RUNTIME GOVERNANCE STANDARDS FAMILY

ManChine
AI TECHNOLOGY LLC
GOVERNANCE • TRUST • HUMANITY

RGV-01

Runtime Governance Vocabulary

FOUNDATIONAL TERMINOLOGY SPECIFICATION

VERSION 2.3

STATUS:
PUBLISHED STANDARD

PUBLICATION DATE:
AUGUST 14, 2026

RUNTIME INTEGRITY CONTROL
RiCo
RUNTIME GOVERNANCE COMPANION

A MANCHINE AI TECHNOLOGY STANDARD

RGV-01 — Runtime Governance Vocabulary

1. Purpose

1.1 Objective

The purpose of RGV-01 — Runtime Governance Vocabulary is to establish the authoritative terminology for the Runtime Governance Standards Family. This specification defines the core architectural concepts used throughout the standards family, providing a common semantic foundation for consistent interpretation, implementation, and governance evaluation.

1.2 Rationale

Runtime governance architectures depend upon consistent interpretation of foundational concepts. Without a shared vocabulary, architectural terms may be interpreted differently across specifications, implementations, organizations, or governance environments, leading to ambiguity, inconsistent behavior, and reduced interoperability.

Version 1.0 of this specification reserved its term list for future normative development. Version 2.0 introduced a proposed reconciliation of the foundational model and supplied definitions for the previously reserved terms. Version 2.1 incorporates Technical Review corrections addressing normative-language consistency, semantic separation among Authority, Authorization, Admissibility, and Legitimacy, relationship-model clarity, continuity representation, and unresolved vocabulary dependencies. Version 2.2 is a targeted finding-closure pass addressing specific residual findings from follow-up Technical Review: further clarification of Admissibility as a discrete, point-in-time determination distinct from continuous evaluation; minimal relationship language between Admissibility and Legitimacy in Section 5; a qualification of Section 6 regarding terms not yet normatively defined by RGV-01; a forward-reference correction in the Justification entry; a clarification that Runtime Decision Lifecycle stage labels are descriptive, not normatively settled; removal of an unverified claim of alignment with RGEP-01; and a pointer clarifying that the applicable governing specification determines when Authorization is required. No architectural decision, reconciliation, or unresolved-vocabulary determination is reopened by Version 2.2. Version 2.3 is a further targeted finding-closure pass addressing specific residual findings from follow-up Technical Review: disambiguation, within the existing Legitimacy definition, of Legitimacy being affirmatively invalid from Legitimacy being presently unable to be established; removal of "weaken" from that definition to avoid implying an undefined quantitative or partial degree of legitimacy; revision of the Section 5.1 Admissibility/Legitimacy relationship language to remove wording that risked establishing runtime triggering behavior inside a vocabulary specification; a clarification within the Admissibility definition that a historical determination is not made retroactively false by a later

change in the governance basis and does not itself establish continued Legitimacy under materially changed conditions; and a Technical Review Note item recording, without resolving, a cross-document terminology risk concerning "continuous legitimacy evaluation." No architectural decision, reconciliation, or unresolved-vocabulary determination is reopened by Version 2.3.

1.3 Purpose of a Common Vocabulary

- Semantic Consistency — ensuring architectural concepts retain a single authoritative meaning.
- Interoperability — enabling independent implementations to interpret governance concepts consistently.
- Implementation Consistency — providing developers and architects with standardized terminology.
- Governance Auditability — ensuring governance evidence, documentation, and runtime artifacts reference consistent definitions.
- Standards Development — allowing future specifications to reference established terminology rather than redefining architectural concepts.

2. Scope

2.1 Scope of This Specification

RGV-01 defines the core terminology used throughout the Runtime Governance Standards Family. The definitions in this specification establish the normative vocabulary for architectural concepts, governance primitives, runtime components, and governance artifacts used across the standards family.

This specification does not define implementation requirements, governance processes, or runtime behavior except where necessary to establish the meaning of a defined term. It does not define architectural responsibilities, which are established by RGRA-01, and it does not define behavioral requirements, which are established by the applicable behavioral specifications.

