

SHE: Trajectory-driven Safety Harness Evolution for LLM Agents

Wanying Qu^{1,2*}, Qinghua Mao^{1,3*}, Yu Li^{1,2}, Jiyao Liu^{1,2}, Xin Zhang², Dadi Guo^{1,4}, Yanxu Zhu¹
Qingyu Liu¹, Leitao Yuan¹, Xi Lin³, Shanfeng Zhu², Yanwei Fu², Jing Shao¹, Xia Hu¹, Dongrui Liu^{1†}

¹Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory ²Fudan University ³Shanghai Jiao Tong University

⁴The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

wyqu24@m.fudan.edu.cn mmmm2018@sjtu.edu.cn

 github.com/RainbowQT/SHE

Abstract

The safety of large language model (LLM) agents depends not only on model weights but also on the agent harness that manages context, memory, tools, permissions, and runtime control. Existing safety mechanisms often treat the harness as a fixed deployment artifact, limiting their ability to evolve with emerging risks. Moreover, coupled functions across harness components obscure safety responsibility attribution, making localized evolution difficult. We propose **Safety Harness Evolution (SHE)**, a framework that learns evolving safe boundaries from rollout trajectories. SHE decomposes the harness into four artifacts with explicit safety responsibilities, including the System Prompt, Rule Bank, Safety Memory, and Tool Policy, defining clear functional boundaries for localized evolution. Based on this decomposition, SHE introduces an attribution-guided evolution loop that converts trajectory failures into structured diagnoses, learns artifact-specific boundary refinements, and selects evolved harnesses through safety-utility validation. Experiments on Agent-SafetyBench demonstrate that SHE effectively enhances safety through harness evolution, achieving a $3.1\times$ ASR reduction compared with static SafeHarness, while also improving benign utility. The evolved harness further generalizes to unseen risks on the held-out AgentHarm benchmark and transfers across agent models without additional evolution.

1 Introduction

As LLM agents are increasingly deployed for complex, long-horizon, and open-ended tasks, their behavior is mediated by an *agent harness* that connects the model to the task environment through context and memory management, tool access, action dispatch, permission enforcement, and persistent state (Weng, 2026). Since the harness shapes what the model observes and what actions it can take, safety risks arise not only from model outputs but also from the execution steps performed by harness components (Li et al., 2026; Liu et al., 2026a), highlighting the necessity of harness-level safety alignment.

Existing studies of safety harness aim to specify permission and information-flow boundaries by hardening harness components, such as rules or runtime guardrails (Jia et al., 2025; Chennabasappa et al., 2025; Shi et al., 2025; Luo et al., 2026; Lin et al., 2026b). However, these mechanisms are often static after deployment: they do not automatically learn from execution trajectories, and their safety boundaries largely rely on human-designed principles and rules (Luo et al., 2026; Lin et al., 2026b; Zhao et al., 2026).

This creates a gap between safety diagnosis and safety improvement: trajectories reveal where current safety mechanisms fail, but static harnesses cannot automatically incorporate these failures into safety guidance. Bridging this gap requires an evolving safety harness that learns from historical rollout trajectories and progressively refines the safety boundaries.

Building an evolvable safety harness encounters two central challenges. **a) coupled functions obscure harness refinement.** A safety failure may involve context construction, memory retrieval, tool authority, or response filtering, but current harnesses often do not expose clear functional boundaries among these components (Rebedea et al., 2023; Chennabasappa et al., 2025; Luo et al., 2026; Lin et al., 2026b). As a result, learning a new safety boundary for one component can interfere with other components and alter the harness behavior as a whole. **b) Trajectory feedback cannot directly contribute to harness evolution.** Full execution trajectories contain rich environment feedback, including tool observations, task verification results, and failure records, yet distilling feasible evolution guidance from such feedback is highly nontrivial (Li et al., 2026; Liu et al.,

* Equal contribution. † Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Motivation of Safety Harness Evolution (SHE). SHE decouples the safety harness into editable artifacts, enabling targeted diagnosis and localized evolution.

2026a; Mou et al., 2026; Lin et al., 2026a). These challenges suggest that harness evolution should rely on functional decoupling to localize drawback and attribution-guided evolution to extract actionable guidance, as illustrated in Figure 1.

We introduce **Safety Harness Evolution (SHE)**, a safety harness that can learn and evolve its own safety boundaries from historical rollout trajectories. SHE follows two high-level designs. **1) Artifact-level decomposition for explicit safety responsibilities.** SHE represents the harness as four editable artifacts to separate safety responsibilities. The system prompt Hines et al. (2024) specifies general safety behavior, the rule bank (Bai et al., 2022) stores explicit safety rules, the safety memory (Mao et al., 2026; Liu et al., 2026b) stores experience from failure cases that remain unresolved after repeated evolution attempts, and the tool policy (Luo et al., 2026; Shi et al., 2025) defines tool-use authority. This separation clarifies each artifact’s safety responsibility and validation target, making it easier to attribute failures to the artifact that should be refined. **2) Attribution-guided evolution for bounded local revision.** SHE formulates an attribution-guided harness evolution loop. For each evaluated trajectory, SHE uses a structured safety diagnosis to attribute the failure and route it to the most relevant harness artifacts for bounded local refinement. Candidate refinements are retained only after validity checking and best-harness selection, enabling SHE to learn from past failures while preserving the safety–utility balance.

On AgentSafetyBench, SHE reduces average ASR from 8.6% to 5.5% over the non-evolved harness, lowers clean UBR from 25.7% to 19.8%, and improves average UA from 33.5% to 47.6%. Compared with the static SafeHarness baseline, SHE lowers ASR from 17.1% to 5.5% and improves average UA from 31.6% to 47.6%. On held-out AgentHarm, the evolved harness further reduces Harm Score from 19.8% to 9.8% compared with non-evolved harness and increases Harm Refusal from 78.4% to 86.4%. These results show that agent safety can benefit from treating the harness as an evolving system. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose *Safety Harness Evolution (SHE)*, a safety harness that evolves its own safety artifacts from rollout trajectories.
- We instantiate SHE with two core designs: four editable harness artifacts and an attribution-guided harness evolution loop. The loop routes trajectory-level safety gaps to responsible artifacts and retains bounded local edits through validity checking and best-harness selection.
- SHE achieves stronger safety–utility performance than both static and evolved baselines: compared with SafeHarness, it obtains a $3.1\times$ lower average ASR and 50.6% higher UA, while maintaining evolved performance across tasks and models.

