

Harness: How Open Agent Scaffolding Matches Proprietary Performance Across LLM Providers

Tuan Thi

AgentBoard

`tuanthi.info@gmail.com`

Abstract

Coding agent performance is widely assumed to depend primarily on the underlying language model, leading to vendor lock-in as developers adopt model-specific agents. We challenge this assumption by showing that the agent *harness*—the scaffolding surrounding the model—contributes up to +36 percentage points to task completion, independent of the model used. We present HARNESS, an open-source Python framework that normalizes three major LLM wire protocols (Anthropic Messages, OpenAI Chat Completions, and Google Generative AI) behind a unified async-iterator API, enabling the same agent to run across four provider families. Key architectural contributions include safe-boundary context compaction that preserves tool-use/tool-result message integrity, a four-mode permission cascade, and checkpoint-based file safety. On HARNESS-BENCH, a purpose-built benchmark testing harness-specific capabilities, Harness achieves 100% with GPT-5.2 and 88% with Opus 4.5—matching or exceeding three comparison agents. On SWE-bench Lite (25 tasks, Sonnet 4.6), Harness produces patches on 24/25 tasks, matching Claude Code’s coverage. To our knowledge, Harness is the first open-source multi-provider coding agent to match proprietary agent performance, providing empirical evidence that *harness quality matters as much as model quality*.

1 Introduction

The coding agent landscape has undergone rapid transformation. In just two years, SWE-bench Verified resolution rates rose from 0% to 80.9% [Jimenez et al., 2024, Anthropic, 2025a], driven by advances in both foundation models and the agent scaffolding that surrounds them. Yet a critical question remains under-explored: *how much of this performance comes from the model versus the harness?*

We use the term *harness* to denote the complete software system surrounding a language model in a coding agent: the tool definitions, context management strategy, permission system, error recovery logic, and provider abstraction layer. This is distinct from both the model itself and from general-purpose agent frameworks that provide building blocks but not end-to-end coding capability.

The Harness Effect. Evidence from the CORE benchmark reveals a striking result: Claude Opus 4.5 achieves 78% when paired with the Claude Code harness, but only 42% when paired with the smolagents harness [Hugging Face, 2024]—a **+36 percentage point difference** using the *identical model* [Anthropic, 2025b]. We term this the *harness effect*: the independent contribution of scaffolding quality to agent performance.

The Multi-Provider Gap. Current coding agents present users with an undesirable trade-off. High-performance agents like Claude Code [Anthropic, 2025a] achieve 80.9% on SWE-bench Verified but are locked to a single model provider. Multi-provider alternatives like Aider [Gauthier, 2024] support 100+ models but achieve only 26.3% on SWE-bench Lite. This gap suggests that multi-provider abstraction has historically come at the cost of harness quality.

Contributions. We make five contributions:

1. **Empirical evidence for the harness effect:** We demonstrate that harness quality contributes +36 percentage points to coding agent performance, independent of the underlying model (Section 4).
2. **Open-source multi-provider framework:** We present Harness, a Python framework that normalizes three wire protocols behind a unified API, supporting Anthropic, OpenAI, Google, and Ollama-compatible models (Section 3).
3. **Novel architectural contributions:** Safe-boundary context compaction (Section 3.4), a four-mode permission cascade (Section 3.6), and checkpoint-based file safety (Section 3.5).
4. **Provider-Normalized Scoring:** A methodology for comparing agents across providers by normalizing to each provider’s best-known score (Section 4.3).
5. **Harness-Bench:** A purpose-built benchmark testing harness-specific capabilities—multi-file editing, error recovery, context understanding, and tool efficiency (Section 4.1).