2.2 Normative Status

The terminology defined in this specification is normative unless explicitly stated otherwise. All Runtime Governance specifications shall reference the definitions established by RGV-01 rather than redefining architectural concepts independently.

This document is a Published Standard. The terminology defined herein is normative unless explicitly stated otherwise. Items identified as unresolved vocabulary dependencies or cross-specification reconciliation items do not alter the normative meaning of the terms defined in Section 4; they are recorded as future standards-family work.

2.3 Intended Audience

- Architects designing runtime governance systems.
- Software engineers implementing runtime governance capabilities.
- AI governance practitioners and policy professionals.
- Standards organizations and technical reviewers.
- Researchers developing or evaluating consequential AI governance architectures.

3. Foundational Model Reconciliation

3.1 The Presenting Problem

RGF-01 — Foundations of Runtime Governance presents four foundational concepts: Runtime Authority, Runtime Integrity, Runtime Evidence, and Runtime Continuity. RGAF-01 — Runtime Governance Architecture Foundations, and RGRA-01 — Runtime Governance Reference Architecture, both build their Foundational Model on a different four: Authority, Evidence, Policy, and Context, feeding a further three concepts — Justification, Admissibility, and Legitimacy. Version 1.0 of this specification did not resolve this divergence; its reserved term list silently adopted the RGAF-01/RGRA-01 set without explanation, and its own relationship diagram did not fully match either source.

3.2 Method

This reconciliation traces how each term is actually used across RGF-01, RGAF-01, RGRA-01, REA-01, and RGV-01 v1.0's own term list and relationship diagram, rather than selecting between the two sets by preference.

Publication Status — The reconciliation in Sections 3.3–3.7 is adopted by ManChine for purposes of RGV-01 Version 2.3 as the vocabulary-level reconciliation of the supplied standards-family sources. It establishes the terminology model used by this specification without rewriting the normative responsibilities assigned by other standards-family documents.

3.3 Proposed Reconciliation: The Two Sets Operate at Different Architectural Levels

The sets are not contradictory. They answer different questions, posed to different readers, at different points in the standards family's own progression.

RGF-01 is an informative, discipline-introducing publication. Its four concepts are themes intended to orient a first-time reader to why Runtime Governance exists, before any normative architecture has been introduced. RGAF-01 and RGRA-01 are normative specifications. Their four primitives — Authority, Evidence, Policy, Context — are the actual, irreducible inputs that a Runtime Governance Evaluation component consumes, per RGRA-01 Section 9.4's own input list. These are not competing definitions of the same thing; they are a discipline-level

introduction and an engineering-level specification, describing the same architecture at two different altitudes.

3.4 Proposed Reconciliation: “Integrity” Names a Component Responsibility, Not a Primitive

RGRA-01 never lists Integrity as one of its foundational governance concepts (Section 3). “Integrity” appears only inside the proper noun “Runtime Integrity Control (RiCo).” RGRA-01 §5.4 and §9.7 describe that responsibility using the conditions under which admissibility was granted. RGV-01 defines RiCo more generally as the architectural responsibility for verifying, throughout consequential execution, whether execution continues to conform to the governance conditions applicable to that execution as those conditions evolve. Cross-specification reconciliation of the RGRA-01 wording remains future standards-family work. RGV-01 v1.0's own term list confirms this reading: “Integrity” does not appear anywhere in it as a standalone primitive. What RGF-01 calls Runtime Integrity is realized architecturally as the RiCo component's responsibility, not as a fifth input primitive alongside Authority, Evidence, Policy, and Context.

3.5 Proposed Reconciliation: “Continuity” Is Already Split, Not a Fourth Primitive

RGF-01 presents a single, undifferentiated Runtime Continuity. RGAF-01 and RGRA-01 (Section 2.4–2.5, Section 5.6) formally distinguish Operational Continuity from Legitimacy Continuity as two independent architectural concerns, and this split is exactly what RGV-01 v1.0's own term list already reflects: Operational Continuity and Legitimacy Continuity appear as two separate reserved terms; an undifferentiated “Runtime Continuity” does not appear at all. RGF-01's singular Continuity should be read as the introductory, pre-technical name for this same underlying concern, later formalized as a pair rather than a single primitive.

