



MANCHINE AI TECHNOLOGY LLC

RUNTIME GOVERNANCE STANDARDS SERIES

RGEP-01

RUNTIME GOVERNANCE EDITORIAL & PUBLICATION POLICY

GOVERNING REVIEW, PUBLICATION, AND EDITORIAL METHODOLOGY
FOR THE RUNTIME GOVERNANCE STANDARDS FAMILY

DOCUMENT STATUS

FIELD	VALUE
IDENTIFIER	RGEP-01
TITLE	Runtime Governance Editorial & Publication Policy
CATEGORY	Governance Policy Specification
CLASSIFICATION	Normative
VERSION	1.0
STATUS	Published
OWNER	Manchine AI Technology LLC



VERSION
1.0



STATUS
PUBLISHED



IDENTIFIER
RGEP-01



CATEGORY
GOVERNANCE
POLICY SPECIFICATION



PUBLICATION DATE
AUGUST 10, 2026



RUNTIME INTEGRITY CONTROL

RiCo

ABSTRACT

RGEP-01 establishes the editorial principles, review process, publication methodology, and governance procedures that govern all specifications within the Runtime Governance Standards Family. This policy ensures consistency, integrity, transparency, and quality throughout the lifecycle of every standard from development through publication and maintenance.

This specification defines how the standards family is created, reviewed, approved, versioned, and maintained.

© 2026 Manchine AI Technology LLC

HUMANS FIRST.

CONTINUITY ALWAYS.

ARCHITECTURE MUST SURVIVE.

1. Purpose

1.1 Purpose

The **Runtime Governance Editorial & Publication Policy (RGEP-01)** establishes the editorial, review, publication, and maintenance policy governing the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

Its purpose is to ensure that all publications are developed, reviewed, versioned, and maintained using consistent, transparent, and traceable processes, preserving the integrity, credibility, and long-term stewardship of the standards family.

1.2 Scope

This policy applies to all documents published within the Runtime Governance Standards Family, including normative specifications, administrative publications, governance vocabularies, technical reports, implementation guidance, and future document categories formally incorporated into the standards family.

It governs the complete publication lifecycle, including document creation, technical review, editorial review, approval, publication, revision, supersession, withdrawal, and archival.

1.3 Audience

This specification is intended for:

Standards authors and contributors

Technical reviewers

Editorial reviewers

Publication maintainers

Governance stewards

Implementers referencing published standards

External reviewers evaluating the Runtime Governance Standards Family

1.4 Relationship to the Runtime Governance Standards Family

RGEP-01 defines the publication governance governing the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

It complements, but does not replace, the architectural, administrative, or technical responsibilities defined by other standards within the family. Documents such as RGSR-01 establish how standards are identified and cataloged, while normative specifications define runtime governance behavior. RGEP-01 governs how those publications are reviewed, approved, published, revised, and maintained throughout their lifecycle.

This specification is procedural rather than architectural. It governs the publication process without altering the normative requirements contained within individual standards.

1.5 Normative Language

The following keywords are used throughout this policy to indicate the level of normative requirement associated with a statement, and apply consistently unless explicitly stated otherwise.

SHALL / SHALL NOT indicates a mandatory requirement or prohibition.

SHOULD / SHOULD NOT indicates a recommended practice, where justified exceptions may exist.

MAY indicates a permitted or optional action.

This policy does not use MUST as a separate mandatory keyword. SHALL and SHALL NOT are the sole mandatory keywords used throughout this policy.

2. Runtime Governance Review Kit

2.1 Purpose

The Runtime Governance Review Kit defines the minimum set of publications required to perform a complete technical review of any specification within the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

Reviewers shall evaluate specifications using the documents defined below in the prescribed order. Each successive tier builds upon the context established by the preceding tier. This review sequence establishes the order in which foundational context should be read; it does not establish interpretive or source precedence, which is governed by Section 4.2.

Tier 1 — Editorial & Publication Policy (RGEP-01)

Establishes the editorial governance governing all Runtime Governance Standards Family publications.

This tier defines:

- publication governance
- review methodology
- document lifecycle
- editorial responsibilities
- publication requirements
- version management
- review expectations

All subsequent review activities shall conform to this policy.

