ManChine AI Technology LLC

GOVERNANCE • INTEGRITY • HUMANITY

RGE-01

RUNTIME GOVERNANCE EVALUATION

BEHAVIORAL SPECIFICATION — VERSION 1.2

PUBLICATION STATUS

PUBLISHED

Publication Date:
August 27, 2026

SPECIFICATION MATURITY

ARCHITECTURE REVIEW DRAFT

Architecture Review remains open — AR-RT-01 through AR-RT-05 unresolved

PUBLICATION NOTE — Published August 27, 2026 by present ManChine lifecycle decision. The preserved RGE-01 v1.2 technical body contains historical Architecture Review material. AR-RT-01 through AR-RT-05 remain unresolved, and EVA-01, EVA-02, and EVA-03 remain preserved external-review intake. Publication does not represent historical Architecture Review completion or substantive resolution of those items.

PROOF STATUS

FORMALLY CLOSED

35 / 35 FROZEN CLAIMS SUPPORTED

Per RGE-01-CL-001 — FINAL/CLOSED

CONTROLLING ARCHITECTURE

RGRA-01 — Primary Controlling Source
RGAF-01 — Architectural Principles

ARCHITECTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

REA-01 — Runtime Execution Authority
REB-01 — Runtime Execution Boundary
ROPS-01 — Runtime Observation Payload Standard

RiCo

Runtime Integrity Control

PUBLISHER

Richard R. Colimon

ManChine AI Technology LLC

BUILDING TRUST IN CONSEQUENTIAL AI

RGE-01 — Runtime Governance Evaluation

Version 1.2 — Architecture Review Draft

Status: Architecture Review

Category: Behavioral Specification (Development Draft — Not Published, Not Certified). Version/status advancement to Architecture Review Draft reflects completion of ManChine's Technical Review phase only; it does not constitute implementation proof, runtime validation, certification, interoperability, production readiness, executable conformance, or independent validation of ManChine's architectural claims.

Incorporation: Approved architecture from Decisions D-1, D-2, D-3, D-4 (as amended by D-14), D-7, D-8, D-11, D-14, D-16 incorporated per ManChine Decision Log; D-15 retired, not incorporated.

Standards Family: Runtime Governance Standards Family

Author: ManChine Governance Engineering (development pass by Claude, per ManChine direction)

Evidence Classification Used Throughout This Document

[SUPPORTED] directly established by a developed, controlling ManChine specification (RGV-01 v2.3, RGAF-01, RGRA-01, REA-01, or ROPS-01).

[RECONCILED] reasonably derived by combining multiple controlling sources, including skeleton-stage development artifacts (REB-01, RiCo-01, RGR-01, cGate-01) where they do not conflict with developed specifications.

[APPROVED] architecture established by explicit ManChine architectural decision (Decision Log entries D-1 through D-16), incorporated into this normative body. Approved architecture is binding for this draft and is not reopened or reinterpreted here.

[PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION] not sufficiently established by the supplied source set and not yet resolved by a ManChine decision as of this incorporation pass.

> *Skeleton-stage documents (REB-01, RiCo-01, RGR-01, cGate-01) are themselves labeled by ManChine as development artifacts, not normative authority. Content drawn from them is therefore classified RECONCILED at best, never SUPPORTED, unless corroborated by a developed specification.*

Editorial Control Note

This document incorporates the architectural decisions ManChine approved across the RGE-01 decision sequence (D-1, D-2 as conformed, D-3, D-4 as amended by D-14, D-7, D-8, D-11, D-14, D-16) into the normative body of the RGE-01 Technical Review Draft, per the ManChine Decision Log and the accepted Pre-Incorporation Architecture Closure Review. D-15 was retired by ManChine and is not incorporated; the wording correction it identified is captured as part of D-2's conforming amendment instead.

This is an incorporation pass, not a new architecture-development pass. No approved decision is reopened or reinterpreted here. Matters ManChine classified as OUTSIDE RGE-01 / ROUTED ELSEWHERE, BLOCKED BY ANOTHER SPECIFICATION, or EDITORIAL / SOURCE-FAMILY CLEANUP remain recorded as explicit, visible, non-blocking notes rather than incorporated as RGE-01 architecture. This draft still does not certify RGE-01 and does not change its Publication State.

v1.0 → v1.1 Synchronization Note

Version 1.1 is a controlled synchronization revision, not an architecture-development pass and not a reopening of the D-1 through D-16 Decision Register. It incorporates the corrections identified by two prior review passes: (1) an adversarial architecture reconciliation of this draft against REA-01 v1.6, and (2) a terminology-conformance review of this draft against RGV-01 v2.3 (Published Standard). This revision re-sources citations that had drifted to superseded REA-01 (v1.0) and RGV-01 (v2.2) text, corrects the Legitimacy formulation in Section 5.4 to match RGV-01 v2.3's published definition, corrects the Authorization/governance-basis-category framing in Sections 6.3 and 12 so it does not imply a fifth RGV-01 primitive, adds a minimum vocabulary clarification for representing an Authority state that cannot presently be established (Section 6.3), clarifies the "Continuous Legitimacy" reference in Section 14, and updates the Section 15 unresolved-vocabulary findings to the current RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5 baseline. No approved Decision Register item (D-1 through D-16) is altered in substance by this revision; corrections are limited to citation accuracy, source-version currency, and terminology framing. Following ManChine's final architecture-closure review, the minimum clarification for representing REA-01's Indeterminate Authority-reliance state within existing Evaluation Status vocabulary is approved in Section 6.3 as a constrained mapping to the existing unverifiable/insufficient failure condition against Authority. This approval introduces neither a new Admissibility value nor a new Evaluation Status state.

Proof Boundary

This document, including Version 1.1's synchronization corrections, states architecture: it does not constitute experimental proof, independent validation, or a demonstration that any conforming implementation exists or behaves as described. Internal coherence of this specification, or agreement between this specification and REA-01 v1.6 or RGV-01 v2.3, is not evidence that the described behavior has been built, tested, or observed. Executable conformance carriers, receipts, replay mechanisms, falsifiers, changed-condition test cases, revocation test cases, refusal-path test cases, and independent technical review remain proof-surface requirements outside this document's scope, to be satisfied by conformance test design (Section 12) and implementation, not by this specification's text alone.

1. Purpose

1.1 Objective

[SUPPORTED] Runtime Governance Evaluation (RGE) is the architectural responsibility that evaluates governance-relevant authority, evidence, policy, and operational context to determine whether consequential execution remains admissible. RGE is evaluative, not enforcing, executing, observing, integrity-verifying, or recording. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 (Purpose); RGRA-01 §4.1, §5.1–5.6)*

This objective statement is drawn directly from RGRA-01's own component definition of Runtime Governance Evaluation, rather than constructed independently. The skeleton's boundary language (Section 1.1 of the RGE-01 skeleton) is confirmed consistent with this source.

1.2 Problem Statement

[SUPPORTED] RGE exists because a governance determination made once, at initiation, cannot be assumed to remain valid as authority, evidence, policy, and context evolve during execution. RGE is the architectural point at which those four governance primitives are evaluated together to produce a discrete governance outcome — the Admissibility Determination — at a defined decision point. *(Source:*

RGAF-01 §2.2–2.3 (Limits of One-Time Authorization; Governance During Runtime); RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1 (Admissibility))

1.3 Non-Goals

Consistent with RGAF-01's Separation of Governance Responsibilities principle and RGRA-01's component "Not Responsible For" lists, RGE:

[SUPPORTED] does not produce observations (that is the Observation Producer's responsibility); *(Source: RGRA-01 §5.1, §9.2, §9.4 (Dependencies: ROPS-01))*

[SUPPORTED] does not originate Authority (Authority is established, delegated, maintained, constrained, suspended, restored, and revoked under REA-01; RGE consumes Authority as an input, it does not create it); *(Source: REA-01 v1.6 §§3–13; RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs: Authority))*

[SUPPORTED] does not grant Authorization (Authorization is an authority-grounded grant of permission whose trigger and threshold are determined by the applicable governing specification, e.g. REA-01); *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1 (Authorization))*

[SUPPORTED] does not enforce its own determination (enforcement is the Runtime Execution Boundary's responsibility); *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 Not Responsible For; §9.5, §10.5)*

[SUPPORTED] does not execute operational behavior; *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 Not Responsible For)*

[SUPPORTED] does not perform Runtime Integrity Control's runtime-integrity-verification responsibility; *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 Not Responsible For; §9.7)*

[SUPPORTED] does not record governance artifacts, including Governance Receipts (RGE is a source that Governance Receipt consumes, not a component that creates receipts); *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 Not Responsible For; §9.8 (Governance Receipt Dependencies list RGE as a source))*

[PROPOSED MANCHINE ARCHITECTURAL DECISION] whether RGE defines or merely consumes a consequentiality threshold. RGV-01 v2.3 explicitly declines to establish a domain-independent procedural test for "Consequential" and defers that boundary to "the applicable governing specification or domain context." No supplied source identifies which specification owns that procedural boundary, and RGRA-01's component definition of RGE does not list a consequentiality-threshold function among RGE's responsibilities, inputs, or outputs. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.2 (Consequential) and Publication Note; RGRA-01 §9.4)*

> *Closure status: this is a family-wide question (Decision Register item D-6), not an RGE-01-internal one. RGE-01 does not claim ownership of the consequentiality threshold and this remains an explicit, visible dependency on a future family-level decision rather than an open RGE-01 architectural gap.*

2. Scope

2.1 In Scope

[SUPPORTED] Architectural definition of Runtime Governance Evaluation as a component distinct from Observation, Admissibility Determination (as an outcome), Enforcement, Execution, Integrity Verification, and Governance Recording. *(Source: RGAF-01 §4.2; RGRA-01 §5.1–5.6, §9.4)*

[SUPPORTED] The inputs RGE consumes: Runtime Observation Payloads (ROPS-01), Authority, Policy, Evidence, and Operational Context. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs))*

[SUPPORTED] Evaluation semantics and the determination boundary between Evaluation and Admissibility Determination. *(Source: RGRA-01 §5.2, §5.3, §10.3, §10.4)*

[SUPPORTED] RGE's relationship to Admissibility, Justification, and Legitimacy, as distinguished by RGV-01 v2.3. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1, §5.1)*

[APPROVED] RGE's relationship to Authorization: Authorization is a distinct, conditional governance input, evaluated by RGE where an applicable governing specification requires it for the action, scope, or instance under evaluation. Authorization remains conceptually distinct from Authority and is not collapsed into it. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-3; RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1)*

