary Protection

- REB enforces the availability and applicability of a usable determination; it does not recreate RGE.
- REB's refusal to permit crossing is not itself a NOT_ADMISSIBLE determination unless the governing input actually contains that RGE determination.
- REB may classify its own boundary action without adding a third Admissibility value.
- No D02 rule creates emergency Authority, protective Authority, rollback Authority, or containment Authority.
- No D02 rule mandates a particular product-level exception, timeout, queue, retry, safe state, or operator workflow.

22.10 Decision Rationale

The architecture needs a non-bypassable rule at the consequence boundary: consequential execution cannot proceed merely because governance evidence is absent, ambiguous, unusable, or technically inconvenient. At the same time, ManChine must preserve the distinction between 'no usable positive basis for this crossing' and a universal command that the entire system fail closed. D02 therefore constrains the crossing while leaving separately governed recovery, safety, emergency, and continuity behavior available to the appropriate architecture.

22.11 Effect on Remaining Decisions

REB-D02 is CLOSED for working architecture. Five genuine ManChine decisions remain: REB-D03 through REB-D07.

D02 constrains D03-D07. cGate, boundary-crossing semantics, trace design, repeated crossing, and in-flight behavior may refine how REB represents and handles a blocked crossing, but none may silently convert an unusable governance state into permission.

22.12 Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: REB-D02 ADOPTED. Proceed to REB-D03 — cGate Relationship.

23. REB-D03 — cGate Relationship

Decision status: ADOPTED — MANCHINE WORKING ARCHITECTURE

Decision class: PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION → ADOPTED FOR REB-01 DEVELOPMENT

Scope: This decision defines the architectural relationship between REB and cGate without making cGate a required standards-family component or implementation.

23.1 Problem

The current REB skeleton identifies cGate as unresolved and expressly prohibits assuming that cGate is equivalent to, above, below, or required by REB without source authority. At the same time, the standards family requires an enforceable execution-boundary responsibility. The architecture must therefore distinguish the normative REB responsibility from any particular control mechanism that may realize it.

23.2 Decision

REB is the normative architectural boundary and responsibility. cGate is not, by virtue of its name or prior use, a normative prerequisite, synonym, or mandatory component of REB.

For REB-01, cGate SHALL be treated as a non-normative candidate implementation/control mechanism capable of realizing some or all REB enforcement behavior where an implementation chooses to use it.

A conforming REB implementation SHALL NOT be required to implement, expose, name, or depend upon cGate unless a later controlling ManChine specification separately establishes cGate as normative.

23.3 Permitted cGate Role

- cGate may implement or host an execution-boundary control point.
- cGate may consume the same determination/binding material required by REB where its implementation role calls for it.
- cGate may technically prevent or permit a crossing in accordance with REB's normative behavior.
- cGate may expose trace information associated with its implementation of REB behavior.

These permitted roles do not give cGate independent normative authority. When cGate realizes REB behavior, its authority to control the crossing derives from conformance to REB and the applicable governance architecture, not from the cGate label itself.

23.4 Prohibited Architectural Collapse

- REB SHALL NOT be defined as 'cGate'.
- cGate SHALL NOT be treated as the producer of Admissibility merely because it enforces a determination.
- cGate SHALL NOT become a source of Authority or Authorization through implementation convenience.
- cGate SHALL NOT absorb RGE evaluation, Consequential Execution, RiCo runtime-integrity verification, or Governance Receipt persistence.
- Absence or failure of a cGate implementation SHALL NOT alter the normative REB obligations; another conforming mechanism may satisfy them.

23.5 Failure and Bypass Implication

Where cGate is used to implement REB, technical failure, bypass, alternate routing, retry, failover, replica use, or removal of cGate cannot be treated as permission to evade REB's normative boundary conditions. The obligation is architectural and survives replacement or failure of the particular implementation mechanism.

The specific degraded-mode behavior of a failed cGate implementation remains governed by REB-D02, REB-D07, applicable safety/continuity architecture, and implementation-specific controls; D03 does not invent a universal fail-open or fail-closed policy.