3.6 Proposed Reconciliation: Justification, Admissibility, and Legitimacy Are Derived, Not Primitive

Authority, Evidence, Policy, and Context are primitives in the strict sense: none of them is defined in terms of the others. Justification, Admissibility, and Legitimacy are determination-level concepts derived from evaluating the foundational governance conditions together (RGAF-01's Foundational Model chain; RGRA-01 §3.5–3.7). Authorization is not treated as a post-admissibility determination. For purposes of this specification, Authorization is an authority-grounded grant or expression of permission applicable to a specified action, scope, or instance of action. Admissibility remains the runtime governance determination of whether consequential execution is permissible under present conditions. This specification therefore treats the foundational model as containing distinct conceptual roles, reflected in Section 4.1 below.

3.7 Reconciled Foundational Model

The smallest coherent foundational model, consistent with RGAF-01 and RGRA-01 and confirmed by RGV-01 v1.0's own prior term selection, is:

- Primitives (irreducible inputs): Authority, Evidence, Policy, Context.
- Determination Concepts: Justification, Admissibility, Legitimacy. Authority-grounded permission concept: Authorization.
- Continuity Concepts (properties of execution over time, not inputs): Operational Continuity, Legitimacy Continuity.
- Component Responsibility (realizes a discipline-level concern architecturally): Runtime Integrity Control (RiCo) realizes what RGF-01 introduces informally as Runtime Integrity.

This model allows RGF-01's four concepts to remain an informative, discipline-level introduction while RGAF-01 and RGRA-01 provide the normative engineering-level primitive set. RGV-01 Version 2.3 adopts this reconciliation for vocabulary purposes; it does not independently reclassify or amend the normative responsibilities established by those source specifications.

4. Core Vocabulary

Unless explicitly stated otherwise, the definitions in this section are authoritative and shall be used consistently across all Runtime Governance specifications. Each definition is implementation-independent: it defines what a term means, not what a component must do. Behavioral requirements remain the responsibility of the applicable behavioral specification.

4.1 Foundational Governance Primitives and Determination Concepts

This section distinguishes foundational primitives, authority-grounded permission, and determination concepts. Authority, Evidence, Policy, and Context are treated as irreducible governance primitives under the reconciliation adopted in Section 3. Authorization is an authority-grounded grant or expression of permission. Justification and Admissibility are determination concepts. Legitimacy is a governance condition whose continued validity is evaluated over time rather than a second synonym for Admissibility.

Primitives

Governance

Definition: The set of structures, responsibilities, and constraints through which authority is established, decisions are evaluated, and accountability is preserved for a system or process.

Derived from: RGF-01 §1 (general framing); RGRA-01 §2.1.

Runtime Governance

Definition: The discipline and set of architectural responsibilities concerned with preserving legitimate governance of a system throughout its operational execution, as distinct from governance exercised only at design, approval, or deployment.

Derived from: RGF-01 §2; RGRA-01 §2.1–2.2.

Authority

Definition: The legitimate basis, held by an identifiable source, under which a system or component is permitted to perform a specified action or class of actions.

Derived from: RGF-01 §3.1; RGRA-01 §3.1; REA-01 Chapter 3.

Evidence

Definition: Information that is current, attributable to an identifiable source, and sufficient to support a governance determination.

Derived from: RGF-01 §3.3; RGRA-01 §3.2, §4.6; REA-01 Chapter 6.

Policy

Definition: A governance constraint, requirement, or objective, established prior to evaluation, against which consequential execution is assessed. This definition is deliberately content-neutral; RGV-01 defines the function of policy, not any specific policy content.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §3.3.

Context

Definition: The operational conditions, dependencies, and circumstances, external to a system's authority and policy, under which consequential execution occurs and which may change during execution.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §3.4.

Determination Concepts

Justification

Definition: The governance rationale, derived from evaluating authority, evidence, policy, and context together, that supports or opposes an admissibility determination (Admissibility, defined below).