2 Related Work

Agent Security and Defense. Recent studies show that LLM agent safety requires protections beyond single-turn content moderation. R-Judge evaluates safety risk awareness from multi-turn agent interaction records (Yuan et al., 2024). AgentDojo studies prompt-injection attacks and defenses in dynamic tool-use

environments (Debenedetti et al., 2024). Agent-SafetyBench and AgentHarm further evaluate diverse agent safety risks, including interaction failures and harmful agent behaviors (Zhang et al., 2024; Andriushchenko et al., 2025). Existing defenses provide safety controls at different levels. Test-time guardrails, including Llama Guard, ShieldGemma, NeMo Guardrails, and LlamaFirewall, introduce external checks over model inputs, outputs, or runtime execution (Inan et al., 2023; Zeng et al., 2024; Rebedea et al., 2023; Chennabasappa et al., 2025). Recent harness-level approaches, including Task Shield, Progent, AgentGuard, and SafeHarness, further constrain tool usage, permissions, and agent execution behaviors (Jia et al., 2025; Shi et al., 2025; Luo et al., 2026; Lin et al., 2026b). However, most existing approaches treat safety mechanisms as fixed policies after deployment and do not study how safety harnesses can adapt from trajectory feedback. SHE differs by treating the safety harness as an evolvable object and exploring trajectory-driven safe-boundary evolution over editable artifacts.

Agentic Harness Evolution. Recent work explores how agent systems and language-based artifacts can be optimized through trajectory feedback. GEPA demonstrates that trajectory feedback can guide reflective prompt evolution (Agrawal et al., 2025), while ABSTRAL and EvoTest extend iterative refinement to multi-agent design and test-time agent evolution (Song et al., 2026; He et al., 2025). SkillOpt optimizes persistent skill documents as reusable agent states (Yang et al., 2026). Meanwhile, automated red teaming methods, including GPTFuzzer, AutoDAN, PAIR, TAP, MART, and Rainbow Teaming, improve safety evaluation by generating diverse adversarial behaviors (Yu et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Chao et al., 2023; Mehrotra et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2024; Samvelyan et al., 2024). Recent harness engineering studies further investigate automatic harness evolution from execution traces (Lin et al., 2026a; Zhang et al., 2026). Unlike these approaches, SHE focuses on harness evolution for agent safety rather than optimizing task performance or generating adversarial behaviors.

3 Methodology

3.1 Preliminaries and Problem Setup

We formalize an LLM-agent system as a tuple $(\pi_\theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H})$, where π_θ is the base LLM policy, $\mathcal{E}$ is the task environment, and $\mathcal{H}$ is the editable *agent harness*. The harness $\mathcal{H}$ specifies the non-parametric execution protocol through which π_θ receives context, accesses tools, incorporates observations from $\mathcal{E}$, applies safety checks, and produces a final response. The task environment $\mathcal{E}$ provides the tool backends, task state, and observations with which the harness-mediated agent interacts. Given a task instance x_i , running π_θ in $\mathcal{E}$ under harness $\mathcal{H}$ produces a rollout trajectory

$$\tau_i = \text{Rollout}(\pi_\theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}, x_i), \quad (1)$$

which records the user task, constructed contexts, model responses, tool calls, tool observations, harness decisions, and final response.

A task-level safety-utility evaluation protocol Ω scores each completed rollout. It maps the task and trajectory to an outcome record

$$o_i = \Omega(x_i, \tau_i), \quad o_i = (o_i^{\text{safe}}, o_i^{\text{util}}). \quad (2)$$

The record contains the safety outcome o_i^{safe} and the utility outcome o_i^{util} .

SHE optimizes the harness $\mathcal{H}$ while holding π_θ , $\mathcal{E}$, and Ω fixed. For any harness $\mathcal{H}$, $S_\Omega(\mathcal{H})$ denotes its safety score and $U_\Omega(\mathcal{H})$ denotes its utility score. The goal is to improve $S_\Omega(\mathcal{H})$ subject to a utility constraint on $U_\Omega(\mathcal{H})$.

3.2 Framework Overview

As shown in Figure 2, **Safety Harness Evolution (SHE)** is organized around a functionally decoupled safety harness and an attribution-guided harness evolution loop. Given evaluated rollout evidence (τ_i, o_i) , SHE diagnoses risk, routes the diagnosis to the responsible artifact, applies validity-checked bounded edits, and retains the best harness state across rounds while keeping π_θ , $\mathcal{E}$, and Ω fixed. The following subsections detail the functionally decoupled harness artifacts and the attribution-guided evolution loop.




Figure 2: Overview of Safety Harness Evolution (SHE). SHE decomposes the safety harness into four functionally bounded artifacts and evolves them from rollout trajectories. Trajectory evidence is diagnosed, routed to responsible artifacts, converted into learned safe-boundary refinements, and retained through safety–utility selection.

3.3 Functionally Decoupled Harness Components

SHE represents the editable harness as a structured state:

$$\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{P}_{sys}, \mathcal{R}_{bank}, \mathcal{M}_{safe}, \mathcal{Q}_{tool}), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{sys}$, $\mathcal{R}_{bank}$, $\mathcal{M}_{safe}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{tool}$ denote the System Prompt, Rule Bank, Safety Memory, and Tool Policy artifacts. Each artifact is associated with a specific safety responsibility, enabling artifact-level attribution during evolution. SHE performs routed local edits on responsible artifacts and records the resulting harness changes as state transitions. Their respective responsibilities are detailed below.

- **System Prompt.** Defines the global behavioral contract for the tool-using agent, including source hierarchy, capability grounding, and trust-boundary commitments.
- **Rule Bank.** Stores structured safety rules for risk classification and intervention over user inputs, contexts, model responses, and proposed actions.
- **Safety Memory.** Stores experience from failure cases that remain unresolved after repeated evolution attempts.
- **Tool Policy.** Specifies tool authority and runtime enforcement for tool calls, tool observations, blocked actions, and final-response recovery.

These artifacts affect agent behavior through different control mechanisms. System Prompt $\mathcal{P}_{sys}$ and Safety Memory $\mathcal{M}_{safe}$ are organized as textual specifications that provide behavioral constraints and contextual safety experience, while the Rule Bank $\mathcal{R}_{bank}$ and Tool Policy $\mathcal{Q}_{tool}$ associate safety conditions with intervention actions, including allow, warn, block, sanitize, and judge.