Tier 2 — Runtime Governance Standards Registry (RGSR-01)

Provides the official administrative registry for the standards family.

This tier establishes:

- document identifiers
- publication status
- version history
- publication relationships
- dependency declarations
- stewardship
- official publication authority

Reviewers shall verify that referenced publications exist within the Registry and possess appropriate publication status.

Tier 3 — Runtime Governance Vocabulary (RGV-01)

Provides the authoritative vocabulary for the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

This tier defines the official meaning of governance concepts used throughout published specifications.

Reviewers shall interpret terminology according to RGV-01 unless an explicit document-specific definition is provided.

Tier 4 — Relevant Specifications (Dependency-Driven)

After the preceding foundational tiers have been reviewed, reviewers shall evaluate the specification together with all formally declared dependencies.

Dependencies may include:

Runtime Governance Specifications

Runtime Execution Boundary specifications

Runtime Evidence specifications

Runtime Authority specifications

Runtime Integrity specifications

Administrative publications

Other formally referenced Runtime Governance Standards

Only specifications declared through the standards dependency chain shall be considered normative dependencies during review.

Review Principle

Reviews shall proceed sequentially through the Runtime Governance Review Kit.

Foundational publication governance, registry information, and vocabulary establish the context required before evaluating individual technical specifications. This dependency-driven approach promotes consistent interpretation, traceable review outcomes, and architectural coherence across the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

3. Publication Review Methodology

3.1 Purpose

The Publication Review Methodology establishes the standard process used to evaluate publications submitted for inclusion within the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

The objective of the review process is to ensure that every published document is technically sound, editorially consistent, architecturally aligned, and suitable for long-term stewardship.

Each review shall produce a documented assessment identifying certification status, publication blockers, consistency observations, editorial recommendations, and a final publication recommendation.

3.2 Publication Certification

Every publication shall undergo a structured review prior to publication.

Certification confirms that the document has been evaluated against the Runtime Governance Review Kit and satisfies the minimum requirements for publication.

Certification evaluates, at minimum:

- Structural completeness
- Editorial quality
- Identifier correctness
- Version consistency
- Registry alignment
- Vocabulary compliance
- Dependency integrity
- Architectural consistency
- Internal cross-reference validation
- Publication metadata

Certification confirms review. It does not imply technical perfection or future immutability.

3.3 Publication Blockers

Publication Blockers are issues that prevent a document from being approved for publication.

Examples include:

- Missing mandatory sections
- Invalid document identifiers
- Inconsistent publication metadata
- Broken or unresolved dependencies
- Conflicting terminology
- Undefined normative requirements
- Registry inconsistencies
- Incorrect version references
- Significant architectural contradictions
- Incomplete publication information

A publication containing one or more blockers shall not receive publication approval until the blockers have been resolved.

3.4 Consistency Issues

Consistency Issues identify non-blocking observations that reduce clarity or consistency but do not prevent publication.

Examples include:

- Formatting inconsistencies
- Terminology preferences
- Editorial duplication
- Minor wording improvements
- Metadata presentation improvements
- Section ordering suggestions
- Reference style inconsistencies

Consistency Issues should normally be resolved before publication but may be deferred if they do not affect interpretation.

3.5 Editorial Suggestions

Editorial Suggestions provide recommendations intended to improve readability, usability, and long-term maintainability without changing normative meaning.

Editorial Suggestions may include:

- Improved wording
- Structural refinement
- Better examples
- Clarified explanations
- Simplified sentence construction
- Improved document navigation
- Enhanced cross-referencing

Editorial Suggestions are advisory and do not constitute publication defects.

3.6 Approval Criteria

A publication may be recommended for publication when:

- all Publication Blockers have been resolved;
- mandatory publication metadata is complete;
- document identifiers conform to the Registry;
- terminology conforms to the Runtime Governance Vocabulary;
- declared dependencies are valid;
- editorial review has been completed;
- the publication's terminology, identifiers, and declared dependencies are consistent with the Runtime Governance Vocabulary and the Runtime Governance Standards Registry.