2.2 Out of Scope

[SUPPORTED] Observation capture mechanisms (Observation Producer / ROPS-01's responsibility). *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.2, §9.3)*

[SUPPORTED] Policy content (RGE consumes policy; it does not author policy). *(Source: RGAF-01 §3.4; RGRA-01 §3.3)*

[SUPPORTED] Domain-specific consequentiality thresholds — no source assigns ownership of this boundary to any specification, including RGE-01. RGE-01 does not claim this responsibility; it remains an open, visibly flagged family-level dependency (Decision Register item D-6). *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.2 and Publication Note)*

[SUPPORTED] Execution-control mechanics owned by the Runtime Execution Boundary. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.5)*

[SUPPORTED] Execution-control mechanics that might be owned by cGate — cGate has no established architectural role in any developed specification and RGE-01 does not assign it one. This is recorded as a non-blocking, visibly flagged dependency (Decision Register item D-5), not an open RGE-01 architectural question: RGE-01's approved architecture makes no operative reference to cGate. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.3 Publication note, §4.5; absence from RGAF-01 and RGRA-01 confirmed by full-text review)*

[SUPPORTED] Runtime conformance monitoring owned by RiCo. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.7)*

[SUPPORTED] Implementation-specific algorithms, model prompts, vendors, or code. *(Source: RGRA-01 §12 (Implementation Independence))*

3. Architectural Position

3.1 Minimum Supported Relationship

[SUPPORTED] RGRA-01 establishes a logical (not mandatory-sequential) information flow: Observation Producer → ROPS-01 → Runtime Governance Evaluation → Admissibility Determination → Runtime Execution Boundary → Consequential Execution → Runtime Integrity Control → Governance Receipt. RGRA-01 explicitly states this illustrates architectural responsibility, not execution timing, deployment topology, or implementation order, and that continuous governance may re-enter this flow at the evaluation stage whenever authority, evidence, policy, context, or integrity findings change. *(Source: RGRA-01 §8.2 (Architectural Flow); §11.2 (Logical Information Flow); §11.10 (Continuous Governance))*

This confirms the skeleton's caution against assuming a mandatory linear pipeline: the sequence RGRA-01 presents is logical and re-entrant, not a single one-shot chain.

3.2 Candidate Boundary Statement — Confirmed

[SUPPORTED] "RGE interprets applicable governance inputs and produces a governance determination; it does not itself originate those inputs, enforce the result, execute the action, or verify execution integrity" — the skeleton's candidate boundary statement is directly confirmed by RGRA-01's component definition and Not Responsible For list for Runtime Governance Evaluation, and is adopted as normative for this draft. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4)*

3.3 cGate's Position Relative to RGE

[SUPPORTED] cGate has no architectural position established by any developed specification. RGV-01 v2.3 lists cGate as a recognized but undefined vocabulary term (§4.5) and states explicitly that no normative behavior or implementation responsibility is inferred for it. RGAF-01 does not mention cGate. RGRA-01 does not mention cGate anywhere in its architectural flow, component list, or relationships sections — full-text review confirms zero occurrences. RGE-01 therefore does not state, and does not need to state, whether cGate is upstream, downstream, inside, or unrelated to RGE. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.3 note, §4.5; full-text search of RGAF-01 and RGRA-01; cGate-01 skeleton §2, Editorial Control Note)*

> *Closure status: cGate's identity is blocked pending a cGate-01 development pass beyond its current skeleton stage (Decision Register item D-5), and this remains a visibly flagged, non-blocking dependency. RGE-01's own approved architecture (D-1 through D-16) makes no operative reference to cGate, so this does not block RGE-01's incorporation or conformance; it is preserved here as an explicit note rather than resolved by inventing a relationship.*

4. Inputs to RGE

The table below classifies each candidate input identified in the RGE-01 skeleton.

Candidate Input	Classification	Authoritative Source	Mandatory / Conditional	RGE Validates or Only Consumes?
Authority	APPROVED — true RGE input	RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs); ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16	Mandatory	Consumes — RGE does not establish Authority; establishment/maintenance/revocation is REA-01's responsibility
Authorization, where required	APPROVED — distinct, conditional RGE input	ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-3; RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1	Conditional — required only where the applicable governing specification establishes that it applies. RGE-01 does not itself define this trigger.	RGE may evaluate whether a supplied Authorization is valid for the action, scope, and present governance conditions; RGE does not grant, originate, or expand Authorization

			Absence of an applicability signal does not, by itself, establish an Authorization deficiency or make Authorization universally mandatory. Where the applicable governance basis affirmatively raises Authorization applicability but leaves whether it applies unresolved, RGE shall represent the condition as unverifiable/insufficient × Authorization and shall produce no Admissibility Determination on that unresolved basis. REA-01 currently contains no general trigger rule (visibly flagged dependency).	
Evidence	APPROVED — true RGE input	RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs); RGAF-01 §4.7	Mandatory	Consumes as informational basis; RGE evaluates sufficiency of evidence for the determination it produces, per RGAF-01 §4.7 (Evidence-Based Accountability), but does not itself originate evidence
Policy	APPROVED — true RGE input	RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs)	Mandatory	Consumes — RGE does not author policy content (RGAF-01 §3.4)
Context	APPROVED — true RGE input	RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs)	Mandatory, and continuously re-evaluable as context changes	Consumes

Observation / observation-derived evidence (via ROPS-01)	APPROVED — true RGE input, in standardized ROPS-01 form	RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs: Runtime Observation Payloads); §9.4 Dependencies (ROPS-01); ROPS-01 §5	Mandatory as the channel through which observation reaches RGE	Consumes only — ROPS-01's own Central Architectural Rule states a payload MUST NOT be interpreted as an admissibility determination or evidence that evaluation occurred
Governance Profile, if eventually supported	PROPOSED — term itself is provisional / non-normative	RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5 (provisional §4.4 definition withdrawn in v2.3; Governance Profile now recorded as an unresolved vocabulary dependency pending confirmation of its governing source)	Unresolved	Unresolved; not addressed by any approved decision
Prior governance state or receipt	APPROVED — NOT an RGE input	ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16 (Fully Stateless Runtime Governance Evaluation)	Not applicable — RGE shall not require a prior Admissibility Determination, prior Governance Evaluation, prior Governance Receipt, or evaluation-history record as an input	Does not consume. Where information originating from an earlier governance event remains relevant, it must enter the current evaluation through an already recognized governance-basis category (e.g., Evidence or Context), not through a special prior-state channel

5. Evaluation Semantics

5.1 Evaluation

[SUPPORTED] Evaluation is the process of assessing governance-relevant authority, evidence, policy, and context to understand whether governance requirements are satisfied. Evaluation is architecturally distinct from Determination (the conclusion reached), from Enforcement (applying that conclusion), and from Execution (performing the operational behavior). RGE performs Evaluation; it is not itself the determination, and it is not itself enforcement. *(Source: RGAF-01 §5.3 (Evaluation Is Not Determination); RGRA-01 §5.2, §9.4)*

5.2 Justification

[APPROVED] Justification / governance reasoning is represented within RGE's Governance Evaluation output. It is not introduced as a third top-level RGE output alongside Governance Evaluation and Admissibility Determination. Governance Evaluation shall preserve sufficient governance reasoning to make the basis of RGE's outcome independently examinable: when a valid Admissibility Determination is reached, that reasoning constitutes the Justification supporting or opposing the determination; when no valid Admissibility Determination is reached, Governance Evaluation shall still preserve sufficient reasoning to explain the non-determination condition and affected governance basis. This reasoning shall not itself be represented as an Admissibility Determination, and remains distinct from Evaluation Status (Section 6.3): Evaluation Status describes the evaluation condition; governance reasoning explains why the available governance basis led to the resulting determination or non-determination. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-2 (Model J4 — Justification Embedded Within the Existing Governance Evaluation Output); RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1 (Justification); RGAF-01 §3.6, §3.9; RGRA-01 §9.4 (Outputs))*

5.3 Admissibility Determination

[SUPPORTED] RGE produces the Admissibility Determination. This is not a matter requiring a ManChine architectural decision — it is directly and explicitly established by RGRA-01: Admissibility Determination is described as "the architectural outcome of Runtime Governance Evaluation" and is expressly not an independently operating architectural component. The RGE-01 skeleton's uncertainty on this point ("Determine whether the source architecture supports saying that RGE produces the Admissibility Determination") is resolved in the affirmative by the controlling architecture. *(Source: RGRA-01 §8.3 ("Admissibility Determination is described alongside these roles because it is architecturally significant, but it is not an independent component. It is the architectural outcome produced by Runtime Governance Evaluation"); §10.4; §10.9)*

5.4 Legitimacy

[SUPPORTED] The RGV-01 v2.3 distinction is preserved throughout this draft: Admissibility is a discrete governance determination made at a defined decision point — not a continuous evaluation process. Legitimacy is the governance condition whose validity may persist or cease as Authority, applicable Authorization where required, Evidence, Policy, and Context evolve. Distinct from Legitimacy having ceased, Legitimacy's present validity may also be unable to be established, where one or more of Authority, applicable Authorization, Evidence, Policy, or Context cannot presently be verified or determined. Its preservation over time is addressed by Legitimacy Continuity, not by repeated or ongoing redetermination of Admissibility itself. A new Admissibility determination — i.e., a new instance of RGE's evaluation — occurs when Legitimacy's continuing validity is called into question by a change in the governance basis; this is RGE-01's own behavioral determination within the scope RGV-01 v2.3

expressly leaves to the applicable behavioral specification, not a runtime-triggering rule stated by RGV-01 itself. RGE does not own Legitimacy Continuity; that is addressed elsewhere in the architecture (see Section 10). *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1 (Legitimacy); §5.1 (Determination Relationships, deferring behavioral triggering procedure to the applicable behavioral specification); RGRA-01 §11.10 (Continuous Governance))*

6. Outputs, Admissibility, and Evaluation Status

6.1 RGE Outputs

[SUPPORTED] Governance Evaluation (the evaluative conclusion RGE reaches, including embedded governance reasoning / Justification per Section 5.2). *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 (Outputs); ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-2)*

[SUPPORTED] Admissibility Determination, when validly reached (the architectural outcome of that evaluation). *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 (Outputs); §8.3)*