23.6 Vocabulary and Specification Treatment

REB remains standards-family vocabulary. cGate should remain implementation-oriented terminology unless and until ManChine deliberately promotes it through a separate normative definition/specification. References to cGate in REB-01 should therefore be illustrative or informative, not required for conformance.

23.7 Decision Rationale

This preserves the strongest architectural property already established by the standards family: responsibility cannot disappear when an implementation changes. Making cGate mandatory now would prematurely bind REB to a particular mechanism and risk confusing architectural enforcement responsibility with a product/control implementation. Keeping cGate non-normative allows ManChine to develop or deploy it without making REB dependent on it.

23.8 Effect on Remaining Decisions

REB-D03 is CLOSED for working architecture. Four genuine ManChine decisions remain: REB-D04 through REB-D07.

D03 means the boundary-crossing event defined under D04 must be architectural rather than cGate-specific; D05 trace requirements must be satisfiable without cGate; and D06-D07 behavior must remain valid across alternative conforming REB implementations.

23.9 Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: REB-D03 ADOPTED. Proceed to REB-D04 — Boundary-Crossing Event.

24. REB-D04 — Boundary-Crossing Event

Decision status: ADOPTED — MANCHINE WORKING ARCHITECTURE

Decision class: PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION → ADOPTED FOR REB-01 DEVELOPMENT

Scope: This decision defines the architecture-level event that marks successful crossing of REB. It does not define the internal execution mechanism, the point of practical irreversibility, or the complete consequence lifecycle.

24.1 Problem

REB requires an externally meaningful point at which an attempted consequential action ceases to be merely proposed or boundary-pending and is released into Consequential Execution. The event must be precise enough for enforcement, ordering, reconstruction, and later integrity verification, while preserving the distinction between REB, Consequential Execution, RiCo, and REA-01's intervention-window / consequence-boundary concepts.

24.2 Decision

REB SHALL recognize a Boundary-Crossing Event when, and only when, REB has successfully applied a current applicable ADMISSIBLE determination to the identified attempted consequential action under the D01 binding requirements and has released that action from REB control into Consequential Execution.

The Boundary-Crossing Event is the architectural handoff event between REB enforcement and the beginning of the authorized consequential execution instance. It is not itself the consequential action, the operational side effect, or proof that an irreversible consequence has already formed.

24.3 Required Semantic Conditions

- An attempted consequential action / execution instance has reached REB.
- A current applicable ADMISSIBLE determination is available.
- The D01 Determination-to-Crossing Binding Envelope establishes correspondence between that determination, the relevant decision point, and the attempted action.
- REB has applied the determination and has not identified a D02 condition that prevents the crossing.
- REB releases the identified action from boundary control into Consequential Execution.

24.4 Non-Events

- RGE producing an ADMISSIBLE determination is not, by itself, a Boundary-Crossing Event.
- Presentation of a determination to REB is not a crossing.

- A queue entry, retry, routing decision, cGate signal, API call, or scheduler action is not necessarily the architectural crossing.
- The start of evaluation is not the crossing.
- A NOT_ADMISSIBLE determination or D02 unusable-governance condition does not create a successful crossing event.
- Formation of a practically irreversible consequence is not automatically identical to the Boundary-Crossing Event.

24.5 Relationship to REA-01 Consequence Boundary / Intervention Window

The REB Boundary-Crossing Event and REA-01's consequence-boundary / intervention-window concepts SHALL remain distinct unless a later governing specification establishes that they coincide for a particular action class.

REB crossing marks release into Consequential Execution. A practical or irreversible consequence may form immediately, later, incrementally, or across multiple stages. Where outcome sensitivity depends on that later point, REA-01 requires the relevant consequence boundary and intervention window to be identifiable. REB-01 must therefore preserve ordering between its crossing event and any later consequence-formation event rather than collapsing them into one universal timestamp.

24.6 Relationship to RiCo

The Boundary-Crossing Event establishes the architecture-level handoff into Consequential Execution and therefore the point from which RiCo's continuing runtime-integrity responsibility applies to the executing consequential instance, subject to the governing RiCo architecture.

This handoff does not imply that REB becomes inactive for all future stages of the action. Whether a later stage encounters REB again is governed by REB-D06.