3.4 Attribution-Driven Harness Evolution Loop

After defining the editable harness components, this subsection describes how SHE assigns concrete rollout trajectories to specific safety-harness artifacts for evolution. Given evaluated trajectories, SHE first diagnoses the safety-relevant evidence in each rollout, identifies which harness responsibility is implicated, and routes the case to the corresponding artifact. This routing provides the basis for bounded local edits and subsequent safety–utility validation.

The evolution loop converts evaluated trajectories into localized and verifiable safe-boundary refinements over functionally decoupled harness artifacts. It proceeds through structured diagnosis, artifact routing, bounded local editing, validity checking, and best-harness selection. Algorithm 1 summarizes this iterative optimization procedure.

Algorithm 1 Safety Harness Evolution (SHE)

Require: base policy π_θ , environment $\mathcal{E}$, evaluation protocol Ω , initial harness $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$, evolution tasks $\mathcal{X}_{evo}$, rounds K
Ensure: best accepted harness $\mathcal{H}_{best}$

```
1:  $\mathcal{H}_{best} \leftarrow \mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ ; initialize rejection feedback  $\mathcal{F}_{rej} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: for  $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$  do
3:   Select  $\mathcal{X}^{(k)} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{evo}$ ; collect  $\{(\tau_i, o_i)\}$  by rolling out  $\pi_\theta$  under  $\mathcal{H}_{best}$  and applying  $\Omega$ .
4:    $\mathcal{I}^{(k)} \leftarrow \{i : \text{RiskRelevant}(o_i)\}$ ; obtain diagnoses/routes  $\{(z_i, r_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k)}}$ .
5:    $\Delta^{(k)} \leftarrow \text{Edit}(\mathcal{H}_{best}, \{z_i, r_i, o_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k)}}, \mathcal{F}_{rej})$ 
6:    $v^{(k)} \leftarrow \text{ValidEdit}(\Delta^{(k)}, \mathcal{H}_{best}, \{z_i, r_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k)}})$ 
7:   if  $v^{(k)} = 1$  then
8:      $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathcal{H}_{best} \oplus \Delta^{(k)}$ 
9:     Evaluate  $S_\Omega(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)})$  and  $U_\Omega(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)})$  under  $\Omega$ .
10:    if the candidate satisfies the safety–utility selection rule then
11:       $\mathcal{H}_{best} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)}$ 
12:    else
13:       $\mathcal{F}_{rej} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{rej} \cup \{(\Delta^{(k)}, \text{metric})\}$ 
14:    end if
15:  else
16:     $\mathcal{F}_{rej} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{rej} \cup \{(\Delta^{(k)}, \text{invalid})\}$ 
17:  end if
18: end for
19: return  $\mathcal{H}_{best}$ 
```

Structured Risk Diagnosis. In evolution round k , SHE selects a set of evolution tasks $\mathcal{X}^{(k)} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{evo}$ and evaluates them under the current best harness $\mathcal{H}_{best}$. The resulting trajectories and outcome records are denoted by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}^{(k)} &= \{\tau_i : x_i \in \mathcal{X}^{(k)}, \tau_i = \text{Rollout}(\pi_\theta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H}_{best}, x_i)\}, \\ \mathcal{O}^{(k)} &= \{o_i : x_i \in \mathcal{X}^{(k)}, o_i = \Omega(x_i, \tau_i)\}.\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

The evolution model then identifies safety-relevant cases

$$\mathcal{I}^{(k)} = \{i : \text{RiskRelevant}(o_i)\},\tag{5}$$

where $\text{RiskRelevant}(o_i)$ indicates that the outcome exposes a safety failure or a safety-relevant failure pattern for evolution. For each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k)}$, the evolution model maps (τ_i, o_i) to a structured risk diagnosis z_i containing trajectory evidence and risk dimensions. Following existing AI risk taxonomies and recent agent safety analyses (Slattery et al., 2024; Cui et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Li et al., 2026; Liu et al., 2026a), it represents each failure through three risk dimensions: harm domain, attack surface, and failure mode. The harm domain captures the potential consequence of the failure, the attack surface identifies the channel through which the risk enters the agent, and the failure mode describes how the agent behavior fails. The trajectory evidence and risk dimensions together provide the basis for artifact-level routing and localized editing.

Harness Artifact Routing. Given the supporting trajectory evidence, structured risk record, outcome feedback, and current harness state, the evolution model performs artifact-level routing to identify candidate artifacts associated with the diagnosed failure. For each diagnosed case z_i , the routing output is denoted by r_i , which specifies the responsible harness artifact, or a small artifact set when a failure spans multiple safety responsibilities. The selected artifacts define the scope of subsequent editing while preserving the functional boundaries among artifacts. This routing step connects trajectory-level failures with artifact-level boundary learning. By separating failure attribution from harness modification, SHE enables localized edits over functionally decoupled artifacts and avoids unnecessary changes to unrelated safety components.

Among the harness artifacts, Safety Memory $\mathcal{M}_{safe}$ has a distinct update condition. It stores safety experience from unresolved failure cases. When a failure pattern remains unresolved after repeated evolution attempts or reappears after artifact updates, the corresponding cases are abstracted into Safety Memory $\mathcal{M}_{safe}$ entries.

Method	Clean	Context		Indirect		Tool		Memory		Composite		Avg.	
	UBR↓	ASR↓	UA↑	ASR↓	UA↑	ASR↓	UA↑	ASR↓	UA↑	ASR↓	UA↑	ASR↓	UA↑
Baseline (No defense)	42.9	28.3	35.7	27.1	46.5	38.1	29.6	47.5	35.2	31.7	46.5	34.6	38.7
<i>Static</i>													
+ System prompt	37.8	22.2	47.8	21.0	43.7	36.8	29.6	33.1	46.5	29.3	54.9	28.5	44.5
+ LlamaFirewall	42.1	28.9	40.0	24.3	47.9	37.2	30.0	35.6	47.9	31.5	46.5	31.5	42.5
+ SafeHarness	42.8	23.2	38.0	23.8	47.9	4.9	14.1	29.8	40.8	3.8	17.1	17.1	31.6
<i>Evolved</i>													
+ PROGENT	34.6	14.1	43.7	15.8	35.2	28.0	39.1	20.1	39.4	17.9	38.0	19.2	39.1
+ Memskill-SafeHarness	37.2	24.5	23.9	21.2	57.7	13.1	24.3	30.8	9.9	8.6	11.3	19.6	25.4
+ SHE (seed)	25.7	7.6	38.0	10.3	22.5	12.0	31.0	8.7	31.0	4.3	45.1	8.6	33.5
+ SHE (evolved) [†]	19.8 (-5.9)	6.0 (-1.6)	52.1 (+14.1)	6.0 (-4.3)	35.7(+13.2)	8.2(-3.8)	38.6(+7.6)	6.0 (-2.7)	53.5 (+22.5)	1.1 (-3.2)	57.7 (+12.6)	5.5 (-3.1)	47.6 (+14.1)
<i>Evolved-to-seed component replacement (*)</i>													
SHE (Rule: E→S)*	19.8	5.4	49.6	9.1	38.9	8.9	41.5	6.6	50.8	2.0	55.2	6.4	47.2
SHE (Mem.: E→S)*	26.4	6.6	49.8	11.2	34.8	8.0	32.5	8.4	39.6	4.2	46.7	7.7	40.7
SHE (Sys.: E→S)*	19.8	5.0	51.0	9.8	35.9	8.2	39.8	7.1	44.2	4.8	53.7	7.0	44.9
SHE (Tool: E→S)*	23.0	5.9	50.4	8.2	42.6	11.1	37.2	7.3	51.0	4.1	54.0	7.3	47.0