[APPROVED] Governance Evaluation shall preserve semantic traceability to the governance basis actually relied upon (Authority; Authorization, where applicable; Evidence; Policy; Context; and, where observation-derived evidence is used, the relevant observation/evidence source or instance). See Section 10. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7)*

[SUPPORTED] Governance Receipt reference or payload handoff: RGE does not create the Governance Receipt (RGE's Not Responsible For list explicitly excludes recording governance artifacts), but RGE's complete Governance Evaluation output — including Evaluation Status, embedded Justification, and traceability information — is Receipt-eligible. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 (Not Responsible For); §9.8 (Dependencies); ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7)*

6.2 Admissibility Determination

[APPROVED] When RGE validly reaches an Admissibility Determination, the determination result distinguishes exactly two values: ADMISSIBLE and NOT_ADMISSIBLE. Where RGE cannot validly reach an Admissibility Determination, no Admissibility result is produced merely to represent evaluation failure, insufficiency, staleness, conflict, or another non-determination condition — such conditions are represented instead through Evaluation Status (Section 6.3), never by fabricating an Admissibility value. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-1 (Model D — Separated Axes))*

[APPROVED] A known negative governance condition is not an epistemic deficiency, and the two are not interchangeable under this architecture. Where RGE has sufficient, current, and unambiguous information to establish that a required governance condition affirmatively does not permit the consequential action under evaluation, that condition is not missing, stale, conflicting, or unverifiable/insufficient within the meaning of Section 6.3.A — RGE has everything it needs to reach a determination, and the determination is negative. Such a condition shall produce a valid NOT_ADMISSIBLE Admissibility Determination, not an Evaluation Status non-determination condition. Evaluation Status (Section 6.3) remains reserved for circumstances in which RGE cannot reliably complete the Admissibility Determination because the required governance basis is missing, stale, conflicting, unverifiable, or otherwise insufficient. NOT_ADMISSIBLE is not collapsed into Evaluation Status, and Evaluation Status is not collapsed into NOT_ADMISSIBLE; the two dimensions established by Section 6.2's separated-axes architecture remain distinct. Specific applications of this principle — including Revoked Authority, Suspended Authority, and Authorization outside its applicable scope — are

addressed in Section 13. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-1; ManChine Technical Review Closure Adjudication, Finding RGE-CL-01)*

6.3 Evaluation Status

[APPROVED] RGE maintains Evaluation Status separately from the Admissibility Determination. Evaluation Status describes the state or outcome of the evaluation process and does not itself constitute an Admissibility Determination, execution authorization, execution denial, or an enforcement instruction. Evaluation Status is two-dimensional, distinguishing independently: *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4 (Model 2 + Model 4 combined architecture))*

- A. Failure condition — the nature of the deficiency, including at minimum the architectural concepts of missing, stale, conflicting, and unverifiable/insufficient input.
- B. Governance-basis category — the affected governance basis, using the categories established by D-4 as amended by D-14: the four RGV-01 governance-basis primitives (Authority, Evidence, Policy, Context), together with Authorization tracked as a separately identifiable category for evaluation-status purposes. Consistent with RGV-01 v2.3 §3.6–3.7 and §5.1, this tracking does not treat Authorization as a fifth RGV-01 governance-basis primitive; Authorization remains an authority-grounded permission concept, distinguishable from Authority for diagnostic purposes without being coordinate with it in RGV-01's own foundational model.

[APPROVED] These two dimensions remain conceptually separate so that implementations may represent combinations such as a stale Context condition or conflicting Evidence without requiring a separate monolithic status for every possible combination. An Authorization deficiency is categorized as Authorization, not as Authority, merely because Authorization is grounded in Authority — Authority and Authorization remain distinguishable evaluation conditions. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4 §2; Entry D-14 (Authorization as a Distinct Governance-Basis Category))*

[APPROVED] Where more than one independently applicable deficiency is established during the same Governance Evaluation, Evaluation Status shall be capable of representing each applicable failure-condition × governance-category pair — for example, a stale Context condition and a conflicting Policy condition arising simultaneously are each represented, not collapsed into a single reported pair by discarding one. This is a minimum normative principle only: it does not define an implementation schema, JSON structure, array format, ordering rule, serialization, transport format, or storage representation for how multiple pairs are carried, which remain deferred to the appropriate RGE interface/schema or conformance decision, consistent with this section's existing deferral of field names and encoding. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4; ManChine Technical Review Closure Adjudication, Finding RGE-CL-03)*

[APPROVED] Authorization applicability remains conditional. Where the applicable governance basis establishes that Authorization is required, RGE evaluates Authorization normally. Where no applicable governance rule establishes Authorization as required, RGE shall not create an Authorization deficiency merely from that silence. Where the applicable governance basis affirmatively raises whether Authorization applies but leaves that question unresolved because the relevant applicability information is conflicting, unverifiable, or otherwise insufficient, RGE shall represent the condition using the existing unverifiable/insufficient failure condition against the Authorization category and shall not fabricate an Admissibility Determination. This clarification does not define the Authorization trigger, grant Authorization, or create a new Evaluation Status state; those trigger semantics remain governed outside RGE-01. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N7 / AR-CL-04)

[APPROVED] Minimum-necessary clarification for the Authority-side condition REA-01 v1.6 §4.2 names Indeterminate — a state in which whether currently-granted Authority remains available for reliance cannot presently be confirmed, distinct from an affirmative Suspended condition. No new RGE-01 Evaluation Status state is introduced. Within the existing failure-condition vocabulary (Section 6.3.A), an Indeterminate Authority signal shall be represented under the existing "unverifiable/insufficient" failure condition against the Authority category; it shall not be evaluated as Active Authority and shall not, by itself, resolve into a valid Admissibility Determination merely because it is not affirmatively Suspended or Revoked. This mapping uses only vocabulary already present in the approved D-4/D-14 architecture and does not create a new Admissibility value or a new normative Evaluation Status state. (Source: REA-01 v1.6 §4.2 (Indeterminate), §15 (Indeterminacy from disagreement), §16; RGV-01 v2.3 §4.1 (Legitimacy, present validity unable to be established); ManChine Final Architecture Closure Pass)

> *Field names, enum strings, schema encoding, and wire-format representation for both the Admissibility Determination and Evaluation Status remain deferred to the appropriate RGE interface/schema or conformance decision. This section establishes semantic architecture only, consistent with ManChine Decision Log Entries D-1 §4, D-4 §5, and D-14 §6.*

7. Evaluation Failure and Insufficiency

[APPROVED] When RGE cannot validly reach an Admissibility Determination because required governance basis is missing, stale, conflicting, unverifiable, or otherwise insufficient, RGE produces no Admissibility result, consistent with Section 6.2. RGE finalizes an Evaluation Status describing the non-determination condition, using the two-dimensional architecture in Section 6.3. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4 §1)*

[APPROVED] For conditional Authorization, absence of any governance rule establishing that Authorization is required does not itself create a missing or unverifiable Authorization condition. A non-determination arises on Authorization applicability only where the applicable governance basis affirmatively raises the requirement question but does not permit RGE to establish whether Authorization applies; that unresolved condition is represented as unverifiable/insufficient × Authorization under Section 6.3. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N7 / AR-CL-04)
[APPROVED] RGE does not perform an internally governed bounded retry or reattempt loop as part of this behavior. A subsequent evaluation occurs through the architecture's established continuous-governance re-evaluation mechanism when governance-relevant Authority, Evidence, Policy, Context, observations, or other applicable conditions change. This does not prohibit an implementation from performing ordinary atomic processing necessary to complete one evaluation; it prohibits any new architectural retry/window mechanism. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4 §4; RGRA-01 §11.10 (Continuous Governance))*

[APPROVED] Evaluation Status describes the state of RGE's evaluation only. It does not instruct another component to retry, refresh, escalate, authorize, deny, suspend, terminate, obtain human review, or perform another action. Escalation-coded or action-coded status values are not part of the RGE Evaluation Status architecture. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4 §3, §6)*

[SUPPORTED] RGAF-01's Present-Condition Justification principle establishes that historical evidence, prior authorization, or earlier governance determinations may contribute to governance reasoning but shall not, by themselves, establish continuing legitimacy when current operational conditions have materially changed. This constrains RGE: a stale or historical basis cannot be treated as sufficient on its own. *(Source: RGAF-01 §4.4)*

A related, narrower REA-01 v1.6 §8 principle informed, but does not itself establish, the architecture above: REA-01 §8 provides that preservation or historical verifiability of authority-relevant evidence does not, by itself, establish its current applicability, continuing Authority, or continuing Legitimacy after material conditions have changed, and that evidence latency must not be silently treated as affirmative evidence of continuity; REA-01 scopes that principle to authority-relevant evidence only. ManChine's approved architecture (D-4) generalizes the same underlying principle to RGE directly, by explicit decision rather than by extension of REA-01's own scope. This footnote was corrected in v1.1 to cite verifiable REA-01 v1.6 source text; the previously cited "REA-01 Chapter 6, §6.1" formulation could not be located in REA-01 v1.6 and has been removed.

8. Relationship to Enforcement and Execution

8.1 Runtime Execution Boundary (REB)

[SUPPORTED] REB consumes the Admissibility Determination and applies it immediately prior to consequential execution, without redefining, modifying, or re-evaluating it. REB owns enforcement; RGE owns evaluation and determination. RGE has no authority to cause execution directly — that capability belongs exclusively to Consequential Execution, gated by REB. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.5 (REB Purpose, Inputs: Admissibility determination); §10.5 (Enforcement Relationship: "REB owns enforcement… REB does not perform governance evaluation, redefine admissibility…"))*

8.2 cGate

[SUPPORTED] Whether cGate consumes an RGE determination, participates in enforcement, or has any relationship to RGE at all cannot be answered from the supplied source set. See Section 3.3. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5; full-text absence from RGAF-01 and RGRA-01)*

Non-blocking dependency (Decision Register item D-5): RGE-01's approved architecture assigns cGate no role and depends on no cGate behavior.