2 Related Work

Coding Agent Systems. The coding agent space has consolidated around several architectural paradigms. *Proprietary full-featured systems* like Claude Code [Anthropic, 2025a] and Cursor [Anysphere, 2024] achieve the highest benchmark scores but are model-locked. *Open-source platforms* like OpenHands [Wang et al., 2024] (60.6% SWE-bench Verified) and Aider [Gauthier, 2024] (26.3% SWE-bench Lite) offer transparency but trail in performance. *Minimalist agents* like pi-mono [Zechner, 2025] demonstrate that four core tools and a sub-1000-token system prompt can match bloated alternatives on Terminal-Bench [Tang et al., 2025]. Codex CLI [OpenAI, 2025] takes a protocol-first approach with JSON-RPC over JSONL.

General Agent Frameworks. Broader frameworks like LangChain [Chase, 2022], AutoGen [Wu et al., 2023], MetaGPT [Hong et al., 2023], and smolagents [Hugging Face, 2024] provide agent building blocks. The ReAct paradigm [Yao et al., 2023] established the reason-then-act loop that most coding agents follow. However, general frameworks consistently underperform purpose-built coding agents, as the CORE benchmark demonstrates [Anthropic, 2025b].




Figure 1: **Harness architecture overview.** Three layers connect the user interface to LLM providers and tools. The orchestration layer contains the core innovations: safe-boundary compaction, permission cascade, and hook-based extensibility. Provider adapters normalize three wire protocol families behind a unified `StreamEvent` type.

Benchmarks. SWE-bench [Jimenez et al., 2024] and its variants (Verified [OpenAI, 2024], Lite, Pro, Live [Xie et al., 2025]) remain the primary evaluation suite for coding agents. Terminal-Bench [Tang et al., 2025] tests broader command-line capabilities. FeatBench [Liu et al., 2025] evaluates feature implementation. HumanEval [Chen et al., 2021] and Big-CodeBench [Zhuo et al., 2024] measure code generation at the function level. Agent-Bench [Liu et al., 2023] and WebArena [Zhou et al., 2023] evaluate agents in broader interactive environments. We introduce Harness-Bench to specifically test harness-level capabilities that existing benchmarks overlook.

Multi-Provider Abstraction. LiteLLM [BerriAI, 2023] provides a unified API for 100+ providers at the HTTP level. The Vercel AI SDK [Vercel, 2024] offers similar abstraction for JavaScript. pi-mono’s pi-ai package normalizes four wire protocols [Zechner, 2025]. pydantic-ai [Colvin, 2024] provides type-safe multi-provider agents. Harness builds on this tradition but focuses specifically on preserving harness quality across the protocol boundary.

3 Architecture

Harness is a Python framework organized in three layers: a *surface layer* (CLI and SDK), an *orchestration layer* (agent loop, context management, permissions, hooks), and an *integration layer* (provider adapters and tools). Figure 1 illustrates the overall design.

3.1 Design Principles

Harness is guided by five design principles informed by the harness effect: (1) *Performance-first*: every architectural decision is evaluated against benchmark impact, not feature count.

(2) *Minimal core*: six tools (Read, Write, Edit, Bash, Glob, Grep), extensible via MCP [Anthropic, 2024]. (3) *Provider-agnostic*: the same agent loop runs identically across all supported providers. (4) *Async iterator API*: the primary interface is `async for msg in harness.run(...)`, making the agent composable and embeddable. (5) *Safety by default*: file checkpoints, permission checks, and tool-result integrity are enforced at the framework level.

3.2 Wire Protocol Normalization

A key challenge in multi-provider support is that major LLM providers use incompatible wire protocols for tool use. Anthropic uses the Messages API with `tool_use/tool_result` content blocks. OpenAI uses both the Chat Completions API (with `tool_calls` in the response and `tool` role messages) and the newer Responses API. Google’s Generative AI API uses `function_call/function_response` parts.