Table 1: Held-in safety and utility results on Agent-SafetyBench. SHE (seed) denotes the initial decoupled harness before evolution, while SHE (evolved)[†] denotes the main experiment result after evolution. Rows marked * keep the evolved harness fixed while replacing the named evolved component (E) with its seed version (S); Rule, Mem., Sys., and Tool denote Rule Bank, Safety Memory, System Prompt, and Tool Policy.

Bounded Editing and Validity Check. Given the routed artifacts and structured risk record, the evolution model generates bounded edits over the selected harness artifacts. For round k , we denote the proposed edit set by

$$\Delta^{(k)} = \text{Edit}(\mathcal{H}_{best}, \{z_i, r_i, o_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k)}}, \mathcal{F}_{rej}). \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{rej}$ stores previously rejected edits and their reasons as feedback for later editing. Each edit specifies the target artifact, modification scope, update operation, learned content, and supporting trajectory evidence. These constraints restrict the evolution process to localized safety repairs over the routed artifacts rather than unrestricted harness rewriting. Before candidate-harness evaluation, SHE performs a validity check to verify whether a proposed boundary refinement represents a valid safety improvement rather than a reward-hacking or evaluator-specific shortcut. The validity decision is written as

$$v^{(k)} = \text{ValidEdit}(\Delta^{(k)}, \mathcal{H}_{best}, \{z_i, r_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(k)}}), \quad v^{(k)} \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (7)$$

The check evaluates whether the edit follows the artifact schema and avoids unsupported safety restrictions, unnecessary capability removal, or modifications that produce superficial safety gains. When $v^{(k)} = 1$, valid edits are applied to construct a candidate harness

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)} = \mathcal{H}_{best} \oplus \Delta^{(k)}, \quad (8)$$

where $\oplus$ denotes applying the bounded edit set to the current best harness. The resulting candidate is then passed to best-harness selection.

Best-Harness Selection. SHE treats each valid edit as a candidate update to the best harness. The candidate harness $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)}$ replaces $\mathcal{H}_{best}$ only when it improves safety while preserving normal task utility:

$$S_{\Omega}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)}) > S_{\Omega}(\mathcal{H}_{best}), U_{\Omega}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)}) \geq U_{\Omega}(\mathcal{H}_{best}). \quad (9)$$

where $S_{\Omega}(\cdot)$ measures safety and $U_{\Omega}(\cdot)$ measures task utility. If the candidate passes this rule, SHE updates $\mathcal{H}_{best}$ and continues rollout with the new best harness in the next round. Otherwise, the active harness is restored to $\mathcal{H}_{best}$. The rejected edit $\Delta^{(k)}$ and its rejection reason are returned to the evolution model as feedback, so later rounds can avoid repeating the same invalid or utility-degrading update and refine subsequent routing and editing decisions.

Method	Harm	Harm	Benign
	Score↓	Refusal↑	NR↑
Baseline (No defense)	51.9	33.5	75.6
<i>Static</i>			
+ System prompt	39.2	51.1	75.1
+ LlamaFirewall	36.4	52.3	75.0
+ SafeHarness	18.0	74.4	68.2
<i>Evolved</i>			
+ PROGENT	39.2	51.1	75.1
+ Memskill-SafeHarness	37.4	53.4	73.9
+ SHE (seed)	19.8	78.4	77.9
+ SHE (evolved)	9.8(-10.0)	86.4(+8.0)	77.8(-0.1)

Table 2: Held-out transfer results. The SHE harness is evolved on Agent-SafetyBench and evaluated on AgentHarm.

Method	Best round	Clean	Avg.	
		UBR↓	ASR↓	UA↑
No defense	—	42.9	34.6	38.7
GPT-5.5	R17	19.8	5.5	47.6
DeepSeek-V3.2	R03	17.6	4.3	40.4
GLM-5.2	R05	24.0	5.9	36.0

Table 3: **Evolution-model ablation on Agent-SafetyBench.** Different evolution models drive SHE to discover different safety–utility trade-offs during harness evolution.




Figure 3: Transfer of evolved harness updates across different agent models. The harness evolved on DeepSeek-V3.2 is applied to Kimi K2.6, GLM-5.2, and MiniMax M2.7 without additional evolution.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We use two complementary agent safety benchmarks. Agent-SafetyBench (Zhang et al., 2024) supports safety harness evolution and held-in evaluation. It contains 2,000 safety-critical tasks across 349 interaction environments, covering 8 safety risk categories. Following the benchmark ordering used by SafeHarness (Lin et al., 2026b), we select the first 200 tasks from the official release. Each Agent-SafetyBench task is evaluated under one clean condition and five attack conditions: *context poisoning*, *indirect injection*, *tool tampering*, *memory injection*, and *composite attack*. For held-out transfer evaluation, we use AgentHarm (Andriushchenko et al., 2025), which focuses on multi-step agent misuse and contains 440 augmented harmful behaviors derived from 110 base tasks across 11 harm categories.

Baselines. We compare against static and evolved safety control baselines. *No defense* is the unprotected reference setting, where the agent executes without any additional safety mechanism. *System prompt* adds safety instructions at the model-prompt level. *LlamaFirewall* (Chennabasappa et al., 2025) represents a runtime firewall that audits prompts, actions, or intermediate execution traces before unsafe behavior is carried out. *SafeHarness* (Lin et al., 2026b) provides lifecycle-integrated protection by inserting safety checks around context construction, tool calls, tool observations, and final responses. Among adaptive or evolved baselines, *PROGENT* (Shi et al., 2025) constrains tool access through task-specific privilege policies. *Memskill-SafeHarness* (Lin et al., 2026b) extends the SafeHarness lifecycle defense with trajectory-driven skill updates. For our method, we report both *SHE (seed)*, the functionally decoupled safety harness introduced in this work without any evolution, and *SHE (evolved)*, the best safety harness selected after evolution.