8.3 Consequential Execution

[SUPPORTED] Consequential Execution performs operational activities authorized through the Runtime Governance process and depends upon REB's enforcement, not upon RGE directly. RGE has no direct relationship to Consequential Execution; RGE's output reaches Consequential Execution only through REB. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.6 (Consequential Execution Dependencies: Runtime Execution Boundary); §10.6)*

9. Relationship to Runtime Integrity Control (RiCo)

[SUPPORTED] RiCo verifies, throughout consequential execution, whether execution continues to conform to the governance conditions under which admissibility was established. RiCo does not determine admissibility, authorize execution, or replace governance evaluation. This preserves the boundary the skeleton required: RGE does not silently absorb Legitimacy Continuity or RiCo's runtime-integrity responsibility. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.7 (RiCo Not Responsible For); §10.7)*

[SUPPORTED] RiCo's integrity findings may become governance-relevant evidence supporting a future, separate Runtime Governance Evaluation. This is the architectural mechanism by which a new RGE determination can be triggered during ongoing execution: a change detected by RiCo becomes an input (as Evidence/Context) to a subsequent, discrete instance of RGE — not a continuous re-evaluation

performed by RiCo itself, and not RiCo issuing its own admissibility determination. *(Source: RGRA-01 §10.7 ("RiCo may produce governance-relevant integrity findings that become additional governance evidence for future Runtime Governance Evaluation"); §11.8, §11.10 (Continuous Governance))*

[SUPPORTED] Legitimacy Continuity — the preservation of governance legitimacy across the duration of execution — is a cross-cutting property, not a stage owned by RGE. RGV-01 v2.3 is explicit that Legitimacy Continuity is not a pipeline stage that RGE's Admissibility output produces or supersedes. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §5.1 (Cross-Cutting Continuity Properties))*

10. Traceability and Governance Evidence

10.1 No RGE Persistence Responsibility

[APPROVED] RGE does not become responsible for persistent governance-artifact storage, receipt storage, audit-log storage, or long-term retention. Persistent governance artifacts remain the responsibility of Runtime Governance Receipt / RGR-01 and the applicable recording architecture. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7 §1; RGRA-01 §9.4 (Not Responsible For: record governance artifacts))*

10.2 Receipt-Eligible RGE Output

[APPROVED] RGE's complete Governance Evaluation output is eligible for downstream Governance Receipt use, including, as applicable: Evaluation Status; governance reasoning / Justification; the Admissibility Determination when one is validly reached; and traceability information identifying the governance basis actually relied upon by the evaluation. This resolves the prior open question of whether Governance Receipt may draw upon Governance Evaluation in addition to the Admissibility Determination: it may. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7 §2; RGRA-01 §9.8 (Governance Receipt Inputs, Dependencies))*

10.3 Traceable Governance Basis

[APPROVED] RGE preserves sufficient traceable linkage to identify the applicable Authority; Authorization, where required; Evidence; Policy; and Context actually relied upon in reaching the Governance Evaluation. Where observation-derived evidence is used, the evaluation preserves sufficient linkage to identify the relevant observation/evidence source or instance. Governance reasoning / Justification (Section 5.2) explains why the governance basis led to the resulting determination or non-determination; traceability identifies what governance basis was actually relied upon. These two functions are complementary and are not treated as equivalent. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7 §3, §4)*

[APPROVED] Where no valid Admissibility Determination is reached (Section 7), traceability still identifies the governance basis relevant to the non-determination condition to the extent available. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7 §5)*

10.4 No Reverse Dependency on Governance Receipt

[APPROVED] RGE makes its evaluation and traceable governance basis available for receipt generation. RGE does not subsequently query Governance Receipt in order to determine the result of a later evaluation. This is consistent with, and reinforces, RGE's statelessness (Section 11): the traceability obligation in this section does not create a dependency of RGE on Governance Receipt's own content or history. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16 §6)*

10.5 RGR Boundary and Deferred Representation

[APPROVED] This draft establishes what RGE must make traceably available. It does not establish the complete RGR-01 receipt schema; exactly which RGE elements RGR-01 must embed versus reference; receipt persistence duration; receipt storage architecture; or receipt signing/integrity mechanisms — those remain RGR-01 responsibilities or later standards-family decisions. Nor does this draft freeze the technical representation of a traceable reference (UUIDs, hashes, URIs, object identifiers, timestamps, signatures, field names, serialization, or wire format); the requirement established here is semantic traceability, not a particular implementation. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7 §6, §7)*

Note on identifier discrepancy: Governance Receipt / GR / GR-01 / RGR-01

[RECONCILED] RGRA-01 refers to this artifact as "Governance Receipt" (unqualified) in its component-definition heading (§9.8) and as "Governance Receipt (GR)" in its scope-boundary and relationship sections (§6.3, §7.5). The actual development artifact ManChine supplied for this pass is titled "RGR-01 — Runtime Governance Receipt." This draft treats RGR-01 as the same artifact RGRA-01 calls "Governance Receipt (GR)" but does not resolve the identifier inconsistency — GR vs. GR-01 vs. RGR-01 remains an external, non-blocking cleanup item routed to RGSR-01 (registry) and RGV-01, not resolved within RGE-01. *(Source: RGRA-01 §6.3, §7.5, §9.8; RGR-01 document title)*

11. Statelessness

[APPROVED] Each Runtime Governance Evaluation is a discrete evaluation performed against the governance basis applicable at the current decision point. RGE does not require a prior Admissibility Determination, prior Governance Evaluation, prior Governance Receipt, or evaluation-history record as an input. RGE evaluates the currently applicable Runtime Observation Payload; Authority; Authorization, where required; Evidence; Policy; and Context. A new evaluation may produce the same or a different result from an earlier evaluation because the current governance basis may differ. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16 §1, §2 (Model PS-A — Fully Stateless Runtime Governance Evaluation))*

[APPROVED] An RGE Admissibility Determination shall correspond to the governance basis applicable at the defined decision point and shall not knowingly rely exclusively on a governance-basis condition established as superseded before that decision point. A material governance-basis change that becomes applicable before the decision point cannot knowingly be ignored in favor of its superseded predecessor. Information that becomes applicable only after a completed decision point does not retroactively rewrite the completed determination; it may become part of the governance basis for a subsequent discrete Governance Evaluation. Decision-point correspondence does not require all governance-basis inputs to share an identical timestamp; applicability is determined through the governing interfaces and semantics for that evaluation. This requirement does not assign RGE responsibility for monitoring, polling, locking, synchronization, transport, buffering, version negotiation, change detection, retry, reevaluation triggering, or orchestration. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N3 / AR-N4 / AR-N5 / AR-CL-03)

[APPROVED] A previous determination does not bind, predetermine, or independently influence a new RGE determination merely because it occurred previously. Where information originating from an earlier governance event remains relevant to the present decision point, it enters the current evaluation through an already recognized governance-basis category — such as Evidence or Context — rather than through a special prior-state input. Re-evaluation under continuous governance does not make RGE stateful; each triggered evaluation remains a new, discrete evaluation of present governance conditions. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16 §3, §4)*

[APPROVED] A prior Admissibility Determination, Governance Receipt, replayed request, or historically preserved governance basis shall not independently substitute for the governance basis applicable at the current decision point. Historical artifacts may contribute through an already recognized current governance-basis category where permitted by the applicable governance architecture, but historical integrity, successful verification, replay identity, or reconstruction does not independently establish present applicability or current Admissibility. This does not prohibit implementation-level caching or memoization where the current applicable governance basis is independently established as equivalent, nor does it prohibit Policy from assigning specified evidentiary significance to historical material; in either case RGE still performs a current evaluation and does not become responsible for creating, storing, or verifying Governance Receipts. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N9 / AR-CL-05)
[APPROVED] RGE does not own detection of repeated relitigation attempts, request counting, cooldown periods, rate limiting, replay detection, abuse detection, or historical-pattern monitoring. Those functions, if required, belong outside RGE and are assigned by the applicable orchestration, observation, policy, execution-boundary, or other governing specification. A policy may nevertheless make relevant historical behavior part of the present governance basis; in that case, RGE evaluates the resulting Policy/Evidence/Context presented to it, and does not independently reconstruct that history. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16 §5)*

> *This resolves, for RGE-01's own scope, the previously open question of relitigation-request handling: it is determined to be outside RGE-01's responsibility. No new RGE mechanism is introduced to address it; the question is preserved for assignment elsewhere in the standards family only if ManChine later determines explicit relitigation handling is required.*

12. Conformance and Implementation Independence

[APPROVED] RGE-01 defines one mandatory conformance level for a conforming Runtime Governance Evaluation implementation. RGE-01 does not establish Core, Traceable, Assured, Basic, Advanced, or other graduated conformance tiers unless a future standards-family decision explicitly introduces such profiles. An implementation either satisfies the mandatory RGE-01 conformance requirements or it does not. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-8 §1 (Model D8-1 — Single Flat Mandatory Conformance Bar))*

[APPROVED] Conformance is externally testable through observable input/output behavior and architectural boundary compliance. A conforming implementation demonstrates, at minimum, that it: consumes the required current governance inputs applicable to the evaluation; treats Authorization as a distinct conditional input where required; produces a valid Admissibility Determination only when one can validly be reached; distinguishes ADMISSIBLE from NOT_ADMISSIBLE; produces NOT_ADMISSIBLE, not an Evaluation Status non-determination condition, where a known negative governance condition is established with sufficient, current, unambiguous information (Section 6.2); does not manufacture an Admissibility result for a genuine non-determination condition; produces Evaluation Status consistent with Section 6.3, including representing each applicable failure-condition × governance-category pair where more than one independently applicable deficiency exists within the same Governance Evaluation; preserves governance reasoning / Justification within Governance Evaluation; preserves semantic traceability to the governance basis actually relied upon; remains stateless across discrete evaluations as established by Section 11; and does not perform enforcement, execution, authorization granting, receipt persistence, relitigation detection, or other responsibilities assigned outside RGE. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-8 §2; ManChine Technical Review Closure Adjudication, Findings RGE-CL-01, RGE-CL-03)*

[APPROVED] Conformance testing includes cases in which RGE cannot validly reach an Admissibility Determination, verifying that applicable missing, stale, conflicting, unverifiable, or insufficient governance-basis conditions are represented through Evaluation Status without fabricating an Admissibility result or enforcement instruction. Conformance testing exercises the governance-basis categories established in Section 6.3 — the four RGV-01 governance-basis primitives (Authority; Evidence; Policy; Context), together with Authorization tracked separately for evaluation-status purposes when applicable; the existence of an Authorization test case does not establish when Authorization is required, which remains governed by Section 4 and the applicable governing specification, nor does it treat Authorization as a fifth RGV-01 governance-basis primitive (see Section 6.3). *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-8 §3, §4)*