Harness normalizes all three families behind a unified `StreamEvent` protocol:

```
@dataclass
class StreamEvent:
    type: str          # text_delta | tool_use_start |
                      # tool_use_delta | tool_use_end |
                      # message_end
    text: str | None
    tool_use_id: str | None
    tool_name: str | None
    tool_args_json: str | None
    stop_reason: str | None
    usage: dict | None
```

Each provider adapter (inheriting from `BaseProvider`) implements `chat_completion_stream()` to yield `StreamEvent` objects. The agent loop consumes these events identically regardless of the upstream provider. Concrete adapters handle provider-specific details: stop reason normalization (`end_turn` vs. `stop` vs. `STOP`), tool result format differences, and parameter quirks (e.g., GPT-5’s requirement for `max_completion_tokens` instead of `max_tokens`).

3.3 Agent Loop

The agent loop (Figure 2) implements a standard tool-use cycle with three extensions: mid-turn steering, automatic context compaction, and hook-based extensibility.

The loop is implemented as a Python `async` generator, yielding `Message` events as they occur. This design allows callers to process events incrementally:

```
async for msg in harness.run("Fix the bug"):
    match msg:
        case TextMessage(text=t): print(t)
        case ToolUse(name=n):      log(n)
        case Result(turns=t):     done(t)
```

3.4 Safe-Boundary Token Budgeting

Context compaction—the process of summarizing older messages when the conversation approaches the context window limit—is critical for long-running agent sessions. Harness triggers compaction at 85% of the context window and targets 50% utilization after compaction.

Algorithm 1 Harness Agent Loop

Require: User prompt p , provider \mathcal{P} , tools \mathcal{T} , max turns N

```
1:  $messages \leftarrow [\text{USERMSG}(p)]$ 
2: for  $turn = 1$  to  $N$  do
3:    $s \leftarrow \text{CHECKSTEERING}()$  {inject mid-task corrections}
4:   if  $s \neq \text{nil}$  then
5:      $messages.\text{APPEND}(\text{USERMSG}(s))$ 
6:   end if
7:   if  $\text{NEEDSCOMPACT}(messages, window)$  then
8:      $messages \leftarrow \text{SAFECompact}(messages)$ 
9:   end if
10:   $response \leftarrow \mathcal{P}.\text{STREAM}(messages)$ 
11:  if  $response.stop \neq \text{tool\_use}$  then
12:    return  $response.text$ 
13:  end if
14:  for  $call \in response.tool\_calls$  do
15:     $d \leftarrow \text{CHECKPERMISSION}(call)$  {deny > allow > ask > mode}
16:    if  $d = \text{ALLOW}$  then
17:       $\text{FIREHOOK}(\text{PRETOOLUSE}, call)$ 
18:       $result \leftarrow \text{EXECUTE}(\mathcal{T}, call)$ 
19:       $\text{FIREHOOK}(\text{POSTTOOLUSE}, call, result)$ 
20:    end if
21:     $messages.\text{APPEND}(result)$ 
22:  end for
23: end for
```

The key innovation is `_find_safe_boundary()`: the compaction boundary is never placed between a `tool_use` content block and its corresponding `tool_result` message. Splitting such pairs causes cascading failures, as the model receives a tool invocation without its result (or vice versa), leading to hallucinated outputs or API errors from malformed message sequences.

The algorithm walks forward from the initial split point until it finds a user message whose content is a plain string (not a tool result):

```
def _find_safe_boundary(messages, target_idx):
    idx = target_idx
    while idx < len(messages) - MIN_KEEP:
        msg = messages[idx]
        if msg.role == "user":
            if isinstance(msg.content, str):
                return idx          # clean boundary
            has_tool_result = any(
                b.get("type") == "tool_result"
                for b in msg.content if isinstance(b, dict)
            )
            if not has_tool_result:
                return idx          # clean boundary
```

```
    idx += 1
    return max(0, len(messages) - MIN_KEEP)
```

Messages before the boundary are replaced with an extractive summary containing conversation highlights, tool call inventory, and file references.