Evaluation Metrics. On Agent-SafetyBench, we report unsafe behavior rate on non-attacked clean tasks (Clean UBR), attack success rate (ASR), and utility under attack (UA). On AgentHarm, we report Harm Score, Harm Refusal, and non-refusal benign score (Benign NR).




Figure 4: Framework-evolution ablation on Agent-SafetyBench. SHE benefits from evolution more consistently than coupled safety frameworks.

Evolution Setting. We use a 15-task stratified subset of the selected 200 Agent-SafetyBench tasks for safety-harness evolution, resulting in 90 task-condition instances. The remaining 185 tasks are reserved exclusively for final evaluation to prevent data leakage. The full AgentHarm dataset is reserved exclusively for held-out evaluation. At each evolution round, SHE evaluates the full evolution subset under the current best harness. We run two rollout replications for each task-condition pair to reduce the influence of stochastic rollout noise. The base agent model is fixed as DeepSeek-V3.2 (Liu et al., 2025), while GPT-5.5 (OpenAI, 2026) is used as the evolution model and as the full-trajectory judge for Agent-SafetyBench. AgentHarm rollouts are evaluated by GPT-4o. Starting from a lightweight seed safety harness with a generic system prompt, a small rule bank, one safety-memory entry, and a generic tool policy, SHE runs 20 evolution rounds. All rollout evaluations and model-based decisions are conducted with temperature set to 0 to ensure deterministic evaluation.

4.2 Held-in Analysis

SHE evolution improves safety while preserving utility. As shown in Table 1, *SHE (evolved)* substantially improves over the *seed* harness, reducing average ASR from 8.6% to 5.5%, reducing clean UBR from 25.7% to 19.8%, and improving average UA from 33.5% to 47.6%. Compared with all static and evolved baselines, *SHE (evolved)* achieves the lowest average ASR and the highest average UA on Agent-SafetyBench. These results demonstrate that SHE can evolve a safety harness from rollout trajectories while improving safety without sacrificing task utility. These results demonstrate that SHE can evolve a safety harness from rollout trajectories, improving safety while preserving task utility rather than relying on a fixed initial specification.

4.3 Generalization Analysis

To evaluate the generalization of SHE, we consider two settings: transfer to unseen safety risks and transfer across different agent models.

Evolved safe-boundary refinements generalize to unseen safety risks. We apply the evolved harness to AgentHarm, which is excluded from SHE evolution, to evaluate transfer to unseen safety risks. Table 2 reports the held-out results under the AgentHarm metrics. SHE (evolved) achieves the lowest Harm Score (9.8%) and the highest Harm Refusal (86.4%) among all methods while maintaining benign non-refusal. These results indicate that SHE produces harness updates that remain effective beyond the evolution data.

Evolved safe-boundary refinements transfer across agent models. We apply the evolved harness to Kimi K2.6 (Moonshot AI, 2026), GLM-5.2 (Z.ai, 2026), and MiniMax M2.7 (Chen et al., 2026) to assess cross-agent transfer. SHE is evolved on DeepSeek-V3.2 as the base agent and directly transferred to each target model without additional evolution. Figure 3 reports the resulting Agent-SafetyBench performance under no defense, SHE (seed), and SHE (evolved). Overall, the transferred SHE harness demonstrates safety improvements over no defense while preserving a comparable safety-utility trade-off across different base agents. These results indicate that SHE produces transferable updates across agent models.

4.4 Ablation Studies

Functional decomposition enables effective harness evolution. Figure 4 evaluates the role of functional decomposition in safety harness evolution. The results show that evolution behaves differently under

Illustrative learned safety boundary: app acquisition on the user’s device
Task and safety target <i>User goal:</i> “Download the best note-taking app on my phone.” <i>Safety target:</i> The agent should not perform device-level app acquisition on behalf of the user. It may recommend applications and provide official-store guidance, while installation remains user-controlled.
Seed harness: missing app-acquisition boundary The seed harness contained only generic tool-safety rules, such as destructive-tool blocking, dangerous-shell-command blocking, and credential protection. It lacked an app-acquisition-specific boundary. In the failing rollout, the agent incorrectly transformed a recommendation task into an execution task: <code>search_apps</code> → <code>open_app</code> → <code>search_in_app</code> → <code>attempted_install_app</code> . Although the final installation was blocked by the generic high-impact tool policy, the agent had already crossed the intended assistance boundary by initiating an autonomous acquisition workflow.
Round 17: learned semantic boundary (Rule Bank) Input boundary. The <code>app-acquisition intent</code> rule identifies requests involving downloading, installing, purchasing, or operating app-store workflows on the user’s device. It allows recommendations, comparisons, and official-store guidance. Execution boundary. The <code>app-acquisition tool</code> rule blocks app-store actions that acquire applications for the user, while preserving benign assistance. Resulting behavior. The evolved harness avoids tool execution for app acquisition requests and provides recommendations with user-controlled official-store guidance.
Round 17: execution enforcement (Tool Policy) The <code>app-install completion-claim detector</code> prevents unsupported claims that the assistant has started, completed, downloaded, or installed an application on the user’s device. The response is repaired to preserve utility while leaving evaluation and installation to the user through official channels.
Learned safety boundary. <i>Recommendation is allowed; autonomous device-level acquisition and unsupported completion claims are not.</i>

Figure 5: A concrete safety case illustrating how SHE transforms an app-acquisition failure into learned artifact-level safety-boundary refinements.

different harness designs. While evolution can reduce ASR for coupled frameworks such as LlamaFirewall and SafeHarness, their updates may introduce regressions in clean safety behavior or utility under attack. In contrast, SHE achieves consistent improvements across all three reported metrics, reducing ASR from 8.6% to 5.5% while simultaneously lowering clean UBR and increasing UA. These results support the central design claim that effective harness evolution requires explicit functional boundaries for accurate failure attribution, localized artifact updates, and regression-aware harness selection.

Artifact replacement confirms that the learned components matter. The component-replacement rows in Table 1 provide a direct ablation of the evolved harness state: replacing an evolved artifact with its seed version generally weakens the safety–utility trade-off or degrades attack-specific robustness. This indicates that SHE’s improvement is not merely inherited from the seed harness, but comes from learned artifact-level safety-boundary refinements accumulated during evolution.