The final publication recommendation shall be recorded as one of the following:

- **Approved for Publication**
- **Approved with Editorial Revisions**

- **Requires Technical Revision**
 - **Requires Major Revision**
 - **Not Recommended for Publication**
-

Review Principle

The purpose of publication review is not to redesign a specification, but to evaluate whether it communicates its intended architectural responsibilities accurately, consistently, and in a manner suitable for publication within the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

4. Source Authority Principles

4.1 Purpose

The Source Authority Principles establish the rules governing how publications within the Runtime Governance Standards Family shall be interpreted during technical review.

Reviews shall be based upon published authority rather than assumption, inference, or unpublished implementation knowledge.

4.2 Authoritative Sources

During review, the following sources constitute authoritative references, in descending order of authority:

1. The specification under review.
2. Formally declared normative dependencies.
3. The Runtime Governance Vocabulary (RGV-01).
4. The Runtime Governance Standards Registry (RGSR-01).
5. This Editorial & Publication Policy (RGEP-01).

No unpublished implementation details, private discussions, marketing materials, demonstrations, or inferred behaviors shall supersede published specifications unless formally incorporated into the standards family.

4.3 Dependency Principle

Specifications shall be interpreted within the context of their formally declared dependencies.

Requirements defined by referenced specifications remain authoritative only within the scope established by those dependencies.

Reviewers shall not introduce implicit dependencies or assume architectural responsibilities that have not been explicitly declared.

4.4 Questions Over Assumptions

Where a publication contains ambiguity, incomplete information, or wording that permits multiple reasonable interpretations, reviewers shall seek clarification rather than resolve uncertainty through assumption.

Review observations should distinguish clearly between:

- published requirements;
- reasonable interpretation;
- reviewer observation; and
- requested clarification.

Questions preserve architectural accuracy. Assumptions do not.

4.5 Published Specifications Presumed Correct

Published specifications are presumed to express the intended architectural responsibilities of their authors unless demonstrable internal inconsistency, documented contradiction, or conflicting authoritative publications establish otherwise.

Reviewers shall evaluate specifications according to their published content rather than inferred intent or unpublished implementation details.

Potential inconsistencies should be documented as review observations and presented for clarification rather than treated as errors without supporting evidence.

Source Authority Principle

The Runtime Governance Standards Family is reviewed according to what has been formally published, not according to what reviewers believe may exist beyond the published record. Authority originates from published specifications, declared dependencies, and established governance processes. Where uncertainty exists, clarification shall always take precedence over assumption.

5. Editorial Rules

5.1 Purpose

The Editorial Rules establish the conventions governing document identity, naming, branding, and cross-referencing throughout the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

These rules preserve publication consistency, prevent ambiguity, and ensure that normative specifications remain distinguishable from implementation branding, marketing materials, and supporting communications.

5.2 Immutable Identifiers

Every published specification shall possess a unique Runtime Governance identifier.

Once a specification has been published, its identifier is permanent and shall not be reassigned, reused, or altered.

If a specification is withdrawn, superseded, or deprecated, its identifier remains permanently reserved within the Runtime Governance Standards Registry (RGSR-01).

Examples include:

- RGV-01
- RGAF-01
- RGRA-01
- REB-01
- RiCo-01

Version numbers may change through revision; identifiers shall not.

Inclusion of an identifier in this policy, including in the examples above and in Appendix A, illustrates naming format or organizational position and does not by itself assert current publication status. See RGSR-01 for authoritative publication status. This policy does not determine whether any currently unresolved identifier represents an existing standalone publication.

5.3 Official Titles

Every published specification shall possess one official specification title.

The official title represents the normative name of the specification and shall be used consistently in:

- document covers;
- publication metadata;
- registry entries;
- dependency references;
- cross-references;
- citations.

Alternative wording shall not replace the official title in normative contexts.

5.4 Brand Versus Specification Title

The Runtime Governance Standards Family distinguishes between branded platform names and official specification titles.

A branded platform name identifies a product, implementation, service, or platform.

An official specification title identifies a published standard.

Where both exist, they serve different purposes and shall not be treated as interchangeable.

For example:

Element	Purpose
RiCo	Branded platform name
RiCo-01 — Runtime Integrity Control	Official specification identifier and title

Brand names may appear within explanatory or implementation contexts but shall not replace the official specification title when referring to published standards.