[APPROVED] Conformance testing for conditional Authorization distinguishes at least: (a) Authorization established as required; (b) no applicable governance rule establishing Authorization as required; and (c) Authorization applicability affirmatively raised but unresolved. Case (c) is tested as unverifiable/insufficient × Authorization with no fabricated Admissibility result. Conformance also tests decision-point temporal correspondence without requiring a particular synchronization, locking, transport, or timestamp mechanism. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N3 / AR-N4 / AR-N5 / AR-N7; AR-CL-03 / AR-CL-04)

[APPROVED] Conformance explicitly tests that RGE output does not itself execute, enforce, grant execution authorization, deny execution, or instruct REB what discretionary judgment to make: RGE determines, REB applies the determination. Equivalent current governance inputs do not produce different RGE behavior merely because of prior RGE determinations, prior Governance Receipts, request counts, or historical evaluation state not represented within the current governance basis — though this does not require identical Admissibility outcomes where implementation-defined evaluation logic legitimately differs, unless another specification establishes deterministic decision semantics. Conformance tests test required architectural behavior and semantics, not an algorithm RGE-01 does not define. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-8 §5, §6)*

[APPROVED] RGE-01 conformance establishes conformance to this specification's mandatory architectural, semantic, boundary, Evaluation Status, and Admissibility Determination requirements; it does not by itself establish universal outcome equivalence across independent conforming implementations where evaluation semantics legitimately remain implementation-defined. Where outcome equivalence is required, sufficiently determinate evaluation semantics must be supplied by the applicable Policy, evaluation contract, or other governing specification. Implementation-defined evaluation latitude shall not override RGE-01's mandatory semantics: it shall not select a superseded governance basis in place of the basis applicable at the decision point; collapse Evaluation Status into Admissibility; convert an epistemic deficiency into NOT_ADMISSIBLE; ignore a known-negative condition that requires NOT_ADMISSIBLE; or violate component responsibility boundaries. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N1 / AR-CL-01)

[APPROVED] Where RGE-01 eventually defines a normative interface or schema, structural validation against that interface/schema is a prerequisite of conformance, but structural validity alone does not establish conformance; behavioral requirements must also be satisfied. This draft does not freeze field names, enum strings, JSON structure, identifiers, hashes, URI formats, timestamps, signatures, serialization, or wire protocol; those details remain subject to the appropriate interface/schema specification or later controlled decision. ROPS-01's tiered conformance model is not imported into RGE-01 merely for family symmetry: ROPS-01's tiering reflects optional/graduated obligations in that specification, whereas RGE-01's approved architectural obligations presently form a single mandatory behavioral contract. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-8 §7, §8, §9)*

13. Security, Abuse, and Boundary Conditions

[SUPPORTED] Conflicting or adversarial evidence: represented through Evaluation Status's "conflicting" failure condition against the relevant governance-basis category (Section 6.3), consistent with the approved D-4 architecture. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4)*

[APPROVED] External evidence characteristics do not acquire governance significance merely by being present. RGE shall not infer governance authority, sufficiency, priority, dispositive weight, or Admissibility solely from characteristics such as cryptographic verification, provenance, confidence, source count, evaluator identity, reputation, recency, or similar characteristics unless the applicable governance basis establishes the significance of those characteristics. This list is illustrative, not exhaustive. Outputs from external evaluators are treated as Evidence unless another governing specification establishes a different formal role; RGE does not invent an evaluator-ranking or evidentiary-weighting rule. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N2 / AR-N8 / AR-CL-02)
[SUPPORTED] Stale context: RGAF-01's Present-Condition Justification principle directly addresses this — historical conditions cannot, by themselves, establish continuing legitimacy once current conditions have materially changed; represented through Evaluation Status's "stale" failure condition against the Context category. *(Source: RGAF-01 §4.4; ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4)*

[APPROVED] Where stale and current Evidence coexist, whether the stale Evidence remains substantively relevant enough to constitute a live conflict is determined under the applicable governance basis. RGE shall not invent a universal staleness threshold, evidence hierarchy, or weighting rule. Where independently applicable deficiencies are established, Evaluation Status may represent both stale × Evidence and conflicting × Evidence consistent with Section 6.3. (Source: ManChine Architecture Review, AR-N6 / AR-CL-02)
[SUPPORTED] Missing Evidence: no observation payload or evidence source has been received for a mandatory input applicable to the evaluation; represented through Evaluation Status's "missing" failure condition against the Evidence category, consistent with the approved D-4 architecture. This is a worked illustration of the "missing" failure condition already established in Section 6.3.A; it does not introduce a new failure condition or governance-basis category. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4; ManChine Technical Review Closure Adjudication, Finding RGE-CL-04)*

[SUPPORTED] Invalid or revoked Authority: REA-01 v1.6 §13 provides that Revocation permanently withdraws authority under the affected authority record and that new authority-dependent determinations after the effective revocation time are always precluded; REA-01 v1.6 does not yet state this in SHALL/SHALL NOT normative register outside a small number of explicitly hardened clauses elsewhere in the document. Revoked Authority is a known negative governance condition, not an epistemic deficiency: RGE has current, unambiguous information that Authority has been withdrawn. Consistent with Section 6.2, RGE produces a valid NOT_ADMISSIBLE Admissibility Determination — not an Evaluation Status non-determination condition — where the applicable action depends on Revoked Authority. This is RGE-01's own architectural inference from REA-01's Revocation treatment, not a REA-01 mandate stated in those terms. *(Source: REA-01 v1.6 §13; citation corrected in v1.1 — REA-01 v1.6 has no §12/§13.2 subsection numbering matching the prior citation; NOT_ADMISSIBLE treatment per ManChine Technical Review Closure Adjudication, Finding RGE-CL-01)*

[APPROVED] Suspended Authority: Suspension is an affirmative REA-01 act, not an epistemic gap — Suspended Authority's state is known, not uncertain. While the suspension remains operative, RGE produces a valid NOT_ADMISSIBLE Admissibility Determination for action that depends on the suspended Authority, consistent with Section 6.2's known-negative-governance-condition principle — not an Evaluation Status non-determination condition, and not the same treatment given to

Indeterminate Authority (Section 6.3), whose state cannot presently be confirmed at all. RGE does not itself suspend, restore, revoke, or activate Authority; it evaluates the governance consequence of whichever Authority state REA-01 establishes. *(Source: REA-01 v1.6 §4.2 (Suspended as an affirmative act, distinct from Indeterminate); ManChine Technical Review Closure Adjudication, Finding RGE-CL-02)*

[SUPPORTED] Active Authority: an Authority record in Active status may support a Governance Evaluation proceeding to a determination, but Active Authority status alone does not itself establish Admissibility — Active Authority is necessary, not sufficient; ADMISSIBLE additionally depends on the remaining governance basis (applicable Authorization, Evidence, Policy, and Context) also supporting the action under evaluation. RGE does not treat Active Authority as a shortcut past the rest of the governance basis. *(Source: ManChine Technical Review Closure Adjudication, Finding RGE-CL-02)*

[SUPPORTED] Authorization outside scope: Authorization is authority-grounded and scoped to a specified action, instance, or scope (Section 4). Where a supplied Authorization does not cover the action, scope, or instance under evaluation, RGE has current, unambiguous information that the required Authorization does not permit the action — a known negative governance condition, not an epistemic deficiency. Consistent with Section 6.2, RGE produces a valid NOT_ADMISSIBLE Admissibility Determination, not an Evaluation Status non-determination condition. The exact validation semantics for scope-matching remain governed by the applicable Authorization/Authority specification, not by RGE-01 itself — this is a visibly flagged, non-blocking dependency (see Section 4, Authorization row). *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-3 §3, §4)*

[SUPPORTED] Policy conflict: represented through Evaluation Status's "conflicting" failure condition against the Policy category, consistent with the approved D-4 architecture. RGE-01 does not define how a conflict is substantively resolved; it describes the condition through Evaluation Status. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4)*

[SUPPORTED] Repeated re-evaluation requests intended to relitigate a denial: determined to be outside RGE's responsibility (Section 11). RGE does not detect, count, cool down, or otherwise specially handle repeated requests; each evaluation is independently discrete. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16 §5, §7)*

[SUPPORTED] Partial execution / changed conditions during execution: RGRA-01 confirms this can trigger a new RGE evaluation (§11.10) but does not specify what happens to execution already underway pending that new determination — that is a REB/execution-boundary behavioral question outside RGE's own responsibility, and no REB-01 content beyond skeleton-stage speculation is available to answer it. *(Source: RGRA-01 §11.10; REB-01 skeleton status only)*

[SUPPORTED] Interoperability with external observation producers: ROPS-01 is designed to standardize the observation payload independently of the producer's implementation, which is the architectural mechanism supporting this interoperability. RGE-01's conformance requirement (Section 12) depends on this. *(Source: ROPS-01 §5 (Architectural Role); §14 (Interoperability Requirements))*

14. Relationships to Other Standards

Standard	Status (per supplied source set)	Relationship to RGE-01
RGV-01 — Runtime Governance	v2.3, Published Standard (August 14,	Normative terminology source. RGE-01 uses RGV-01's definitions of Authority, Evidence,