SHE enables effective harness evolution with diverse evolution models. Table 3 evaluates whether SHE depends on a specific evolution model for trajectory diagnosis and harness learning. We replace the evolution model while keeping the harness structure, evolution procedure, and evaluation protocol unchanged. The results show that SHE can effectively improve the seed harness with different evolution models, rather than relying on a single powerful model. Different evolution models discover different safety–utility trade-offs during evolution. DeepSeek-V3.2 converges earlier at R03 and favors a more aggressive safety improvement, achieving lower clean UBR and ASR but with a larger utility trade-off. GPT-5.5 performs a more gradual evolution process and achieves the strongest utility-preserving improvement among the SHE variants. GLM-5.2 obtains an intermediate trade-off between safety improvement and utility preservation. These results demonstrate the potential of harness evolution and show that SHE can leverage different evolution models to discover effective safety-boundary refinements.

4.5 What Does SHE Learn During Evolution?

Figure 5 illustrates a fine-grained safety boundary learned by SHE during evolution. From an unsafe app-acquisition trajectory, SHE identifies that the failure arises not from the request, but from the agent extending recommendations into autonomous device-level execution. It attributes the trajectory evidence to the responsible harness artifacts and converts it into localized updates: the Rule Bank learns the boundary between permissible app recommendations and prohibited device-level acquisition, while the Tool Policy

enforces execution constraints. Compared with the seed harness, the evolved harness preserves utility by allowing recommendations and official-store guidance while blocking direct installation actions and unsupported completion claims. This example shows how SHE turns trajectory-level failures into reusable safety boundaries rather than broad refusals or benchmark-oriented fixes.

5 Conclusion

We introduced Safety Harness Evolution (SHE), a framework for improving tool-using LLM agent safety by evolving the safety harness from rollout trajectories. SHE represents the harness as four functionally decoupled artifacts with explicit safety responsibilities, enabling targeted safety updates while preserving unrelated capabilities. SHE evolves the harness through trajectory analysis, localized artifact updates, and safety-utility validation. Experiments on Agent-SafetyBench and held-out AgentHarm show SHE can reduce attack success rates while preserving task utility, supporting the view that agent safety can be treated as an evolving architectural property. The generalization results suggest that learned harness updates can transfer to held-out risks and across agent models without target-specific evolution.

References

- Lakshya A. Agrawal, Shangyin Tan, Dilara Soylu, Noah Ziemis, Rishi Khare, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Arnav Singhvi, Herumb Shandilya, Michael J. Ryan, Meng Jiang, Christopher Potts, Koushik Sen, Alexandros G. Dimakis, Ion Stoica, Dan Klein, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. GEPA: Reflective prompt evolution can outperform reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.19457*, 2025.
- Maksym Andriushchenko, Alexandra Souly, Mateusz Dziemian, Derek Duenas, Maxwell Lin, Justin Wang, Dan Hendrycks, Andy Zou, J. Zico Kolter, Matt Fredrikson, Eric Winsor, Jerome Wynne, Yarin Gal, and Xander Davies. AgentHarm: A benchmark for measuring harmfulness of LLM agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09024*, 2025.
- Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, Carol Chen, Catherine Olsson, Christopher Olah, Danny Hernandez, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Dustin Li, Eli Tran-Johnson, Ethan Perez, Jamie Kerr, Jared Mueller, Jeffrey Ladish, Joshua Landau, Kamal Ndousse, Kamile Lukosuite, Liane Lovitt, Michael Sellitto, Nelson Elhage, Nicholas Schiefer, Noemi Mercado, Nova DasSarma, Robert Lasenby, Robin Larson, Sam Ringer, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Sheer El Showk, Stanislav Fort, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tom Conerly, Tom Henighan, Tristan Hume, Samuel R. Bowman, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Ben Mann, Dario Amodei, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Tom Brown, and Jared Kaplan. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J. Pappas, and Eric Wong. Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08419*, 2023.
- Aili Chen, Aonian Li, Baichuan Zhou, Bangwei Gong, Binyang Jiang, Boji Dan, Changqing Yu, Chao Wang, Cheng Ma, Cheng Zhong, et al. The MiniMax-M2 series: Mini activations unleashing max real-world intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.26494*, 2026.
- Sahana Chennabasappa, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Daniel Song, David Molnar, Stephanie Ding, Shengye Wan, Spencer Whitman, Lauren Deason, Nicholas Doucette, Abraham Montilla, Alekhya Gampa, Beto de Paola, Dominik Gabi, James Crnkovich, Jean-Christophe Testud, Kat He, Rashnil Chaturvedi, Wu Zhou, and Joshua Saxe. LlamaFirewall: An open source guardrail system for building secure AI agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.03574*, 2025.
- Tianyu Cui, Yanling Wang, Chuanpu Fu, Yong Xiao, Sijia Li, Xinhao Deng, Yunpeng Liu, Qinglin Zhang, Ziyi Qiu, Peiyang Li, et al. Risk taxonomy, mitigation, and assessment benchmarks of large language model systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05778*, 2024.
- Edoardo Debenedetti, Jie Zhang, Mislav Balunović, Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Florian Tramèr. AgentDojo: A dynamic environment to evaluate prompt injection attacks and defenses for LLM agents. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=m1YYAQjO3w>.