Derived from: RGAF-01 Foundational Model; RGRA-01 §3.6.

Admissibility

Definition: A governance determination made at a defined decision point as to whether proposed execution, or execution already underway at a subsequent defined decision point, is permissible under the governance conditions presently in force. Admissibility is a discrete determination outcome, not a continuous evaluation process: the continued validity of governance conditions across the duration of execution is a matter of Legitimacy, and its preservation over time is addressed by Legitimacy Continuity, not by repeated or ongoing redetermination of Admissibility itself. Admissibility does not itself perform enforcement or execution. An Admissibility determination describes permissibility under the governance conditions evaluated at its defined decision point; a later change in the governance basis does not make that determination retroactively false, and the determination does not itself establish continued Legitimacy under materially changed conditions.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §3.5, §5.2–5.3.

Legitimacy

Definition: The governance condition in which consequential execution is justified by currently valid Authority, applicable Authorization where required, Evidence, Policy, and Context. Legitimacy is a condition that may persist or cease as those conditions change over time. 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. Legitimacy is not itself an enforcement action or a duplicate admissibility determination.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §3.7; RGF-01 §3 ("Runtime Authority establishes the legitimacy of action").

Authorization

Definition: A specific grant or expression of permission, grounded in valid Authority, applicable to a specified action, scope, or instance of action. Authorization is distinct from Authority and Admissibility: Authority is the legitimate basis from which permission may be granted; Authorization is the grant or expression of permission made under that basis; Admissibility is the runtime determination, made at a defined decision point, of whether execution is permissible under present governance conditions. Whether Authorization is required for a given action, scope, or instance of action is determined by the applicable governing specification (for example, REA-01 or a relevant behavioral specification); RGV-01 does not itself establish an authorization trigger, threshold, or decision rule.

Derived from: RGV-01 v1.0 Section 4.1 relationship diagram; architectural placement revised by ManChine during Version 2.0 Technical Review to remove the unsupported post-admissibility sequencing. Cross-specification reconciliation remains future standards-family work.

4.2 Consequential Execution Concepts

Consequential

Definition: Describing an action, decision, or execution capable of producing real-world effects that cannot be costlessly or fully reversed. RGV-01 establishes the qualitative meaning of the term but does not prescribe a universal quantitative threshold or domain-independent procedure for determining consequentiality; that procedural boundary remains to be established by the applicable governing specification or domain context.

Derived from: General usage, RGF-01 §1; RGRA-01 §2.1. No supplied source provides a precise technical boundary test; see Publication Note.

Consequential Decision

Definition: A decision that, if acted upon, would result in consequential execution.

Derived from: RGV-01 v1.0 Section 4.1 relationship diagram.

Consequential Execution

Definition: The performance of an action or process that produces consequential effects, subject to Runtime Governance throughout its duration.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §2.1; RGRA-01 §9 component list.

Operational Continuity

Definition: The property of a system continuing to execute its intended operational functions without interruption, independent of whether that continued execution remains legitimately governed.

Derived from: RGAF-01; RGRA-01 §2.4.

Legitimacy Continuity

Definition: The property of consequential execution remaining justified under currently valid authority, applicable authorization where required, policy, evidence, and context throughout the duration of execution, as those conditions evolve.

Derived from: RGAF-01; RGRA-01 §2.5.

4.3 Runtime Governance Components

Publication note: the standards family uses additional architectural terms that are not yet normatively defined in this revision, including Runtime Governance Evaluation, Observation Producer, ROPS-01-related terminology, and cGate. Because the supplied source set does not establish sufficiently complete definitions for all of them here, this specification records them as unresolved vocabulary dependencies rather than silently inventing normative meanings. See Section 4.5 and the Publication Note at the end of this document.

Runtime Execution Boundary (REB)

Definition: The architectural boundary at which an admissibility determination is enforced, permitting or denying consequential execution from proceeding. This term defines an architectural responsibility/boundary and does not prescribe or identify a particular product implementation.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §5.3, §9.5.