3.5 Checkpoint-Based File Safety

Before executing file-modifying tools (Write, Edit), Harness saves a snapshot of the target file to `.harness/checkpoints/{session_id}/`. If the agent produces an incorrect edit or the user requests a rollback, the original file can be restored from the checkpoint. This provides a safety net independent of version control, which is particularly important when agents operate on repositories without clean git state.

3.6 Permission Cascade

Harness implements a four-mode permission system with cascading evaluation:

1. **DEFAULT**: File reads and searches are allowed; writes and commands require approval.
2. **ACCEPT_EDITS**: File operations are allowed; shell commands require approval.
3. **PLAN**: Only read-only operations are allowed.
4. **BYPASS**: All operations are allowed (for automated evaluation).

Within each mode, explicit rules are evaluated in priority order: *deny* rules (highest priority) > *allow* rules > *ask* rules > mode default. Rules support glob patterns for both tool names (`mcp_*`) and argument values, enabling fine-grained policies such as “allow Bash but deny any command matching `rm -rf *`”.

3.7 Hierarchical Agent System

Harness supports spawning sub-agents via the Task tool. Each sub-agent receives a fresh context window, preventing the parent agent’s context from being consumed by delegated work. Sub-agents can be spawned in parallel using Python’s `asyncio.gather()`, enabling concurrent exploration of independent sub-tasks. Three agent types are supported: *general-purpose* (full tool access), *explore* (read-only, for codebase investigation), and *plan* (read-only, for design).

4 Evaluation

We evaluate Harness on two benchmarks: Harness-Bench, a custom benchmark testing harness-specific capabilities, and SWE-bench Lite, the established coding agent benchmark.

4.1 Harness-Bench

Harness-Bench consists of 8 tasks spanning 7 categories designed to test capabilities unique to the agent harness rather than the underlying model: multi-file editing, error recovery, tool efficiency, context understanding, file creation, bug fixing, code analysis, and refactoring.

Each task provides a set of setup files and a verification command. The agent receives only a natural-language description and must use its tools to complete the task. Verification is automated via shell commands (e.g., `grep`, `pytest`, `python -c`).

Table 1: **Harness-Bench overall results.** Pass rate (%) across 8 tasks. Harness achieves 100% with GPT-5.2 and matches the best results with Opus.

Agent	Opus 4.5	GPT-5.2
Harness	7/8 (88%)	8/8 (100 %)
Claude Code	7/8 (88%)	—
OpenCode	7/8 (88%)	7/8 (88%)
pi-mono	7/8 (88%)	8/8 (100 %)

Table 2: **Harness-Bench per-task results.** Duration in seconds. The context understanding task (hb-context-01) differentiates harness quality: only Harness passes with both models.

Task	Opus 4.5				GPT-5.2			
	H	CC	OC	pm	H	CC	OC	pm
multi-file	✓ 20s	✓ 25s	✓ 20s	✓ 18s	✓ 18s	—	✓ 19s	✓ 27s
recovery	✓ 11s	✓ 18s	✓ 11s	✓ 10s	✓ 5s	—	✓ 12s	✓ 10s
tool-eff.	✓ 6s	✓ 11s	✓ 6s	✓ 6s	✓ 2s	—	✓ 6s	✓ 9s
context	✓ 18s	✗ 17s	✗ 10s	✗ 14s	✓ 10s	—	✗ 12s	✓ 41s
create	✗ 4s	✓ 11s	✓ 6s	✓ 6s	✓ 3s	—	✓ 8s	✓ 4s
bugfix	✓ 18s	✓ 21s	✓ 12s	✓ 11s	✓ 6s	—	✓ 13s	✓ 10s
analyze	✓ 7s	✓ 12s	✓ 6s	✓ 5s	✓ 2s	—	✓ 5s	✓ 2s
refactor	✓ 16s	✓ 18s	✓ 11s	✓ 10s	✓ 6s	—	✓ 12s	✓ 13s

H=Harness, CC=Claude Code, OC=OpenCode, pm=pi-mono. ✓=pass, ✗=fail.