5.5 Taglines and Marketing

Taglines, descriptive subtitles, mascot captions, marketing language, presentation themes, and promotional material are informative rather than normative.

Such language may evolve over time without changing the identity, authority, or normative meaning of a published specification.

Editorial review shall not treat differences in branding or marketing language as publication defects unless they alter or conflict with the official specification title or normative content.

5.6 Cross-Reference Rules

Cross-references shall identify specifications using both their official identifier and official title whenever practical.

Examples:

- **RGV-01 — Runtime Governance Vocabulary**
- **RGAF-01 — Runtime Governance Architecture Foundations**
- **RGRA-01 — Runtime Governance Reference Architecture**
- **RiCo-01 — Runtime Integrity Control**

Cross-references shall:

- reference published identifiers exactly;
- reference official titles exactly;
- reference the current published version where required;
- remain consistent with the Runtime Governance Standards Registry.

Where a referenced specification has been superseded, the Registry shall determine the authoritative publication status.

Editorial Principle

Editorial consistency preserves architectural consistency. Identifiers establish permanent publication identity. Official titles establish normative meaning. Branding, taglines, and marketing communicate the broader vision of the Runtime Governance Standards Family but shall never modify, replace, or redefine the normative identity of a published specification.

6. Reviewer Responsibilities

6.1 Purpose

This section defines the responsibilities, authority, and limitations of reviewers participating in the technical and editorial review of publications within the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

Reviewers are responsible for improving publication quality while preserving the architectural intent, normative meaning, and authorship of the specification under review.

6.2 Permitted Corrections

Reviewers may correct objective publication defects that can be verified directly against authoritative sources.

Permitted corrections include:

- Editorial and grammatical errors.
- Typographical errors.
- Formatting inconsistencies.
- Incorrect document identifiers.
- Incorrect version references.
- Incorrect publication status.
- Broken or invalid cross-references.
- Registry inconsistencies.
- Vocabulary inconsistencies verified against RGV-01.
- Missing required publication metadata.
- Clearly demonstrable internal contradictions.

Such corrections shall preserve the normative intent of the specification and shall not introduce new architectural requirements.

6.3 Required Clarifications

Where a publication contains ambiguity or insufficient information, reviewers shall request clarification rather than introduce assumptions.

Clarification shall be requested when:

- Multiple reasonable interpretations exist.
- Architectural intent cannot be determined from published sources.
- A dependency is missing or unavailable.
- Branding and normative terminology cannot be clearly distinguished.
- Cross-references appear incomplete or uncertain.
- The published text does not provide sufficient evidence to support a correction.

Requests for clarification are review outcomes rather than publication defects unless the ambiguity prevents correct interpretation of normative requirements.

6.4 Review Boundaries

Reviewers shall evaluate the specification as published and within the scope of the Runtime Governance Review Kit.

Reviewers shall not:

- redesign the architecture;
- redefine normative terminology;
- introduce new requirements;
- infer unpublished implementation details;
- substitute implementation behavior for published standards;
- expand document scope beyond its stated purpose;
- modify official identifiers or official specification titles;
- treat branding, marketing, or descriptive taglines as normative content.

The objective of review is to assess conformance to published authority—not to author a different specification.

6.5 Certification Outcomes

Upon completion of review, the reviewer shall record one of the following certification outcomes:

Certified for Publication

The specification satisfies publication requirements and contains no unresolved Publication Blockers.

Publication Approved Following Correction of Identified Publication Blockers

One or more Publication Blockers were identified during review and subsequently corrected.

Following verification of those corrections, the specification is approved for publication.

Publication Deferred Pending Clarification

Publication cannot be completed because clarification from the author or responsible editor is required before review may continue.

Publication Not Approved

The specification contains unresolved Publication Blockers that prevent publication.

Publication may proceed only after those blockers have been resolved and successfully re-evaluated.

Reviewer Responsibility Principle

Reviewers safeguard the integrity of the Runtime Governance Standards Family by applying published authority consistently, correcting only objectively verifiable defects, requesting clarification where uncertainty exists, and preserving the architectural intent of every specification. Review is an act of stewardship rather than authorship.