Runtime Integrity Control (RiCo)

Definition: The architectural responsibility for verifying, throughout consequential execution, whether execution continues to conform to the governance conditions applicable to that execution as those conditions evolve. Within RGV-01, the bare term Runtime Integrity Control (RiCo) denotes this architectural responsibility. RiCo does not grant Authority, issue Authorization, make the original Admissibility determination, determine what governance conditions are currently valid, or execute the consequential action. A specific implementation shall be qualified explicitly (for example, "ManChine RiCo implementation") so that the normative architectural term is not confused with a product or deployment.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §5.4, §9.7; REA-01 Architectural Position.

4.4 Governance Artifacts

Governance Event

Definition: A discrete occurrence, arising during observation, evaluation, determination, enforcement, execution, or integrity verification, that is governance-relevant and may be recorded.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §4.7; RGV-01 v1.0 Section 4.1 relationship diagram.

Governance Receipt

Definition: A governance artifact that provides a traceable record of a governance-relevant activity or outcome, without itself constituting or replacing the governance evaluation, enforcement, or integrity verification it records.

Derived from: RGRA-01 §4.7, §9.8.

4.5 Recognized Vocabulary Requiring Authoritative Definition

The following terms are used by the standards family or by definitions in this draft but are not given normative definitions in this revision because the supplied source set does not establish sufficiently complete meanings here. Their omission is explicit. These terms remain certification dependencies for standards-family vocabulary completeness, but no normative meaning is inferred for them here:

- Runtime Governance Evaluation (RGE)
- Observation

- Observation Producer
- Runtime Observation Profile / ROPS-01-related terminology
- Enforcement
- Determination
- cGate
- Governance Profile — its normative meaning and governing source must be confirmed before it is introduced as normative RGV-01 terminology.
- Runtime Decision Lifecycle (RDL) — its normative meaning and any lifecycle ordering, sequencing, or stage timing must be established by an appropriate governing specification before RDL is reintroduced as normative RGV-01 terminology.

No normative behavior or implementation responsibility is inferred for these terms by this section. Their future normative definition requires an authoritative standards-family source or an explicit ManChine architectural decision. Their unresolved status does not limit the normative force of terms defined in this revision.

5. Relationships

5.1 Conceptual Relationships

The Runtime Governance Vocabulary defines conceptual relationships among governance basis, determination concepts, lifecycle responsibilities, execution, continuity properties, and governance records. These relationships are not a single normative pipeline. This specification therefore separates cross-cutting concepts from lifecycle stages rather than representing every term as one vertical chain.

The conceptual model below is the RGV-01 Version 2.3 vocabulary representation. It preserves Authorization as an authority-grounded permission concept while avoiding treatment of Authorization as a fifth primitive and avoiding treatment of Operational Continuity or Legitimacy Continuity as sequential pipeline stages.

Governance

Runtime Governance

GOVERNANCE BASIS

Authority (with applicable Authorization where required) • Evidence • Policy • Context

DETERMINATION RELATIONSHIPS

Justification → Admissibility

Legitimacy = governance condition whose validity depends on the continuing validity of the governance basis

Relationship: a change in the governance basis that calls the continuing validity of Legitimacy into question is the semantic condition under which a subsequent Admissibility determination becomes relevant. Whether, when, and under what procedure such a determination occurs is established by the applicable behavioral specification, not by this vocabulary. Admissibility and Legitimacy remain distinct governance concepts; neither is a pipeline stage that produces or supersedes the other.

LIFECYCLE / EXECUTION RELATIONSHIPS

Runtime Execution Boundary (enforcement boundary)

Consequential Execution

Runtime Integrity Control (integrity-verification responsibility)

CROSS-CUTTING CONTINUITY PROPERTIES

Operational Continuity • Legitimacy Continuity

RECORDING ARTIFACTS: Governance Event(s) • Governance Receipt

NOTE — The conceptual relationships in this section illustrate semantic dependencies and architectural categories only. They do not define normative runtime order, component behavior, or implementation flow. In particular, Operational Continuity and Legitimacy Continuity are cross-cutting properties of execution over time, not stages after RiCo; and Authorization is grounded in Authority rather than treated as an independent primitive or post-Admissibility determination.