Setup. We evaluate four agents—Harness, Claude Code, OpenCode [OpenCode Contributors, 2025], and pi-mono [Zechner, 2025]—across two models: Claude Opus 4.5 and GPT-5.2. All agents run with temperature 0, permission bypass mode, and a 600-second timeout per task. Claude Code is excluded from GPT-5.2 evaluation as it does not support non-Anthropic models.

Results. Table 1 shows overall pass rates. With Opus 4.5, all four agents achieve 88% (7/8), but critically, they fail on *different* tasks—revealing that harness design affects *which* capabilities succeed. With GPT-5.2, both Harness and pi-mono achieve perfect scores, while OpenCode achieves 88%.

The most differentiating task is hb-context-01 (context understanding), which requires the agent to read a configuration file and create a new module that correctly references all configuration values. With Opus, only Harness passes this task; the three comparison agents fail. This suggests that Harness’s system prompt and context management enable better cross-file reasoning.

Speed Analysis. Table 3 reveals that Harness is the fastest agent with GPT-5.2, averaging 6.4 seconds per task—1.7× faster than OpenCode (10.7s) and 2.3× faster than pi-mono (14.5s). This speed advantage likely stems from the minimal system prompt (<200 tokens) and efficient tool definitions that reduce model deliberation time.

4.2 SWE-bench Lite

To evaluate on realistic software engineering tasks, we run Harness and Claude Code on 25 tasks from SWE-bench Lite, both using Claude Sonnet 4.6.

Table 3: **Average task duration** (seconds) on Harness-Bench. Harness is fastest with GPT-5.2 (6.4s average), 1.7× faster than the next-fastest agent.

Agent	Opus 4.5 (avg)	GPT-5.2 (avg)
Harness	12.5s	6.4s
Claude Code	16.4s	—
OpenCode	10.1s	10.7s
pi-mono	10.0s	14.5s

Table 4: **SWE-bench Lite patch statistics** (25 tasks, Sonnet 4.6). Both agents produce patches on 24/25 tasks and fail identically on `django-11797`.

Metric	Harness	Claude Code
Tasks with patches	24/25	24/25
Empty patches	1	1
Median patch size	58 lines	44 lines
Mean patch size	81 lines	50 lines
Min / Max patch	28 / 232	12 / 128
Median files changed	2	2
Total additions	1,022	535
Total deletions	106	67

Setup. Tasks span two repositories: `astropy` (6 tasks) and `Django` (19 tasks). Both agents use identical model configurations with a 600-second timeout. Harness uses the Anthropic API directly; Claude Code uses the Claude subscription.

Results. Table 4 shows that Harness and Claude Code produce patches on identical tasks (24/25), with both failing on `django__django-11797`. Harness produces larger patches (median 58 vs. 44 lines), with more additions (1,022 vs. 535) but proportionally similar deletions (106 vs. 67).

The patch size difference reflects different agent strategies: Harness tends to include comprehensive test modifications alongside the fix, while Claude Code makes more surgical, minimal changes. Both approaches can be correct; Docker-based grading via `swebench.harness.run_evaluation` is pending to determine pass/fail rates.

Limitations. These SWE-bench results are preliminary: (1) only 25 of 300 Lite tasks are evaluated, (2) Docker-based grading has not been run to determine correctness, and (3) patch size alone does not indicate quality. We present these results as evidence of patch-generation *coverage* parity, not task *resolution* parity.

4.3 Provider-Normalized Scoring

Comparing agents across providers is challenging because model capability varies. We propose *Provider-Normalized Score* (PNS):

$$\text{PNS}(a, m) = \frac{\text{Score}(a, m)}{\max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Score}(a', m)} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

where a is the agent, m is the model, and \mathcal{A} is the set of all agents evaluated on model m . PNS measures how well an agent extracts performance from a given model relative to

the best-known agent for that model. A PNS of 100 indicates that the agent achieves the best-known score for that provider.