7. Publication Governance

7.1 Purpose

Publication Governance establishes the policies governing the lifecycle of all publications within the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

These policies ensure that published specifications remain identifiable, traceable, synchronized, and historically verifiable throughout their lifecycle.

Publication governance preserves continuity while allowing the standards family to evolve in a controlled and transparent manner.

7.2 Version Management

Every published document shall maintain an explicit version identifier.

Version numbers communicate the publication history of a specification and shall increase sequentially as revisions are approved.

Version updates shall accurately reflect the scope of change.

General guidance:

- **Major Version (2.0, 3.0, ...)** — Significant architectural, normative, or structural changes.
- **Minor Version (1.1, 1.2, ...)** — clarifications, additional guidance, or limited normative additions that do not alter the fundamental purpose of the specification.

Previous published versions remain part of the historical publication record unless formally withdrawn.

7.3 Status Definitions

Every publication shall declare its current publication status.

The following publication states are recognized:

Status	Description
Working Draft	Active development; not approved for review or citation.
Technical Review	Under formal technical review prior to publication.
Public Review	Released for public comment and community feedback.

Status	Description
Published	Approved as an official Runtime Governance Standards Family publication.
Superseded	Replaced by a newer published version while retained for historical reference.
Withdrawn	Removed from active publication while preserved within the publication history.
Archived	Retained for historical purposes with no further maintenance planned.

Publication status shall be clearly identified within the document and maintained within the Runtime Governance Standards Registry.

Lifecycle Transitions

Public Review is optional and is not a universally mandatory stage. The normal progression is Working Draft to Technical Review to Published, or, where external review is appropriate, Working Draft to Technical Review to Public Review to Published. A Published document may subsequently become Superseded, Withdrawn, or Archived through controlled action recorded under this policy. A previously Published edition shall not regress to Working Draft or any earlier status; substantive revision proceeds through a new controlled version or revision rather than through status regression.

Prohibition on Premature Publication Claims

A publication SHALL NOT display Published status or a publication date on its cover, metadata, Registry entry, website, or other public representation until final publication approval has been recorded under Section 6.5 and Section 7.6. This requirement applies without exception, including to this policy itself while it remains in Technical Review.

7.4 Revision Policy

Published specifications evolve through controlled revision rather than informal modification.

Every approved revision shall:

- preserve the document identifier;
- assign an updated version number where appropriate;
- update the revision history;
- document the nature of significant changes; and
- undergo review consistent with this publication policy.

Editorial revisions shall not alter the normative intent of a published specification without following the established publication review process.

A previously published edition SHALL NOT be altered in place. Corrections SHALL proceed through a controlled new version, editorial revision, erratum, or superseding edition, while the prior published edition remains preserved unmodified. Withdrawal is a separately governed lifecycle action and does not mean deleting or rewriting historical evidence.

In addition to Major and Minor versions, an Editorial Revision tier (for example, 1.0.1) is available for corrections or improvements that do not change normative meaning. Minor revisions remain available for backward-compatible clarifications or limited normative additions. A lightweight erratum or correction mechanism may be used for factual, metadata, typographical, or cross-reference corrections; an erratum SHALL NOT be used to silently change normative meaning.

7.5 Registry Synchronization

The Runtime Governance Standards Registry (RGSR-01) serves as the authoritative administrative record for the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

Whenever a publication is:

- created;
- approved;
- revised;
- superseded;
- withdrawn; or
- archived,

the corresponding Registry entry shall be updated to reflect the current publication state.

Registry information shall remain synchronized with the published specification, including:

- identifier;
- official title;
- version;
- publication status;
- publication category;
- dependency relationships; and

- revision history.

Where a discrepancy exists between a published specification and the Registry, the discrepancy shall be resolved through the formal publication process to restore consistency.

The Registry records authoritative publication status resulting from formally approved publication actions; it does not rewrite or retroactively alter historical source artifacts. Where Section 5.6 states that the Registry determines authoritative publication status, this means the Registry reflects formally recorded supersession or publication actions, not that the Registry originates or overrides them.

Public-facing representations of a publication, including the Manchine website and official publication or business listings, shall be updated to remain consistent with the authoritative Registry metadata following an approved publication-state or metadata change.