24.7 Atomicity and Race Protection

A conforming implementation SHALL preserve the semantic ordering of determination application and release: the action must not be released as though crossing succeeded before REB has applied the current applicable determination to that crossing.

REB-01 does not require a particular locking, transaction, synchronization, timestamp, or distributed-consensus mechanism. Where concurrent state change or distributed disagreement makes the applicability of the determination unresolved before release, the crossing cannot be represented as successfully completed merely by implementation timing; D02 applies until the required governance state is usable.

24.8 Traceability

The Boundary-Crossing Event SHALL be traceable as a distinct governance-relevant event or event-equivalent fact sufficient to reconstruct that REB released a particular consequential execution instance on the basis of a particular applicable determination/binding.

D04 does not assign persistent Governance Receipt creation to REB and does not freeze an event schema, identifier format, clock source, signature scheme, or storage mechanism. The minimum recording contribution is resolved under REB-D05.

24.9 Multi-Stage Constraint

One Boundary-Crossing Event SHALL NOT be presumed to authorize every later stage, retry, resumed operation, delegated continuation, or newly consequential step of an execution. Whether a later stage constitutes another REB crossing is unresolved by D04 and is adjudicated under REB-D06.

24.10 Decision Rationale

The architecture needs a precise handoff without turning the boundary into the execution engine or confusing authorization to begin execution with irreversible consequence. Defining crossing as REB's governed release of the bound action creates an observable enforcement point, supports temporal reconstruction, and preserves separate responsibility for execution, continuing integrity, and consequence formation.

24.11 Effect on Remaining Decisions

REB-D04 is CLOSED for working architecture. Three genuine ManChine decisions remain: REB-D05 through REB-D07.

D04 constrains D05 to preserve a trace of the crossing event, D06 to determine when additional stages create additional crossings, and D07 to distinguish governance changes occurring before release, after release but before consequence formation, and during later in-flight execution.

24.12 Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: REB-D04 ADOPTED. Proceed to REB-D05 — REB Trace / Governance-Recording Contribution.

25. REB-D05 — REB Trace / Governance-Recording Contribution

Decision status: ADOPTED — MANCHINE WORKING ARCHITECTURE

Decision class: PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION → ADOPTED FOR REB-01 DEVELOPMENT

Scope: This decision establishes the minimum trace contribution REB must make so its boundary action can be reconstructed, without assigning REB ownership of persistent Governance Receipt creation, custody, or the broader governance-recording system.

25.1 Problem

REB performs a governance-relevant enforcement action at the point immediately preceding consequential execution. That action must remain reconstructable: what attempted to cross, what determination/binding REB applied, what boundary outcome occurred, and whether a successful Boundary-Crossing Event was produced. At the same time, the standards family distinguishes enforcement from persistent governance recording. REB must therefore contribute evidence without becoming the Governance Receipt system.

25.2 Decision

REB SHALL produce or expose a REB Boundary Trace for each completed boundary disposition sufficient to reconstruct the governance-relevant facts of REB's action.

The REB Boundary Trace is an evidence contribution. It SHALL NOT, by itself, be defined as the authoritative Governance Receipt, persistent governance record, or custody system unless a later controlling specification explicitly assigns such responsibility.

25.3 Minimum Semantic Trace Content

- Identity or equivalent reference for the attempted consequential action / execution instance presented at REB.
- Reference or equivalent identity for the Admissibility Determination presented to REB.
- Reference or equivalent linkage to the D01 Determination-to-Crossing Binding Envelope used for the attempted crossing.
- REB boundary disposition: crossing permitted, crossing prevented by an applicable NOT_ADMISSIBLE determination, or crossing not authorized by the available governance state under D02.
- Whether a D04 Boundary-Crossing Event occurred.
- Where crossing occurred, sufficient semantic linkage to the consequential execution instance released from REB.
- Ordering information sufficient to reconstruct the relevant sequence among determination presentation/application, REB disposition, and boundary crossing where outcome-sensitive.

- Reason/category sufficient to distinguish a substantive NOT_ADMISSIBLE enforcement from a D02 unusable-governance/binding condition, without converting the latter into an Admissibility value.