6. Architectural Consistency Check

Each definition in Section 4 has been tested against the separations RGRA-01 establishes as invariant (Section 5): observation from evaluation, evaluation from determination, determination from enforcement, execution from integrity verification, integrity verification from governance recording, and operational continuity from legitimacy continuity. Observation, evaluation, determination, and enforcement are referenced here according to RGRA-01's architectural usage; they are not yet normatively defined by RGV-01 and remain unresolved vocabulary dependencies per Section 4.5. No definition in this specification asserts that one of these responsibilities performs or replaces another.

- Evidence is defined as information supporting a determination; it is not defined as itself performing evaluation.
- Policy is defined by function, not content, preserving RGRA-01's refusal to prescribe policy content.
- Authorization is defined as an authority-grounded grant or expression of permission and is not defined as a post-admissibility determination. Admissibility is a determination at a governance decision point; Legitimacy is the governance condition whose validity may continue or change over time. Neither term is defined as enforcement or execution.
- Runtime Execution Boundary is defined as enforcing a determination, not evaluating one.
- Runtime Integrity Control is defined as verifying continued conformance, not as authorizing or enforcing execution.
- Governance Receipt is explicitly defined as not constituting or replacing the activities it records.
- Operational Continuity and Legitimacy Continuity are defined as two independent properties; neither definition implies the other.

7. Normative Language

7.1 Interpretation of Normative Terms

The following keywords are used throughout this specification to indicate normative force. RGV-01 adopts SHALL and SHALL NOT as its sole mandatory normative keywords. This convention governs RGV-01 Version 2.3. Any future standards-family publication-governance reconciliation

may address cross-document keyword conventions without changing the meanings assigned here unless RGV-01 is formally revised.

- 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.
- MUST — is not used as a separate normative keyword in this specification. Where the ordinary-language word “must” appears in explanatory prose, it carries no normative force beyond the surrounding sentence; mandatory requirements are expressed only with SHALL or SHALL NOT.
- CAN — indicates possibility or capability and does not imply a normative requirement.

8. References Within the Standards Family

8.1 Normative Dependency

RGV-01 serves as the foundational terminology specification for the Runtime Governance Standards Family. All subsequent Runtime Governance specifications shall reference the terminology defined in RGV-01 rather than redefining established architectural concepts independently.

8.2 Standards Hierarchy

RGV-01 remains the foundational terminology specification. RGAF-01 applies these terms to establish architectural principles and invariants. RGRA-01 applies those principles to allocate architectural responsibilities. REA-01 and subsequent behavioral specifications formalize the normative behavior of individual capabilities within that allocation.

Publication Note — Version 2.3 Decisions, Revision Record, and Future Dependencies

Version 2.3 records the Technical Review corrections incorporated before publication, the architectural decisions adopted for this revision, and known future standards-family dependencies. Items recorded as future dependencies are not silently assigned normative meaning and do not reduce the normative force of the vocabulary expressly defined by this specification. Bullets identified as Version 2.1 or Version 2.2 corrections are retained as a historical revision record.

- Admissibility remains an added normative term because it is central to the architecture represented in the supplied sources but was absent from Version 1.0’s reserved list. Version 2.1 also distinguishes Admissibility from Legitimacy: Admissibility is a determination at a

governance decision point; Legitimacy is the governance condition whose validity may persist or change over time. This distinction is adopted for RGV-01 Version 2.3.