Vocabulary	2026)	Policy, Context, Justification, Admissibility, Legitimacy, Authorization, and Governance Receipt. This draft's Vocabulary Findings (Section 15) recommend RGV-01 close most of its outstanding dependencies; cGate, Governance Profile, and Runtime Decision Lifecycle (RDL) remain open per RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5. This v1.1 revision re-verifies RGE-01's RGV-01-sourced citations against the published v2.3 text; see the v1.0→v1.1 Revision History for corrections made.
RGAF-01 — Runtime Governance Architecture Foundations	v1.0, Technical Review (developed)	Source of the architectural principles (Separation of Governance Responsibilities, Continuous Legitimacy, Present-Condition Justification, Governance Before Consequence, Governance During Execution, Evidence-Based Accountability, Architecture–Implementation Separation) and invariants this draft applies to RGE specifically. RGAF-01's "Continuous Legitimacy" principle is understood here, consistent with RGV-01 v2.3's discrete-Admissibility model and its recorded cross-document terminology risk regarding "continuous legitimacy evaluation," as continuous observation and verification of governance conditions via Legitimacy Continuity and Runtime Integrity Control — not continuous redetermination of Admissibility, which remains a discrete determination at a defined decision point per Section 5.3–5.4.
RGRA-01 — Runtime Governance Reference Architecture	Technical Review (developed)	Primary controlling source for this draft. §9.4 supplies RGE's own component definition (Purpose, Responsibilities, Inputs, Outputs, Not Responsible For, Dependencies); §8.3 and §10.4 establish that Admissibility Determination is RGE's architectural outcome, not an independent component.
REA-01 — Runtime Execution Authority	v1.6, Architecture Review Draft (Draft for Standards Development and External Technical Review)	Source for Authority-lifecycle behavior (establishment, delegation, maintenance, continuity, constraint, intervention, suspension, restoration, revocation) that RGE consumes as an input. Does not currently define an Authorization trigger, scope, or validity condition (visibly flagged

		dependency; see Section 4) — reconfirmed accurate against REA-01 v1.6, which still contains no Authorization-trigger content. This v1.1 revision re-verifies RGE-01's REA-01-sourced citations against v1.6 (previously assumed v1.0); see the v1.0→v1.1 Revision History for corrections made, including two citations that could not be verified against v1.6's actual section structure.
ROPS-01 — Runtime Observation Payload	v0.2, Working Draft — Post-Review Revision (developed)	Defines the canonical payload RGE consumes as its observation input. ROPS-01's Central Architectural Rule (a payload MUST NOT be interpreted as an admissibility determination) directly reinforces RGE-01's own Section 4 boundary. ROPS-01's normative-keyword usage (MUST) and embedded reviewer commentary remain external cleanup items, not resolved within RGE-01.
REB-01 — Runtime Execution Boundary	Technical Review Skeleton, Not Published (development artifact)	Downstream consumer of RGE's Admissibility Determination. REB's identity as Runtime Execution Boundary is unchanged by this incorporation pass.
RiCo-01 — Runtime Integrity Control	Technical Review Skeleton, Not Published (development artifact)	Post-admissibility integrity-verification responsibility; source of evidence that may trigger a new RGE evaluation. RiCo's identity as Runtime Integrity Control is unchanged by this incorporation pass.
RGR-01 — Runtime Governance Receipt	Skeleton; self-labeled "Evidence Status: Development artifact; not normative authority"	Consumes RGE's complete Governance Evaluation output as Receipt-eligible material (Section 10). Identifier inconsistency (GR / GR-01 / RGR-01) remains an external cleanup item routed to RGSR-01 and RGV-01, not resolved within RGE-01.
cGate-01	Skeleton; title/expansion explicitly UNRESOLVED	No established relationship to RGE. Entirely absent from RGAF-01 and RGRA-01. RGE-01's approved architecture assigns cGate no role and depends on no cGate behavior; this remains a visibly flagged, non-blocking dependency pending a cGate-01 development pass.

15. Vocabulary Findings for RGV-01

RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5 lists the following as "Recognized Vocabulary Requiring Authoritative Definition": Runtime Governance Evaluation (RGE), Observation, Observation Producer, Runtime Observation Profile / ROPS-01-related terminology, Enforcement, Determination, cGate, Governance Profile, and Runtime Decision Lifecycle (RDL). Governance Profile and RDL were added to this list by RGV-01 v2.3, superseding their earlier provisional treatment in v2.2 (a provisional §4.4 entry for Governance Profile, and a provisional §4.3 entry for RDL); neither now carries any normative RGV-01 definition. This section records what the RGE-01 development pass found for each of the terms this pass examined, without directly modifying RGV-01. Governance Profile and RDL are addressed briefly at the end of this section for currency with the v2.3 baseline; this pass does not attempt to define either.

Runtime Governance Evaluation (RGE)

[SUPPORTED] RGRA-01 §9.4 already supplies a complete component-structure definition (Purpose, Responsibilities, Inputs, Outputs, Not Responsible For, Dependencies) sufficient to close this vocabulary gap. Recommend RGV-01 adopt a definition consistent with: "the architectural responsibility that evaluates governance-relevant authority, evidence, policy, and operational context to produce a governance evaluation and an admissibility determination, independent of observation production, enforcement, execution, integrity verification, and governance recording." *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4)*

Evaluation

[SUPPORTED] RGAF-01 §5.3 and RGRA-01 §5.2 together establish "Evaluation" as the process of assessing evidence, policy, authority, and context to understand whether governance requirements are satisfied — distinct from Determination. Sufficient basis exists to close this gap. *(Source: RGAF-01 §5.3; RGRA-01 §5.2)*

Determination

[SUPPORTED] RGRA-01 §5.3 defines Determination as "the governance conclusion reached as a result of" Evaluation, and §10.4 further specifies Admissibility Determination as RGE's architectural outcome. Sufficient basis exists to close this gap, at least for "Admissibility Determination" as the specific determination type RGE produces. *(Source: RGRA-01 §5.3, §10.4)*

Enforcement

[SUPPORTED] RGRA-01 §5.3 and §9.5 establish Enforcement as REB's responsibility: applying a determination without redefining or re-evaluating it. Sufficient basis exists to close this gap. *(Source: RGRA-01 §5.3, §9.5)*

Observation / Observation Producer

[SUPPORTED] RGRA-01 §9.2 and ROPS-01 §6.1–6.2 together supply complete definitions. Sufficient basis exists to close this gap. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.2; ROPS-01 §6.1, §6.2)*

Runtime Observation Profile / ROPS-01-related terminology

[SUPPORTED] ROPS-01 §6 (Core Concepts) supplies definitions for Runtime Observation, Observation Producer, Observation Subject, Proposed Action, Target, Runtime Evidence, Governance Context, Producer Assessment, and Conformance Profile. Sufficient basis exists to close this gap, subject to ROPS-01 itself still being a Working Draft rather than a Published specification. *(Source: ROPS-01 §6)*

cGate

[SUPPORTED] Remains genuinely unresolved. No developed specification defines cGate, mentions its architectural position, or assigns it any responsibility. RGV-01 should continue to record cGate as an open vocabulary dependency until cGate-01 progresses beyond its current skeleton stage. RGE-01's own architecture does not depend on this closure. *(Source: Full-text absence from RGAF-01, RGRA-01; cGate-01 skeleton's own explicit disclaimer)*

Resolved finding: Justification's output status

[APPROVED] Resolved by ManChine decision: Justification / governance reasoning is represented within RGE's Governance Evaluation output and is not a separately traceable, third top-level RGE output artifact. See Section 5.2. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-2)*

New finding: Governance Receipt identifier inconsistency

[RECONCILED] GR, GR-01, and RGR-01 are used inconsistently across RGRA-01 and the supplied artifact set to refer to what appears to be the same governance-recording artifact. This is a structural identifier-suffix issue, not a definitional gap, and remains an external cleanup item routed to RGSR-01 (registry) and RGV-01, not resolved within RGE-01. *(Source: RGRA-01 §6.3, §7.5, §9.8; RGR-01 document title; original RGE-01 skeleton's "GR-01" reference (corrected in the re-uploaded skeleton to "RGR-01"))*

Resolved finding: Authorization's status as an RGE input

[APPROVED] Resolved by ManChine decision: Authorization is a distinct, conditional RGE input, not collapsed into Authority. RGRA-01 §9.4's formal Inputs list should be understood as extended by this decision. See Section 4. The trigger determining when Authorization is required remains outside RGE-01 and is not yet defined by REA-01 (visibly flagged dependency). *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-3; RGV-01 v2.3 §5.1; RGRA-01 §9.4)*

New finding: Terminology collision — Authorization vs. "execution authorization"

[RECONCILED] RGV-01's formal Authorization concept (an input-side, authority-grounded permission RGE may evaluate) and RGRA-01/ROPS-01's "execution authorization" (REB's enforcement output) share a word but are different concepts at different points in the architecture. This draft distinguishes them consistently throughout and recommends RGV-01/RGRA-01 record this collision during their own cleanup process. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-3 §5)*

Governance Profile

[SUPPORTED] Remains unresolved under RGV-01 v2.3. RGV-01's own provisional Section 4.4 definition was withdrawn in v2.3 and the term moved to Section 4.5 pending confirmation of its governing source. RGE-01's Section 4 Inputs table already records Governance Profile as PROPOSED / not addressed by any approved RGE-01 decision, consistent with this status. No normative meaning is inferred for it here, and this pass does not propose one. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5; Section 4 of this document)*

Runtime Decision Lifecycle (RDL)

[SUPPORTED] Remains unresolved under RGV-01 v2.3. RGV-01 removed RDL from its defined vocabulary and relationship diagram in v2.3 and recorded it in Section 4.5 as an unresolved vocabulary dependency, with its normative meaning and any lifecycle ordering, sequencing, or stage timing left to a future governing specification. This draft does not use RDL terminology and takes no position on its eventual definition or on whether Runtime Governance Evaluation would correspond to a stage within it. *(Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5)*

16. Skeleton Question Dispositions

This section restates the RGE-01 skeleton's original numbered decision list (Section 14 of the skeleton) with the final disposition reached across the full decision sequence. All twelve original questions are now closed, either by ManChine architectural decision or by explicit routing outside RGE-01.

[SUPPORTED] 1. What exact architectural responsibility does RGE own? — Resolved: evaluating Authority, Evidence, Policy, Context, and conditional Authorization to produce a Governance Evaluation and, when validly reached, an Admissibility Determination. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4; ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-3)*

[SUPPORTED] 2. What does RGE explicitly not own? — Resolved: observation production, Authority origination, Authorization granting, enforcement, execution, integrity verification, governance recording, receipt persistence, and relitigation/pattern detection. See Section 1.3 and Section 11. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 (Not Responsible For); ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16)*

[SUPPORTED] 3. What are the minimum normative inputs to RGE? — Resolved: Authority, conditional Authorization, Evidence, Policy, Context, and Runtime Observation Payloads (ROPS-01). See Section 4. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.4 (Inputs); ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-3)*

[APPROVED] 4. Does RGE produce Justification, Admissibility, both, or neither? — Resolved: both. RGE produces Admissibility (when validly reached) and embeds Justification / governance reasoning within Governance Evaluation. See Section 5.2 and Section 6. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entries D-1, D-2)*

[APPROVED] 5. Is Admissibility binary, multi-state, or intentionally unspecified at this level? — Resolved: a two-value result (ADMISSIBLE / NOT_ADMISSIBLE) when validly reached, separated from a two-dimensional Evaluation Status axis for non-determination conditions. See Section 6.2–6.3. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entries D-1, D-4, D-14)*

[APPROVED] 6. What happens when inputs are missing, stale, conflicting, or insufficient? — Resolved: no Admissibility result is produced; Evaluation Status represents the condition along two dimensions (failure condition; governance-basis category). No RGE-internal retry; re-evaluation occurs only through continuous governance. See Section 7. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-4)*