25.4 What REB Does Not Need to Record

REB SHALL NOT be required to duplicate the complete Authority, Authorization, Evidence, Policy, Context, RGE evaluation record, RiCo integrity record, or execution telemetry merely to satisfy its trace obligation. Those materials may be referenced through provenance where necessary, but REB's trace should remain scoped to the boundary action it actually owns.

25.5 Event vs. Receipt

A REB Boundary Trace may be emitted as, associated with, or later incorporated into a Governance Event where the governance-recording architecture supports that representation. D05 does not require REB itself to own the canonical Governance Event service.

A Governance Receipt may consume, preserve, bind, or reference the REB Boundary Trace together with evidence from other responsibilities. Receipt creation, canonicalization, signing, persistence, custody, retention, replay, and reconstruction services remain outside REB unless separately assigned by a controlling specification.

25.6 Historical Fidelity and Non-Retroactivity

The REB Boundary Trace SHALL represent what REB received and did at the relevant boundary decision/action. Later governance information, later determinations, later execution outcomes, or later discovery of defective inputs SHALL NOT silently rewrite the historical REB trace.

Corrections, superseding records, reconciliations, or later findings may be linked to the historical trace by the applicable recording architecture, but the original boundary fact must remain distinguishable.

25.7 Integrity and Correspondence

The trace contribution SHALL preserve sufficient integrity/provenance correspondence to detect or expose substitution of the determination, binding, action identity, or boundary outcome in later reconstruction.

REB-01 does not freeze a cryptographic algorithm, signature scheme, hash format, clock, database, ledger, identifier syntax, storage topology, or serialization. Those mechanisms may implement the required integrity and traceability semantics without becoming REB architecture.

25.8 Failed, Prevented, and Non-Crossing Attempts

REB traceability is not limited to successful crossings. A completed REB disposition that prevents crossing or determines that crossing is not authorized by the available governance state SHALL remain traceable when that disposition is governance-relevant.

This prevents the evidence record from containing only successful execution paths while denials, unusable governance states, bypass attempts, or other consequential boundary actions disappear from reconstruction.

25.9 Relationship to RiCo and Execution Evidence

The D04 Boundary-Crossing Event provides the handoff from REB into Consequential Execution. RiCo and execution-layer evidence may subsequently describe what occurred after crossing. REB SHALL NOT claim those later observations as its own trace, but the governance-recording architecture should be capable of relating the REB Boundary Trace to the corresponding execution and integrity evidence.

25.10 Implementation Independence

- The REB Boundary Trace is a semantic evidence obligation, not a required log-file format.
- cGate may emit the trace when implementing REB, but cGate is not required for conformance.
- A conforming implementation may stream, emit, expose, buffer, or otherwise provide the trace to the responsible recording architecture.
- Persistence location and long-term custody are not REB conformance requirements unless separately assigned.

25.11 Decision Rationale

Enforcement without reconstructable evidence would make it impossible to establish which governance determination actually controlled a consequential crossing or denial. Conversely, assigning full receipt ownership to REB would collapse enforcement and governance recording. D05 therefore requires REB to leave a bounded, integrity-preserving trace of its own action while allowing the broader recording/receipt architecture to assemble and preserve the complete governance record.

25.12 Effect on Remaining Decisions

REB-D05 is CLOSED for working architecture. Two genuine ManChine decisions remain: REB-D06 and REB-D07.

D05 constrains D06 so each additional qualifying boundary crossing/disposition remains separately reconstructable, and D07 so changed-condition/in-flight boundary actions can be related to the original crossing without retroactively rewriting it.

25.13 Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: REB-D05 ADOPTED. Proceed to REB-D06 — Multi-Stage / Repeated Crossing.

26. REB-D06 — Multi-Stage / Repeated Crossing

Decision status: ADOPTED — MANCHINE WORKING ARCHITECTURE

Decision class: PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION → ADOPTED FOR REB-01 DEVELOPMENT

Scope: This decision defines when a later execution stage, continuation, retry, delegation, resumption, or newly consequential operation must encounter REB again rather than inheriting an earlier boundary crossing indefinitely. It does not define changed-condition/in-flight behavior, which remains REB-D07.