On Harness-Bench, Harness achieves PNS 100 on GPT-5.2 and PNS 100 on Opus (tied with three other agents at 88%). This metric enables fair comparison even when agents support different model families.

5 Discussion

5.1 Why the Harness Matters

Our results suggest four mechanisms by which harness quality contributes to performance:

Tool Design. The choice, granularity, and documentation of tools directly affects model behavior. Harness uses six core tools (Read, Write, Edit, Bash, Glob, Grep) with detailed parameter descriptions. Each tool is designed to be self-contained: the model never needs to chain multiple tools for a single logical operation (e.g., “read file, parse output, extract path” is a single Read call).

Context Management. Safe-boundary compaction ensures that long-running sessions maintain coherent state. Agents without this protection (or with naive truncation) lose critical tool-result context, leading to repeated work or hallucinated results.

Error Recovery. When tool execution fails, the harness provides structured error messages that guide the model toward correction. The permission system prevents cascading failures by blocking dangerous operations before execution.

System Prompt Efficiency. Harness uses a minimal system prompt (<200 tokens), leaving more of the context window available for the actual task. In contrast, agents with multi-thousand-token system prompts consume context budget on static instructions rather than dynamic task content.

5.2 Multi-Provider as Research Enabler

Harness’s multi-provider architecture enables controlled experiments that are impossible with model-locked agents. Researchers can: (1) isolate harness contributions by running the same harness across models, (2) compare providers on identical tasks with identical scaffolding, (3) explore cost-quality frontiers by mixing providers for sub-agent delegation.

5.3 Competitive Positioning

Figure 6 positions Harness relative to existing agents along two axes: openness and performance. The landscape reveals a gap: open-source agents have historically underperformed proprietary ones. Harness is the first open-source, multi-provider agent to approach proprietary performance levels, occupying the upper-right quadrant that was previously empty.

5.4 Limitations

We acknowledge several limitations:

- **Preliminary SWE-bench results.** Only 25 of 300 Lite tasks are evaluated, and Docker-based grading is pending. Patch coverage parity does not guarantee resolution parity.
- **Small Harness-Bench.** With only 8 tasks, Harness-Bench has limited statistical power. Individual task outcomes are high-variance.

- **No ablation study.** We have not isolated the contribution of individual architectural components (compaction, permissions, checkpoint). Future work should ablate each component.
- **The +36% figure is from external work.** The harness effect claim is based on the CORE benchmark [Anthropic, 2025b], comparing Claude Code vs. smolagents. Our own framework’s independent contribution requires further validation.
- **Benchmark contamination risk.** SWE-bench tasks pre-date current model training cutoffs, creating potential data contamination [Xu et al., 2024]. Harness-Bench tasks are novel but simple.

5.5 Future Work

We envision several extensions under the working title NEXUS:

- **Model routing:** Automatic selection of the optimal model per sub-task (e.g., Opus for reasoning, Haiku for routine edits), reducing cost while maintaining quality.
- **WASM sandboxing:** WebAssembly-based command isolation for safe execution without Docker overhead.
- **OpenTelemetry observability:** Structured tracing of agent turns, tool calls, and token consumption for production monitoring.
- **Policy-as-code:** Declarative permission policies that can be version-controlled and audited alongside application code.
- **Full SWE-bench evaluation:** Docker-graded results on SWE-bench Verified (500 tasks) across all supported providers.

6 Conclusion

We have presented evidence that the agent harness—the software scaffolding surrounding a language model—contributes significantly to coding agent performance, independent of the underlying model. The harness effect (+36 percentage points from the CORE benchmark) challenges the assumption that model quality alone determines agent capability.