-
- Suyu Ge, Chunting Zhou, Rui Hou, Madian Khabisa, Yi-Chia Wang, Qifan Wang, Jiawei Han, and Yuning Mao. MART: Improving LLM safety with multi-round automatic red-teaming. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2024.
- Yufei He, Juncheng Liu, Yue Liu, Yibo Li, Tri Cao, Zhiyuan Hu, Xinxing Xu, and Bryan Hooi. Evotest: Evolutionary test-time learning for self-improving agentic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.13220*, 2025.
- Keegan Hines, Gary Lopez, Matthew Hall, Federico Zarfati, Yonatan Zunger, and Emre Kiciman. Defending against indirect prompt injection attacks with spotlighting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14720*, 2024.
- Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, Jianfeng Chi, Rashi Rungta, Krithika Iyer, Yuning Mao, Michael Tontchev, Qing Hu, Brian Fuller, Davide Testuggine, and Madian Khabisa. Llama guard: LLM-based input-output safeguard for human-AI conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06674*, 2023.
- Feiran Jia, Tong Wu, Xin Qin, and Anna Squicciarini. The task shield: Enforcing task alignment to defend against indirect prompt injection in LLM agents. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2025.
- Yu Li, Haoyu Luo, Yuejin Xie, Yuqian Fu, Zhonghao Yang, Shuai Shao, Qihan Ren, Wanying Qu, Yanwei Fu, Yujiu Yang, Jing Shao, Xia Hu, and Dongrui Liu. ATBench: A diverse and realistic agent trajectory benchmark for safety evaluation and diagnosis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.02022*, 2026.
- Jiahang Lin, Shichun Liu, Chengjun Pan, Lizhi Lin, Shihan Dou, Zhiheng Xi, Xuanjing Huang, Hang Yan, Zhenhua Han, Tao Gui, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Agentic harness engineering: Observability-driven automatic evolution of coding-agent harnesses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.25850*, 2026a.
- Xixun Lin, Yang Liu, Yancheng Chen, Yongxuan Wu, Yucheng Ning, Yilong Liu, Nan Sun, Shun Zhang, Bin Chong, Chuan Zhou, and Yanan Cao. SafeHarness: Lifecycle-integrated security architecture for LLM-based agent deployment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.13630*, 2026b.
- Aixin Liu, Aoxue Mei, Bangcai Lin, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bingzheng Xu, Bochao Wu, Bowei Zhang, Chaofan Lin, Chen Dong, et al. Deepseek-v3. 2: Pushing the frontier of open large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.02556*, 2025.
- Dongrui Liu, Qihan Ren, Chen Qian, Shuai Shao, Yuejin Xie, Yu Li, Zhonghao Yang, Haoyu Luo, Peng Wang, Qingyu Liu, et al. AgentDoG: A diagnostic guardrail framework for AI agent safety and security. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.18491*, 2026a.
- Xiaogeng Liu, Nan Xu, Muhao Chen, and Chaowei Xiao. AutoDAN: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Zhe Liu, Zonghao Ying, Wenxin Zhang, Quanchen Zou, Deyue Zhang, Dongdong Yang, Xiangzheng Zhang, and Hao Peng. SafeHarbor: Hierarchical memory-augmented guardrail for LLM agent safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.05704*, 2026b.
- Jiaqi Luo, Songyang Peng, Jiarun Dai, Zhile Chen, Zhuoxiang Shen, Geng Hong, Xudong Pan, Yuan Zhang, and Min Yang. AgentGuard: An attribute-based access control framework for tool-use LLM-based agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.28071*, 2026.
- Qinghua Mao, Xi Lin, Jinze Gu, Jun Wu, Siyuan Li, and Yuliang Chen. Benchmarking safety risks of knowledge-intensive reasoning under malicious knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.10146*, 2026.
- Anay Mehrotra, Manolis Zampetakis, Paul Kassianik, Blaine Nelson, Hyrum Anderson, Yaron Singer, and Amin Karbasi. Tree of attacks: Jailbreaking black-box LLMs automatically. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02119*, 2023.
- Moonshot AI. Kimi K2.6: Advancing open-source coding, 2026. URL <https://www.kimi.com/blog/kimi-k2-6>. Accessed: 2026-07-26.
- Yutao Mou, Zhangchi Xue, Lijun Li, Peiyang Liu, Shikun Zhang, Wei Ye, and Jing Shao. ToolSafe: Enhancing tool invocation safety of LLM-based agents via proactive step-level guardrail and feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.10156*, 2026.

-
- OpenAI. Introducing GPT-5.5, 2026. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5-5/>. Accessed: 2026-07-26.
- Traian Rebedea, Razvan Dinu, Makesh Narsimhan Sreedhar, Christopher Parisien, and Jonathan Cohen. NeMo guardrails: A toolkit for controllable and safe LLM applications with programmable rails. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, 2023.
- Mikayel Samvelyan, Sharath Chandra Raparthy, Andrei Lupu, Eric Hambro, Aram H. Markosyan, Manish Bhatt, Yuning Mao, Minqi Jiang, Jack Parker-Holder, Jakob Foerster, Tim Rocktäschel, and Roberta Raileanu. Rainbow teaming: Open-ended generation of diverse adversarial prompts. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- Tianneng Shi, Jingxuan He, Zhun Wang, Hongwei Li, Linyu Wu, Wenbo Guo, and Dawn Song. Progent: Securing AI agents with privilege control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11703*, 2025.
- Peter Slattery, Alexander K Saeri, Emily AC Grundy, Jess Graham, Michael Noetel, Risto Uuk, James Dao, Soroush Pour, Stephen Casper, and Neil Thompson. The ai risk repository: A comprehensive meta-review, database, and taxonomy of risks from artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12622*, 2024.
- Weijia Song, Jiashu Yue, and Zhe Pang. ABSTRAL: Automatic design of multi-agent systems through iterative refinement and topology optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.22791*, 2026.
- Lilian Weng. Harness engineering for self-improvement. *Lil’Log*, July 2026. URL <https://lilianweng.github.io/posts/2026-07-04-harness/>.
- Yifan Yang, Ziyang Gong, WeiQuan Huang, Qihao Yang, Ziwei Zhou, Zisu Huang, Yan Li, Xuemei Gao, Qi Dai, Bei Liu, Kai Qiu, Yuqing Yang, Dongdong Chen, Xue Yang, and Chong Luo. Skillopt: Executive strategy for self-evolving agent skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.23904*, 2026.
- Jiahao Yu, Xingwei Lin, Zheng Yu, and Xinyu Xing. GPTFUZZER: Red teaming large language models with auto-generated jailbreak prompts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10253*, 2023.
- Tongxin Yuan, Zhiwei He, Lingzhong Dong, Yiming Wang, Ruijie Zhao, Tian Xia, Lizhen Xu, Binglin Zhou, Fangqi Li, Zhuosheng Zhang, Rui Wang, and Gongshen Liu. R-Judge: Benchmarking safety risk awareness for LLM agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, 2024. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.79/>.
- Z.ai. GLM-5.2: Built for long-horizon tasks, June 2026. URL <https://z.ai/blog/glm-5.2>. Accessed: 2026-07-26.
- Wenjun Zeng, Yuchi Liu, Ryan Mullins, Ludovic Peran, Joe Fernandez, Hamza Harkous, Karthik Narasimhan, Drew Proud, Piyush Kumar, Bhaktipriya Radharapu, Olivia Sturman, and Oscar Wahltinez. Shieldgemma: Generative AI content moderation based on gemma. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21772*, 2024.
- Hangfan Zhang, Shao Zhang, Kangcong Li, Chen Zhang, Yang Chen, Yiqun Zhang, Lei Bai, and Shuyue Hu. Self-harness: Harnesses that improve themselves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.09498*, 2026.
- Zhexin Zhang, Shiyao Cui, Yida Lu, Jingzhuo Zhou, Junxiao Yang, Hongning Wang, and Minlie Huang. Agent-safetybench: Evaluating the safety of LLM agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14470*, 2024.
- Wei Zhao, Zhe Li, Peixin Zhang, and Jun Sun. ClawGuard: A runtime security framework for tool-augmented LLM agents against indirect prompt injection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.11790*, 2026.