26.1 Problem

A single consequential activity may contain multiple stages, delayed steps, retries, delegated operations, resumed work, or distinct side effects. If the first successful REB crossing were treated as indefinite permission for every later step, an earlier determination could silently become continuing authority for consequences that were not within the original crossing or that arise at a later governance decision point. Conversely, forcing every internal instruction or technical sub-step through a new governance boundary would collapse architecture into implementation detail.

26.2 Decision

A successful REB Boundary-Crossing Event authorizes only the consequential execution instance and action scope bound to that crossing. It SHALL NOT be presumed to authorize all later stages, retries, resumptions, delegated continuations, alternate routes, or newly consequential operations.

A later operation SHALL encounter REB again when it constitutes a new consequential crossing or a new governance decision point rather than a continuation wholly within the action scope already released through REB.

26.3 Re-Crossing Triggers

- The later operation introduces a consequential action or consequence scope not covered by the D01 binding of the prior crossing.
- The later operation requires a new Admissibility Determination under the governing architecture.
- The prior execution has ended, been abandoned, materially suspended, or otherwise ceased such that a later resumption is a new consequential execution instance rather than continuous execution.
- Execution is delegated or transferred to another actor, authority scope, execution instance, or route in a manner that is not already within the bound scope of the prior crossing.

- A retry or alternate route would otherwise be used to obtain a consequence after a prior crossing was prevented, not authorized, revoked, narrowed, or rendered unusable.
- A later stage reaches a separately identifiable consequential commitment or action for which the prior crossing cannot establish determination-to-action correspondence.

26.4 Non-Triggers

A new REB crossing is not required merely because an implementation performs another internal instruction, function call, packet transfer, model step, scheduler operation, or other technical sub-step within the already bound and continuously executing consequential action scope.

REB-01 therefore defines repeated crossing semantically, not by implementation topology or call count.

26.5 Scope Continuity Test

For purposes of REB-D06, a later operation may remain within the original crossing only where the implementation can preserve correspondence to the same consequential execution instance, the same bounded action scope, and the same applicable governance decision point.

If that correspondence cannot be established, the prior Boundary-Crossing Event SHALL NOT be used as an indefinite permission token. The later consequential operation must be treated as requiring a new REB crossing with the applicable current governance determination.

26.6 Retry, Failover, Replica, and Alternate-Route Protection

Retries, queues, replicas, failover, alternate routing, delegated actors, recovery mechanisms, or equivalent technical paths SHALL NOT be used to bypass a REB disposition or extend a prior crossing beyond its bound action scope.

A technical continuation may preserve an existing crossing only where it is genuinely the same governed execution instance and does not create a new consequential decision point or expand the bound consequence scope.

26.7 Multi-Stage Consequence

A multi-stage action may therefore produce one or multiple Boundary-Crossing Events depending on its governance structure. The architecture does not require one crossing per technical stage and does not presume one crossing for the entire workflow.

Where a later stage is independently consequential, requires renewed Admissibility, or falls outside the original bound action scope, it SHALL have its own applicable determination/binding and its own REB disposition before that stage crosses.

26.8 Traceability

Each repeated REB disposition and each successful repeated Boundary-Crossing Event SHALL produce or expose its own D05 REB Boundary Trace. The recording architecture should be capable of relating those traces to the same broader workflow or execution lineage without collapsing them into a single historical event.

26.9 Relationship to Changed Conditions

D06 determines when the structure or scope of execution creates another REB crossing. It does not decide what happens when governance-relevant conditions change while an already released action remains in flight.

Where a material governance-relevant change creates a new decision point, D06 requires a new crossing for any later consequential operation governed by that new decision point. The treatment of execution already underway, including remaining changeable steps and consequence already formed, is reserved to REB-D07.

26.10 Non-Retroactivity

A later REB crossing does not retroactively replace, invalidate, or rewrite an earlier crossing that was valid when it occurred. Each crossing remains associated with the determination, decision point, action scope, and governance state applicable to that crossing.