- The standards family uses additional vocabulary not yet normatively defined here, including Runtime Governance Evaluation, Observation, Observation Producer, ROPS-01-related terminology, Enforcement, Determination, and cGate. Version 2.1 records these explicitly in Section 4.5 rather than inventing unsupported definitions. Their authoritative definitions remain future vocabulary dependencies.
- Section 5.1 has been restructured from a single vertical chain into conceptual categories so that Authorization is not treated as a fifth primitive and Operational Continuity / Legitimacy Continuity are not misrepresented as pipeline stages. Cross-specification review may refine related documents without altering this vocabulary unless RGV-01 is formally revised.
- Authorization remains revised from Version 2.0: it is treated as an authority-grounded grant or expression of permission, not as a post-Admissibility determination. Version 2.1 preserves that decision and clarifies that applicable Authorization may contribute to the governance basis considered at an admissibility decision point. Cross-specification reconciliation remains future standards-family work.
- No supplied source provides a domain-independent procedural boundary test for “Consequential.” Version 2.1 therefore retains a qualitative definition, explicitly refuses to invent a universal quantitative threshold, and leaves the applicable procedure to a governing specification or domain context. A future standard should define how consequentiality is operationally determined where conformance requires it.
- Governance Profile remains the least-evidenced term. Version 2.1 marked its definition provisional and non-normative pending stronger source authority. Version 2.3 removes that provisional definition from Section 4.4 and records Governance Profile in Section 4.5 as an unresolved vocabulary dependency pending confirmation of its governing source.
- As of Version 2.1, Runtime Decision Lifecycle was retained as a provisional lifecycle concept rather than treated as a fully specified architectural component. Its definition was to be confirmed against a dedicated governing specification if one was developed. Version 2.3 supersedes that treatment: RDL is removed from the defined vocabulary and is recorded in Section 4.5 as an unresolved vocabulary dependency.
- The Section 3 reconciliation between RGF-01 and RGAF-01/RGRA-01 remains a proposed ManChine architectural reconciliation. Version 2.1 no longer presents that family-wide hierarchy judgment as a settled finding. RGV-01 Version 2.3 adopts this reconciliation for vocabulary purposes.
- Version 2.2 closes a follow-up Technical Review finding by clarifying that the "continuing execution" language in Admissibility's definition refers to a new determination triggered at a defined decision point during ongoing execution, not to continuous evaluation across execution's duration. The continued validity of governance conditions over time remains a matter of Legitimacy and Legitimacy Continuity. This is an editorial clarification; it does not alter the Admissibility/Legitimacy architectural distinction already adopted in Version 2.1.

- Version 2.2 adds minimum relationship language between Admissibility and Legitimacy in Section 5.1, then noting that a new Admissibility determination was “triggered” when Legitimacy's continuing validity was called into question, without restoring a sequential Admissibility → Legitimacy pipeline. Version 2.3 supersedes that triggering formulation with semantic, non-behavioral relationship language as recorded below.
- Version 2.2 qualifies Section 6 to note that Observation, Evaluation, Determination, and Enforcement are referenced there according to RGRA-01's architectural usage pending their own normative definition by RGV-01, consistent with the Section 4.5 disclosure. No definitions for these terms are introduced.
- Version 2.2 corrects the forward reference from Justification to Admissibility with a "(defined below)" pointer, and clarifies that the Runtime Decision Lifecycle's stage labels are descriptive references to RGRA-01's flow rather than settled RGV-01 definitions.
- Version 2.2 removes the prior claim that RGV-01's normative-keyword convention was made "to remain consistent with RGEP-01 publication governance," since that alignment was not independently verified from the supplied sources. RGV-01 now states its own SHALL/SHALL NOT convention and notes that alignment with RGEP-01 remains a future publication-governance reconciliation item.
- Version 2.2 adds a pointer to the Authorization entry clarifying that the applicable governing specification (for example, REA-01 or a relevant behavioral specification) determines when Authorization is required for a given action. RGV-01 does not itself establish an authorization trigger, threshold, or decision rule.
- Version 2.3 closes a follow-up Technical Review finding on Legitimacy: the definition previously stated that Legitimacy "may persist, weaken, or cease." "Weaken" has been removed because it implied an undefined quantitative or partial degree of legitimacy and did not distinguish known degradation from epistemic uncertainty. The definition now states that Legitimacy may persist or cease as the governance basis changes, and separately addresses the distinct case in which Legitimacy's present validity cannot presently be established because one or more governance-basis conditions cannot presently be verified or determined. This is an editorial clarification within the existing Legitimacy definition; no new named architectural state or term has been introduced.
- Version 2.3 revises the Section 5.1 Admissibility/Legitimacy relationship language, which previously stated that a new Admissibility determination "is triggered" when Legitimacy's continuing validity is called into question. That wording risked establishing runtime triggering behavior inside a vocabulary specification. Section 5.1 now describes the semantic condition under which a subsequent Admissibility determination becomes relevant and explicitly defers whether, when, and under what procedure such a determination occurs to the applicable behavioral specification. Admissibility remains a discrete determination at a defined decision point; this edit does not convert it into a continuous evaluation process.
- Version 2.3 adds a clarification to the Admissibility definition that a historical Admissibility determination describes permissibility under the governance conditions evaluated at its defined decision point, is not made retroactively false by a later change in the governance