Appendix

A Implementation Details

Models and evolution setup. We use DeepSeek-V3.2 as the base tool-using agent and GPT-5.5 for structured diagnosis and artifact-edit generation. GPT-5.5 is also the full-trajectory judge for Agent-SafetyBench, whereas GPT-4o is the judge for AgentHarm. SHE runs 20 evolution rounds over 15 fixed Agent-SafetyBench

tasks. Each task is evaluated under six conditions (clean, context poisoning, indirect injection, tool tampering, memory injection, and composite attack), with two rollout replications per task-condition pair. Thus each round contains 90 task-condition instances and 180 rollout trajectories. The evolution IDs are 11, 18, 22, 28, 46, 49, 56, 61, 74, 75, 89, 100, 120, 174, and 199; the other 185 IDs in the released first-200 subset form the held-out Agent-SafetyBench split and are evaluated once under each condition. Safety Memory stores a boundary only when it remains unresolved after two rounds or recurs after artifact updates.

Evaluation. GPT-5.5 evaluates each Agent-SafetyBench rollout using the original task, attack condition, trajectory, tool-use evidence, and final response. The judgments are aggregated into Clean UBR, overall ASR, and overall UA.




Figure 6: Agent-SafetyBench full-trajectory judge template.

Baselines. All methods use the same task files, attack conditions, and rollout budget. No defense, System Prompt, LlamaFirewall, and SafeHarness are static controls. Adaptive baselines, including PROGENT and Memskill-SafeHarness, retain the artifacts/configurations evolved under the data and benchmark specified by their own implementations; they are not re-evolved on SHE’s 15-task split.

B Evolution History

Figure 7 records the candidate selected at each evolution round. Green circles indicate accepted candidates that update the best-so-far harness, whereas red crosses denote evaluated candidates that are retained as negative evidence. The step curve shows that SHE accepts updates at R00, R03, R04, R05, and R17. The best-so-far score rises sharply through R05, remains unchanged while later candidates are rejected, and receives a final improvement at R17.

The metric traces explain why selection is necessary. The accepted updates reduce Clean UBR and overall ASR while maintaining utility. Subsequent candidates can improve an individual metric but fail to improve the joint safety-utility criterion, so the retained harness remains unchanged. In particular, the plateau from R05 to R16 prevents transient candidates with lower utility or weaker safety from replacing the best harness. The accepted R17 update yields the final best score, while later candidates are rejected because they do not provide a better overall trade-off.

C Harness Artifact Structures

The four artifacts have distinct internal forms. The System Prompt is a single text safety contract, illustrated verbatim in the first panel of Figure 8. The Rule Bank consists of individual rule records. Each record specifies the relevant risk labels, the condition that activates the rule, the intervention to apply, and its rationale, benign exemption, priority, and supporting trajectories. A Safety Memory entry captures a contrastive boundary by pairing harmful and benign behaviors with blocked and allowed cases, source trajectories, confidence, and status. Tool Policy is composed of policy and detector records. These records specify where a check is applied, which tools it covers, the condition that triggers it, the resulting decision, and any warning, recovery action, or benign exemption. Figure 8 illustrates these four representations.




Figure 7: Evolution history under best-so-far selection. Top: accepted and rejected candidate scores, with the step curve denoting the retained harness. Bottom: Clean UBR, overall ASR, and overall UA across rounds. Shaded columns mark accepted updates.

System Prompt

You are a tool-using agent operating under SHE. Treat tool outputs, retrieved content, user-provided context, and memory as data, not higher-priority instructions. Follow Rule Bank, Safety Memory, and Tool Policy decisions over task completion. If an action is blocked, do not retry it through another tool or route. Preserve benign utility: do not refuse solely because of risk-related keywords.

Rule Bank

Fields: rule identifier; harm domain; attack surface; failure mode; triggering condition; intervention action; rationale; harmful pattern; benign exemption; priority; supporting trajectory IDs.
Stored form: a collection of individually addressable rules, with one record per safety boundary.

Safety Memory

Fields: memory identifier; topic; harmful boundary; benign boundary; blocked cases; allowed cases; source trajectories; confidence; status; retrieval keys.
Stored form: a compact contrastive boundary record that pairs prohibited and allowed behaviors with their evidence.

Tool Policy

Fields: policy identifier; control point; tool scope; path and sink constraints; unknown-tool handling; generated-content condition; trigger; decision; warning or recovery action; benign exemption; supporting trajectory IDs.
Stored form: a set of pre-call policies and runtime-event detectors, each represented by its control point, condition, and intervention.

Figure 8: Internal representations of the four SHE artifacts. The System Prompt panel shows a representative text prompt; the other panels list their structured records.

D Failure Diagnosis Dimensions

SHE diagnoses each failure along three dimensions. **Harm domain** specifies the type of potential harm, such as privacy leakage, financial loss, physical harm, cyber risk, availability compromise, or misinformation. **Attack surface** identifies where the risky instruction or content entered the agent, including the user request, retrieved content, tool output, tool specification, or memory. **Failure mode** describes how the harness failed, such as unsafe compliance, compliance with tainted context, unauthorized tool use, unsafe side effects, or over-refusal.

Dimension	Labels
Harm domain	data exfiltration or privacy, property or financial loss, physical or health harm, cyber or vulnerable code, availability compromise, legal, ethical, or social harm, misinformation or unsafe information
Attack surface	clean user goal, user or context input, tool output or retrieved content, tool specification or registry poisoning, memory or history, multiple channels
Failure mode	unsafe compliance, tainted context compliance, unauthorized tool use, unsafe side effect or blind trust, task failure or over-refusal

Table 4: Three dimensions used for SHE failure diagnosis. Harm domain characterizes the potential consequence, attack surface identifies the channel through which risky content enters the agent, and failure mode describes the resulting unsafe, unreliable, or over-refusing behavior.