26.11 Decision Rationale

The architecture must prevent a valid initial crossing from becoming a durable bearer token for unlimited future consequence. At the same time, REB should not be inserted into every internal execution step. D06 therefore uses governance-relevant action scope and decision-point continuity—not technical call boundaries—to determine whether another crossing is required.

26.12 Effect on Remaining Decision

REB-D06 is CLOSED for working architecture. One genuine ManChine decision remains: REB-D07.

D06 constrains D07: when changed conditions create a new governance decision point, later consequential operations cannot inherit the original crossing indefinitely. D07 must now determine the boundary treatment of the execution that is already in flight while the governance basis changes and any renewed determination is pending or subsequently produced.

26.13 Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: REB-D06 ADOPTED. Proceed to REB-D07 — Changed-Condition / In-Flight Consequence Application.

27. REB-D07 — Changed-Condition / In-Flight Consequence Application

Decision status: ADOPTED — MANCHINE WORKING ARCHITECTURE

Decision class: PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION → ADOPTED FOR REB-01 DEVELOPMENT

Scope: This decision defines REB responsibility when governance-relevant conditions change after a valid boundary crossing while consequential execution remains in flight. It preserves non-retroactivity, separates already formed consequence from remaining changeable execution, and does not create universal rollback, fail-open, fail-closed, containment, or emergency behavior.

27.1 Problem

A consequential action may validly cross REB and then encounter a material change in Authority, Authorization, Evidence, Policy, Context, integrity-relevant state, or another governance-basis condition before all consequential execution has completed. RGE-01 establishes that such a change can require a new discrete evaluation but does not determine what happens to execution already underway. REA-01 separately preserves the historical validity of already formed consequences while preventing authority loss or material narrowing from being bypassed through continuation by inertia. REB must therefore govern the remaining consequence boundary without retroactively rewriting the earlier valid crossing.

27.2 Decision

A material governance-relevant change occurring after a valid REB Boundary-Crossing Event SHALL NOT retroactively invalidate, erase, or rewrite that earlier crossing or any consequence already validly formed before the change became effective.

The same earlier crossing SHALL NOT, however, be treated as continuing permission for remaining changeable or newly consequential execution after the governing architecture establishes that the change creates a new decision point or requires renewed evaluation.

For such remaining execution, REB SHALL require a current applicable Admissibility Determination and a valid D01 binding before any further consequential crossing governed by the new decision point may occur.

27.3 Three In-Flight Regions

- FORMED CONSEQUENCE — consequence already produced or committed before the effective governance change. REB does not retroactively undo it merely because later governance changes.
- IN-FLIGHT BUT STILL GOVERNABLY CHANGEABLE EXECUTION — execution has begun, but remaining steps or consequence have not yet passed the applicable intervention/consequence

boundary. These remaining steps cannot inherit the prior crossing once a new decision point requires renewed governance.

- FUTURE / NEWLY CONSEQUENTIAL EXECUTION — later stages, additional commitments, resumptions, retries, delegations, or new consequential actions after the changed condition. These require the applicable current determination and a new REB crossing under D06 where appropriate.

27.4 Pending Renewed Determination

Where a governance-relevant change has created a new decision point and the required renewed RGE determination is not yet available, REB SHALL NOT authorize further consequential crossing for the affected remaining execution on the basis of the prior determination alone.

This is a D02 condition: the affected crossing is not authorized by the available governance state. REB does not convert the pending state into NOT_ADMISSIBLE and does not prescribe a universal system shutdown.

27.5 New Determination Produced

When renewed RGE produces a current applicable determination for the changed decision point, REB SHALL apply that new determination only to the remaining or future consequential execution to which it is bound.

- If the new determination is ADMISSIBLE, affected remaining execution may cross REB only within the newly bound action scope.
- If the new determination is NOT_ADMISSIBLE, affected remaining/future consequential crossing SHALL be prevented.
- The new determination does not retroactively alter the historical validity of the prior RGE determination, prior REB crossing, or consequence already formed under the earlier governance basis.

27.6 Intervention Window and Practical Irreversibility

REB-D07 SHALL preserve REA-01's distinction between execution that remains governably changeable and consequence for which the practical intervention window has closed.