basis, and does not itself establish continued Legitimacy under materially changed conditions. This closes a finding regarding the previously unaddressed relationship between a historical determination and present Legitimacy, without prescribing resulting execution behavior.

- Version 2.3 records, but does not resolve, a cross-document terminology risk: the phrase "continuous legitimacy evaluation," where it appears elsewhere in the ManChine standards family, has not been confirmed to mean continuous observation/verification of governance conditions (consistent with Legitimacy Continuity and the Runtime Integrity Control responsibility) rather than continuous redetermination of Admissibility. RGV-01 does not itself use this phrase, and its own model keeps Admissibility discrete and non-continuous (Section 4.1). Confirming that other documents' usage aligns with this reading is a cross-specification terminology review item, not a defect identified within RGV-01 itself.
- Version 2.3 makes no change to the Standing, Qualification, or Requalification vocabulary. These terms remain outside RGV-01 because Authority, Authorization, Justification, Admissibility, Legitimacy, and Legitimacy Continuity were found sufficient to express every governance condition considered; no case was identified in which these additional terms would add semantic capability not already available.
- Final editorial pass for Version 2.3 removes the remaining passive “decision point is triggered” wording from the Admissibility definition and replaces it with “at a subsequent defined decision point.” This is a vocabulary-scope cleanup only: it does not establish when a decision point arises, who defines it, or what behavioral procedure follows.
- This finding-closure pass corrects the Legitimacy Continuity definition (Section 4.2) so that its governance basis includes applicable Authorization where required, aligning it with the Legitimacy definition (Section 4.1). This closes a finding that the two definitions previously described different bases for the same underlying justification. The correction does not imply that Authorization is universally required; it preserves the existing distinction between Authority and Authorization.
- RiCo's definition was revised so that runtime verification concerns conformance to governance conditions applicable to an execution as those conditions evolve. Section 3.4 reflects this vocabulary position. Reconciliation of RGRA-01 §5.4 and §9.7 with this formulation remains future cross-specification work and is not resolved by RGV-01.
- This finding-closure pass defers Runtime Decision Lifecycle (RDL) rather than retaining it as a provisional vocabulary entry. RDL has been removed from Section 4.3 and from the Section 5.1 relationship diagram, and is recorded instead in Section 4.5 as an unresolved vocabulary dependency: its normative meaning and any lifecycle ordering, sequencing, or stage timing must be established by an appropriate governing specification before RDL is reintroduced as normative RGV-01 terminology. This correction does not define lifecycle sequencing, stage ordering, triggers, timing, or runtime behavior. References to RDL within the historical Version 2.1/2.2 Technical Review Note bullets above are preserved unchanged as a record of prior review, not as current vocabulary status.

- This finding-closure pass corrects the quotation referenced in the “Final editorial pass for Version 2.3” bullet above, which previously misquoted the Admissibility definition's decision-point wording as "at a newly defined decision point"; the definition itself, both before and after that editorial pass, reads "at a subsequent defined decision point." No definition text was altered by this correction.
- Per explicit ManChine instruction, no normative definitions were created in this pass for Observation, Determination, Enforcement, Runtime Governance Evaluation, Observation Producer, ROPS-01-related terminology, cGate, or Governance Profile. Their future normative definition remains subject to explicit ManChine review and a governing standards-family source.