7.6 Approval Authority

Final publication approval, formal supersession, withdrawal, archival, and other publication-state actions requiring organizational authority are authorized by the Manchine Publication Authority, informed by the recorded technical-review certification. Manchine organizational governance determines who is authorized to exercise the Manchine Publication Authority role.

The reviewer who records a technical-review certification under Section 6.5 is distinct from the Manchine Publication Authority that formally authorizes the resulting publication-state action. A recorded certification informs, but does not itself constitute, final publication approval.

Publication Governance Principle

Publication governance preserves the integrity of the Runtime Governance Standards Family by ensuring that every specification remains uniquely identifiable, version-controlled, transparently maintained, and consistently represented throughout its lifecycle. The Registry records the history of the standards family, while this policy governs how that history is created and maintained.

Appendix A — Runtime Governance Standards Hierarchy

A.1 Purpose

This appendix presents the normative organizational hierarchy of the Runtime Governance Standards Family.

It illustrates the dependency relationships among specifications within the standards family while preserving the separation of architectural responsibilities established throughout the standards program.

Runtime Governance Standards Family

Research & Publications (Informative)

- |
- |— White Papers
- |— Technical Articles
- |— Research Notes
- |— Architectural Commentaries

|



Constitutional Layer (Normative)

- |
- |— RGV-01 — Runtime Governance Vocabulary
- |— RGAF-01 — Runtime Governance Architecture Foundations
- |— RGRA-01 — Runtime Governance Reference Architecture

|



Administrative Layer

- |
- |— RGSR-01 — Runtime Governance Standards Registry
- |— RGEF-01 — Runtime Governance Editorial & Publication Policy

|



Behavioral Specifications

|

|— RDL-01 — Runtime Decision Lifecycle

|— RGE-01 — Runtime Governance Evaluation

|— REB-01 — Runtime Execution Boundary

└— RiCo-01 — Runtime Integrity Control

|



Artifact Specifications

|

|— ROPS-01 — Runtime Observation Payload Specification

|— GR-01 — Governance Receipt

└— Future Artifact Specifications

|



Conformance Requirements

|



Reference Implementations

Independent Implementations

SDKs

Platforms

|



Appendix B — Publication Status Definitions

Publication status definitions are authoritative in Section 7.3 and are not restated here. See Section 7.3 for the current definitions of Working Draft, Technical Review, Public Review, Published, Superseded, Withdrawn, and Archived.

Appendix C — Review Classification Matrix

Classification	Blocks Publication	Requires Correction
Publication Blocker	✓ Yes	✓ Required
Consistency Issue	✗ No	Recommended
Editorial Suggestion	✗ No	Optional
Clarification Request	Depends on impact	Author response required if normative meaning is affected

Certification Outcomes

Outcome	Meaning
Certified for Publication	No unresolved Publication Blockers remain.
Publication Approved Following Correction of Identified Publication Blockers	Publication Blockers were corrected and verified before approval.
Publication Deferred Pending Clarification	Review paused pending required clarification.
Publication Not Approved	One or more unresolved Publication Blockers remain.

Appendix D — Standard Review Checklist

Before approving any publication, reviewers should confirm the following:

Publication

- ☐ Identifier is correct
 - ☐ Official title is correct
 - ☐ Version is correct
 - ☐ Publication status is correct
 - ☐ Metadata is complete
-

Registry

- ☐ Registry entry exists
 - ☐ Registry status matches publication
 - ☐ Dependencies are current
 - ☐ Version synchronization confirmed
-

Vocabulary

- ☐ Terminology conforms to RGV-01
 - ☐ No conflicting definitions
 - ☐ Cross-references verified
-

Editorial

- ☐ Formatting complete
 - ☐ Section numbering correct
 - ☐ Tables verified
 - ☐ Revision history updated
 - ☐ Cross-references validated
-

Technical

- ☐ Dependencies reviewed
 - ☐ Architectural consistency verified against declared dependencies
 - ☐ Normative language appropriate
 - ☐ Scope boundaries preserved
 - ☐ No unresolved Publication Blockers
-

Final Certification

- ☐ Review completed
- ☐ Certification outcome recorded
- ☐ Publication recommendation issued
- ☐ Registry synchronized