Closure of an intervention window SHALL NOT manufacture continuing authority. If a consequence can no longer practically be prevented or altered, that fact must be represented as an execution/consequence condition rather than misrepresented as renewed Admissibility or continuing Authority.

REB-01 does not require a universal rollback, compensation, termination, containment, or reversal mechanism. Such behavior depends on the applicable action, safety architecture, emergency authority, and implementation capability.

27.7 Revocation, Suspension, Expiry, and Material Narrowing

Where Authority or Authorization is revoked, suspended, expired, withdrawn/replaced, or materially narrowed and that state creates a new governance decision point, no new authority-dependent consequential crossing may rely solely on the earlier REB crossing.

Already formed consequences are not retroactively undone by REB. Remaining execution must be governed according to the current basis and the applicable renewed determination, subject to practical intervention limits and any separately governed protective/emergency behavior.

27.8 RiCo and Change Detection

REB does not assume ownership of continuous monitoring or runtime-integrity detection. RiCo, observation systems, authority-management functions, or other governed mechanisms may surface evidence that a governance-relevant condition has changed.

Once the governing architecture establishes a new decision point and renewed evaluation is required, REB's responsibility is to prevent the affected remaining consequential crossing from inheriting the stale prior determination and to apply the resulting current determination when available.

27.9 Race and Temporal Ordering

Where outcome depends on whether the governance change became effective before or after a particular REB crossing or consequence-formation event, the relevant temporal ordering SHALL be reconstructable.

REB-D07 does not mandate a clock technology, global transaction, lock, or distributed-consensus algorithm. If ordering cannot be established sufficiently to determine which governance state applies to an attempted further crossing, that crossing falls under D02 rather than being permitted by timing ambiguity.

27.10 No Authority by Inertia

Execution already being underway SHALL NOT itself create a right to continue. Queue state, resource commitment, partial completion, cost already incurred, technical momentum, retry state, failover, delegation, or inability to conveniently stop SHALL NOT substitute for the current governance basis required for remaining consequential crossing.

27.11 Protective and Emergency Actions

D07 does not prohibit separately authorized protective, containment, emergency, or safe-state actions. Such actions must derive from an applicable governing authority/behavioral or safety specification; they are not implied merely because the original execution can no longer continue on its prior determination.

REB therefore preserves a path for governed protective action without treating emergency necessity as a silent extension of the original Admissibility Determination.

27.12 Trace and Historical Reconstruction

Each material changed-condition REB disposition and any subsequent repeated crossing SHALL remain separately reconstructable under D05. The record should preserve the original determination/crossing, the governance-relevant change or reference to it, the resulting new decision point where applicable, any renewed determination, and the boundary disposition applied to remaining execution.

Later records may relate these facts but SHALL NOT overwrite the historical state that governed the earlier valid crossing.

27.13 Decision Rationale

D07 resolves the central in-flight governance tension without choosing either retroactive invalidation or authority by inertia. A valid past crossing remains historically valid; a material governance change can nevertheless terminate its applicability to remaining consequence. The architecture therefore evaluates present standing at the new decision point while preserving the truth of what was valid before.

27.14 Effect on REB Architecture

REB-D07 is CLOSED for working architecture. All seven ManChine architectural decisions identified by the v0.3 internal gate are now adjudicated: REB-D01 through REB-D07.

The resulting working architecture now establishes: determination-to-crossing binding; non-determination/invalid-input treatment; non-normative cGate relationship; the Boundary-Crossing Event; bounded REB trace contribution; repeated-crossing semantics; and changed-condition/in-flight consequence application.

27.15 Internal Architecture Gate Disposition

DISPOSITION: REB-01 INTERNAL ARCHITECTURE DECISION GATE COMPLETE.

The working architecture is now sufficiently resolved to prepare a controlled architecture-review candidate. This disposition does not declare REB-01 published, normatively mature, implemented, proven, or externally affirmed. The next lifecycle step is to consolidate the adopted D01-D07 decisions into a coherent review candidate, remove obsolete skeleton instructions that assign architecture design to Claude, preserve unresolved downstream matters explicitly, freeze the candidate, and submit that candidate for independent architectural challenge against the verified ManChine review baseline.