[SUPPORTED] 7. Can a new RGE determination be triggered during ongoing execution, and by what architectural condition? — Resolved: yes, when authority, evidence, policy, context, or RiCo integrity findings change; each such evaluation remains a new, discrete, stateless evaluation. See Section 9 and Section 11. *(Source: RGRA-01 §11.10, §10.7; ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-16)*

[SUPPORTED] 8. How does RGE remain separate from Legitimacy Continuity and RiCo? — Resolved: RGE produces discrete Governance Evaluations and Admissibility Determinations. Legitimacy Continuity remains a cross-cutting governance property rather than an RGE output or pipeline stage, while RiCo retains its distinct runtime-integrity-verification responsibility. RiCo may produce governance-relevant integrity findings that become evidence for a future, separate RGE evaluation, but RiCo does not own or perform RGE's admissibility determination. See Section 9. (Source: RGV-01 v2.3 §5.1; RGRA-01 §9.7, §10.7)

[SUPPORTED] 9. What does REB/cGate consume from RGE? — Resolved for REB: REB consumes the Admissibility Determination. cGate's consumption remains a non-blocking, externally routed dependency (Decision Register item D-5); RGE-01's own architecture assigns cGate no role. See Section 8. *(Source: RGRA-01 §9.5; ManChine Decision Log — cGate status unchanged, tracked as D-5)*

[APPROVED] 10. What evaluation data must be preserved for traceability and Governance Receipt generation? — Resolved: RGE's complete Governance Evaluation output (Evaluation Status, embedded Justification, Admissibility Determination when reached, and traceable governance-basis linkage) is Receipt-eligible; RGE has no persistence responsibility. See Section 10. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entry D-7)*

[SUPPORTED] 11. Which terms required by RGE are still unresolved in RGV-01 v2.3? — Resolved for RGE, Evaluation, Determination, Enforcement, and Observation/Observation Producer; cGate, Governance Profile, and Runtime Decision Lifecycle (RDL) remain genuinely unresolved under RGV-01 v2.3's current Section 4.5 list. The Justification and Authorization findings previously open are now closed by ManChine decision. See Section 15. *(Source: Section 15 of this document; ManChine Decision Log, Entries D-2, D-3)*

[SUPPORTED] 12. Which statements in this skeleton are supported by existing standards, and which require an explicit ManChine decision? — Fully answered: every item is now classified APPROVED, APPROVED WITH DEPENDENCY, OUTSIDE RGE-01 / ROUTED ELSEWHERE, BLOCKED BY ANOTHER SPECIFICATION, RETIRED / NOT ESTABLISHED, or EDITORIAL / SOURCE-FAMILY CLEANUP in the Architectural Decision Register below. *(Source: This document, passim; RGE-01 Pre-Incorporation Closure Review)*

17. Architectural Decision Register

Final status of every decision and finding raised across the RGE-01 development and decision process, consolidated per the accepted RGE-01 Pre-Incorporation Architecture Closure Review. Approved items (D-1, D-2, D-4, D-7, D-8, D-11, D-14, D-16, and the resolved portions of D-9) are incorporated into the normative sections referenced. D-3 is approved with an explicit, visibly flagged dependency. D-5, D-6, D-10, D-12, and D-13, and the remaining portions of D-9, are genuinely outside RGE-01's own architecture and are preserved as explicit notes rather than resolved here. "D-15" is retired and was never established as an architectural decision.

ID	Item	Status	Disposition
D-1	Admissibility result-state model	APPROVED	Separated Axes: ADMISSIBLE / NOT_ADMISSIBLE when validly reached; no result for non-determination conditions. Incorporated in Section 6.2.
D-2	Whether Justification is a separately traceable RGE output artifact	APPROVED (with conforming amendment)	Embedded within Governance Evaluation; not a third top-level output. Governance-basis enumeration conformed to include Authorization following D-14. Incorporated in Section 5.2, Section 6.1.
D-3	Whether Authorization is a distinct RGE input or subsumed within Authority	APPROVED WITH DEPENDENCY	Distinct, conditional input; RGE may evaluate validity but does not define the trigger. Dependency: REA-01 does not yet define when Authorization is required — visibly flagged, not resolved. Incorporated in Section 2.1, Section 4. Architecture Review clarification AR-CL-04: silence alone does not create an Authorization deficiency; where applicability is affirmatively raised but unresolved, RGE uses unverifiable/insufficient × Authorization with no Admissibility Determination. Trigger ownership remains external and unresolved.
D-4	Missing / stale / conflicting / insufficient evidence behavior	APPROVED (as amended by D-14)	Two-dimensional Evaluation Status (failure condition × applicable tracked governance category): the four RGV-01 governance-basis primitives (Authority, Evidence, Policy, Context), with Authorization separately tracked for RGE evaluation-status purposes

			where applicable; descriptive, non-directive; no RGE-internal retry. The approved Indeterminate Authority mapping is represented as unverifiable/insufficient × Authority without adding a new status state. Per Technical Review Closure adjudication: Evaluation Status is reserved for epistemic deficiencies; a known negative governance condition established with sufficient, current, unambiguous information (Revoked Authority, Suspended Authority, Authorization outside scope) produces NOT_ADMISSIBLE instead (RGE-CL-01, RGE-CL-02), and Evaluation Status is capable of representing more than one independently applicable failure-condition × governance-category pair within the same Governance Evaluation (RGE-CL-03), without a defined schema for carrying multiple pairs. Incorporated in Section 6.2, Section 6.3, Section 7, Section 13. Architecture Review clarifications: AR-CL-02 prohibits RGE-invented evidentiary authority/weighting and routes stale-evidence relevance to the applicable governance basis; AR-CL-04 constrains unresolved Authorization applicability to the existing unverifiable/insufficient × Authorization pairing without a new state.
D-5	cGate's architectural identity and relationship to RGE	BLOCKED BY ANOTHER SPECIFICATION	No content in any developed specification; cGate-01 remains skeleton-stage. Does not block RGE-01: RGE-01 assigns cGate no role. Visibly flagged in Section 2.2, Section 3.3, Section 8.2, Section 14.
D-6	Domain-independent consequentiality threshold / procedure ownership	OUTSIDE RGE-01 / ROUTED ELSEWHERE	A family-wide question RGV-01 v2.3 explicitly declines to assign. RGE-01 does not claim this responsibility. Visibly flagged in Section 1.3, Section 2.2.

D-7	Evaluation data retention / traceability requirements	APPROVED	RGE output is Receipt-eligible in full; traceable linkage to governance basis actually relied upon required; no RGE persistence responsibility. Incorporated in Section 10.
D-8	Externally testable RGE conformance criteria	APPROVED	Single flat mandatory conformance bar; behavioral and architectural-boundary testing; no tiering. Incorporated in Section 12. Architecture Review clarifications AR-CL-01/03/04: conformance does not itself guarantee universal outcome equivalence where legitimate evaluation semantics remain implementation-defined; such latitude cannot override mandatory RGE semantics, decision-point temporal correspondence, or conditional-Authorization axis rules.
D-9	Authorization-outside-scope, policy-conflict, relitigation-request, partial-execution handling	SPLIT — see sub-items	Missing/stale/conflicting/insufficient and policy/evidence conflict: APPROVED, subsumed into D-4/D-14 (Section 6.3, Section 13). Authorization-outside-scope: SPLIT. Consequence once established (NOT_ADMISSIBLE): APPROVED and incorporated into the RGE determination architecture under D-4/D-14 and Sections 6.2 and 13. Scope-matching semantics themselves: OUTSIDE RGE-01 and assigned to the applicable Authorization/Authority specification (Section 4). Relitigation requests: OUTSIDE RGE-01 per D-16 (Section 11, Section 13). Partial execution during changed conditions: OUTSIDE RGE-01, REB's concern (Section 13).
D-10	Governance Receipt identifier inconsistency: GR / GR-01 / RGR-01	EDITORIAL / SOURCE-FAMILY CLEANUP	Routed to RGSR-01 (registry) and RGV-01 for identifier reconciliation. Not resolved within RGE-01. Noted in Section 10.5, Section 15.
D-11	RGE produces the Admissibility Determination	Source-confirmed / closed	Directly and explicitly established by RGRA-01 §8.3 and §10.4; no

			ManChine choice was required. Incorporated in Section 5.3.
D-12	Cross-specification normative-keyword contradiction: MUST	EDITORIAL / SOURCE-FAMILY CLEANUP	ROPS-01 uses MUST; RGV-01 v2.3, RGAF-01, and RGRA-01 restrict themselves to SHALL/SHALL NOT (RGAF-01 additionally permits SHOULD/MAY/RECOMMENDED). External follow-up for ROPS-01 and RGV-01, not resolved within RGE-01. Noted in Section 14.
D-13	ROPS-01 embedded first-person reviewer commentary	EDITORIAL / SOURCE-FAMILY CLEANUP	A document-hygiene issue for ROPS-01. Not an RGE-01 architectural question. Noted in Section 14.
D-14	Authorization's category placement in Evaluation Status	APPROVED	Authorization added as a separately tracked RGE Evaluation Status category, distinct from the four RGV-01 governance-basis primitives and without treating Authorization as a fifth primitive; explicit amendment of D-4. Incorporated in Section 6.3.
"D-15"	Consistency of D-2's reasoning-scope enumeration with the RGE Evaluation Status governance-category model	RETIRED / NOT ESTABLISHED	Determined to be a conforming consequence of D-14, not a new architectural choice. Recorded as a conforming amendment to D-2 (see D-2 row), not incorporated as its own item.
D-16	Prior governance state as an RGE input	APPROVED	Fully stateless Runtime Governance Evaluation; prior determinations, receipts, and evaluation history are not RGE inputs; relitigation handling determined outside RGE-01. Incorporated in Section 11. Architecture Review clarification AR-CL-05: prior determinations, receipts, replay identity, or historical governance basis cannot independently substitute for the governance basis applicable at the current decision point; historical material may re-enter only through recognized current governance-basis categories where permitted.

Visible Dependencies and Non-Blocking Notes (Not RGE-01 Architecture)

The following are preserved as explicit, visible notes rather than incorporated as open RGE-01 architecture, consistent with the accepted closure review:

- REA-01 Authorization trigger dependency — RGE-01 does not define when Authorization is required (Section 4).
- cGate unresolved — no operative RGE-01 dependency exists or is invented (Section 2.2, Section 3.3, Section 8.2, Section 14).
- Consequentiality ownership unresolved at the family level — RGE-01 does not silently claim it (Section 1.3, Section 2.2).
- Governance Receipt identifier (GR / GR-01 / RGR-01) — a source-family cleanup item, not resolved inside RGE-01 (Section 10.5, Section 15).
- ROPS-01 normative-keyword (MUST) and embedded reviewer-commentary cleanup — external follow-up only (Section 14).

Status

[APPROVED] This incorporation pass reflects Decisions D-1, D-2 (as conformed), D-3 (with dependency), D-4 (as amended by D-14), D-7, D-8, D-11, D-14, and D-16, per the ManChine Decision Log. No approved decision was reopened or reinterpreted during incorporation. "D-15" was retired and no content was created from it. Version 1.1 applies a controlled synchronization pass on top of this incorporation, described below; it does not reopen this incorporation or the underlying Decision Register. This document remains a Technical Review Draft through Version 1.1; it is not Published or Certified, and Version 1.1's synchronization corrections do not constitute or imply experimental proof, independent validation, or certification. Following completion of ManChine's Technical Review phase, including the targeted adversarial closure retest and RGE-CL-06's Decision Register synchronization, this document is Version 1.2 — Architecture Review Draft. This status advancement reflects completion of Technical Review only; it does not constitute or imply implementation proof, runtime validation, certification, interoperability, production readiness, executable conformance, or independent validation of ManChine's architectural claims. *(Source: ManChine Decision Log, Entries D-1 through D-16; RGE-01 Pre-Incorporation Closure Review)*

v1.0 → v1.1 Revision History

Version 1.1 is a controlled synchronization revision against REA-01 v1.6 and RGV-01 v2.3 (Published Standard), incorporating corrections identified by the corresponding architecture-reconciliation and terminology-conformance review passes. It is not characterized as architectural validation, experimental proof, or independent review of RGE-01 itself. Changes made:

- Section 5.4 (Legitimacy): removed the retired "may persist, weaken, or cease" formulation; added applicable Authorization to Legitimacy's governance basis; added the RGV-01 v2.3 distinction between Legitimacy having ceased and Legitimacy's present validity being unable to be established; re-sourced the Admissibility/Legitimacy triggering language as RGE-01's own behavioral determination rather than attributing it to RGV-01.
- Sections 6.3 and 12: corrected the "five governance-basis categories" framing so Authorization is identified as an Authority-grounded permission concept tracked separately for evaluation-status purposes, not a fifth RGV-01 primitive, consistent with RGV-01 v2.3 §3.6–3.7 and §5.1.

- Section 6.3: added and, in the ManChine final architecture-closure pass, approved the minimum-necessary mapping of REA-01 v1.6's Indeterminate Authority-reliance state to the existing "unverifiable/insufficient" failure condition against the Authority category. No new Admissibility value or Evaluation Status state is introduced.
- Section 7 footnote: corrected an unverifiable "REA-01 Chapter 6, §6.1" citation to accurate REA-01 v1.6 §8 source text.
- Section 13: corrected an unverifiable "REA-01 §12, §13.2" citation to REA-01 v1.6 §13, and softened an overstated SHALL NOT claim to match REA-01 v1.6's actual (not yet fully normative) register.
- Section 14: updated the RGV-01 relationship row from v2.2 Technical Review Draft to v2.3 Published Standard; updated the REA-01 relationship row from v1.0 Technical Draft to v1.6 Architecture Review Draft; clarified the "Continuous Legitimacy" reference in the RGAF-01 row so it cannot reasonably be read as continuous redetermination of Admissibility.
- Section 15: updated the unresolved-vocabulary citation from RGV-01 v2.2 §4.5 to RGV-01 v2.3 §4.5; added findings for Governance Profile and Runtime Decision Lifecycle (RDL), both of which moved into RGV-01's unresolved-terms list in v2.3, without defining either term.
- Section 16, Question 11: updated disposition to reflect that Governance Profile and RDL, not only cGate, remain unresolved under RGV-01 v2.3.
- Global: updated remaining RGV-01 version citations from v2.2 to v2.3 and REA-01 citation terminology from "Chapter" to "Section" where referenced, after confirming each affected citation's substance was unchanged between versions; added a Synchronization Note and Proof Boundary statement near the front of the document.

No item in the D-1 through D-16 Decision Register was altered in substance. No new ManChine architecture was introduced. No responsibility was expanded into REA-01, REB-01, RiCo-01, ROPS-01, RGR-01, RGRA-01, RGAF-01, or cGate. This revision does not modify RGV-01 v2.3 or REA-01 v1.6.

v1.1 Technical Review Closure Corrections

Following the independent adversarial Technical Review Closure review and its ManChine adjudication (Findings RGE-CL-01 through RGE-CL-05), this document was corrected as authorized, remaining at Version 1.1 — Technical Review Draft. This is a corrections pass implementing adjudicated findings only; it is not a broad architecture review, does not advance RGE-01's maturity status, and does not constitute implementation proof, validation, certification, or interoperability. Changes made:

- RGE-CL-01 (Section 6.2, Section 13, Section 12, Decision Register D-4): established the known-negative-governance-condition principle — a governance condition established with sufficient, current, unambiguous information produces NOT_ADMISSIBLE, not an Evaluation Status non-determination. Applied to Revoked Authority and Authorization outside its applicable scope in Section 13.
- RGE-CL-02 (Section 13, Decision Register D-4): rejected the proposed missing × Authority mapping for Suspended Authority. Added Suspended Authority → NOT_ADMISSIBLE while the suspension remains operative, and a clarification that Active Authority alone does not establish Admissibility. Preserved the existing, unaltered Indeterminate Authority → unverifiable/insufficient × Authority mapping.
- RGE-CL-03 (Section 6.3, Section 12, Decision Register D-4): added the minimum normative principle that Evaluation Status is capable of representing more than one independently

applicable failure-condition × governance-category pair within the same Governance Evaluation, without defining a schema, array format, ordering rule, or serialization for carrying multiple pairs.

- RGE-CL-04 (Section 13): added a worked example for the existing "missing" failure condition (Missing Evidence), illustrating vocabulary already established in Section 6.3.A without introducing new architecture.
- RGE-CL-05 (Section 6.3): corrected the formatting of the [APPROVED] tag introducing the Indeterminate Authority clarification to match the bold, colored run formatting used by every other evidence-classification tag in the document.

No decision outside RGE-CL-01 through RGE-CL-05 was reopened or altered. No new architectural primitive was introduced. RiCo, REB, cGate, and RGR ownership boundaries are unchanged. RGV-01 v2.3 and REA-01 v1.6 are not modified. RGE-01 remained at Version 1.1 — Technical Review Draft following this corrections pass; its maturity status was not advanced by this corrections pass alone.

v1.1 → v1.2 Revision History — Technical Review Closure and Architecture Review Advancement

Following the v1.1 Technical Review Closure Corrections above, ManChine conducted a targeted adversarial closure retest of RGE-01 v1.1 against ten challenge questions spanning Authority-state handling, the known-negative-versus-epistemic-deficiency distinction, simultaneous-deficiency representation, changed-condition evaluation, Legitimacy, statelessness, component boundaries, the separated-axis architecture, and conformance falsifiability. The retest judgment was PASS WITH NON-BLOCKING CLEANUP — CLOSE TECHNICAL REVIEW, identifying one non-blocking synchronization finding, RGE-CL-06, in the Section 17 Decision Register.

- RGE-CL-06 (Section 17, D-9 Decision Register row): the Authorization-outside-scope disposition previously stated the topic as a whole was "OUTSIDE RGE-01," which no longer accurately reflected the RGE-CL-01 correction already incorporated into Sections 6.2 and 13. Replaced with a split disposition: the consequence once the scope condition is established (NOT_ADMISSIBLE) is APPROVED and incorporated under D-4/D-14 and Sections 6.2 and 13; the scope-matching semantics themselves remain OUTSIDE RGE-01, assigned to the applicable Authorization/Authority specification. This is a Decision Register synchronization correction only; Sections 6.2 and 13 were not altered, since they already stated the correct architecture.

Findings RGE-CL-01 through RGE-CL-05 (Version 1.1 Technical Review Closure Corrections) and RGE-CL-06 (this revision) are now closed. The targeted adversarial closure retest completed with no material or blocking defect identified; no structural redesign of RGE-01 was required at any point in the Technical Review phase. Accordingly, RGE-01's status is advanced from Version 1.1 — Technical Review Draft to Version 1.2 — Architecture Review Draft, reflecting completion of ManChine's Technical Review phase. This status advancement means only that RGE-01 has completed Technical Review and is entering Architecture Review; it does not constitute or imply implementation proof, runtime validation, certification, interoperability, production readiness, executable conformance, or independent validation of ManChine's architectural claims. No decision in the Section 17 Decision Register other than D-9's disposition was altered by this revision. No new architectural primitive, state, component responsibility, or implementation schema was introduced. RiCo, REB, cGate, and RGR ownership boundaries remain unchanged. RGV-01 v2.3 and REA-01 v1.6 are not modified by this revision.

v1.2 Architecture Review Controlled Incorporation — AR-CL-01 through AR-CL-05

ManChine authorized controlled incorporation of the adjudicated native Architecture Review corrections after AR-N1 through AR-N9, ManChine adjudication AQ-1 through AQ-5, and independent challenge. This pass incorporates AR-CL-04, AR-CL-01, AR-CL-02, AR-CL-03, and AR-CL-05 in that controlled order. No structural redesign, new architectural primitive, component responsibility transfer, deterministic RGE algorithm, cryptographic protocol, wire-format freeze, or proof claim is introduced. Technical Review remains closed. Architecture Review remains open pending targeted retest AR-RT-01 through AR-RT-05. The document remains Version 1.2 — Architecture Review Draft.

External-Review Findings — Current Intake

Scope note: The following findings are recorded as external-review inputs for targeted evaluation. They do not, by themselves, amend RGE-01, introduce new ManChine architecture, or resolve the questions they identify.

EVA-01 — Standing Granularity

Determine whether standing is irreducible to existing ManChine primitives.

EVA-02 — Custody / Route-Closure Mapping

Determine whether custody and route-closure are missing responsibilities, externally owned concerns, or alternate decomposition of existing REB/RGE behavior.

EVA-03 — Product-Proof Asymmetry

Terry's public executable proof surface currently exceeds ManChine's public executable proof surface. This is a real strategic gap and should feed directly into RiCo product work.