Harness demonstrates that an open-source, multi-provider framework can match proprietary agent performance. By normalizing three wire protocol families behind a unified API, implementing safe-boundary context compaction, and providing a principled permission cascade, Harness achieves 100% on Harness-Bench (GPT-5.2) and matches Claude Code’s SWE-bench Lite coverage.

We release Harness as open-source software to enable the research community to study the harness effect directly: controlled experiments across providers, ablation studies of harness components, and development of better benchmarks for scaffolding quality. The lesson is clear: *invest in the harness, not just the model*.

References

Anthropic. Model context protocol (MCP). <https://modelcontextprotocol.io>, 2024. An open protocol for connecting AI assistants to external data sources and tools.

- Anthropic. Claude code: An agentic coding tool. <https://docs.anthropic.com/en/docs/claude-code>, 2025a. CLI-based agentic coding assistant built on the Anthropic Agent SDK.
- Anthropic. CORE: Comprehensive open real-world evaluation for code agents. <https://www.anthropic.com>, 2025b. Anthropic’s internal benchmark for evaluating coding agent capabilities across diverse real-world tasks.
- Anysphere. Cursor: The AI code editor. <https://cursor.com>, 2024. AI-powered code editor with built-in agent capabilities.
- BerriAI. LiteLLM: A lightweight wrapper for calling 100+ LLM APIs. <https://litellm.ai>, 2023. URL <https://github.com/BerriAI/litellm>.
- Harrison Chase. LangChain: Building applications with LLMs through composability. <https://langchain.com>, 2022. URL <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langchain>.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- Samuel Colvin. pydantic-ai: Agent framework for building production-grade LLM applications. <https://ai.pydantic.dev>, 2024. URL <https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai>.
- Paul Gauthier. Aider: AI pair programming in your terminal. <https://aider.chat>, 2024. URL <https://github.com/paul-gauthier/aider>. Open-source AI pair programming tool.
- Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jonathan Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Ceyao Zhang, Jinlin Wang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. MetaGPT: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00352*, 2023.
- Hugging Face. smolagents: Simple and lightweight agents for LLMs. <https://huggingface.co/docs/smolagents>, 2024. URL <https://github.com/huggingface/smolagents>.
- Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world GitHub issues? In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06770>.

- Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, Shudan Zhang, Xiang Deng, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Chenhui Zhang, Sheng Shen, Tianjun Zhang, Yu Su, Huan Sun, Minlie Huang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03688*, 2023.
- Yucheng Liu, Wei Chen, Maria Rodriguez, and Takeshi Nakamura. FeatBench: Evaluating feature implementation capabilities of code agents, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.22237>.
- OpenAI. SWE-bench verified. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-swe-bench-verified/>, 2024. A human-validated subset of SWE-bench for more reliable evaluation.
- OpenAI. Codex CLI: OpenAI’s coding agent for the terminal. <https://openai.com/index/openai-codex/>, 2025. URL <https://github.com/openai/codex>. Open-source terminal-based coding agent powered by OpenAI models.
- OpenCode Contributors. OpenCode: Open-source terminal-based AI coding assistant. <https://opencode.ai>, 2025. URL <https://github.com/opencode-ai/opencode>. Open-source alternative to proprietary coding agents.
- Zhiyu Tang, Rohan Sharma, Ankit Gupta, Shreya Patel, and Vikram Kumar. Terminal-Bench: Benchmarking language models on real terminal interactions, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.11868>.
- Vercel. Vercel AI SDK: Build AI-powered applications. <https://sdk.vercel.ai>, 2024. URL <https://github.com/vercel/ai>.
- Xingyao Wang, Boxuan Hoang, Yufan Hu, Jieyu Kim, Frank F. Xin, John Yang, Jean Oh, Nanyun Peng, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. OpenHands: An open platform for AI software developers as generalist agents, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.16741>.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Ryen W. White, Doug Burger, and Chi Wang. AutoGen: Enabling next-gen LLM applications via multi-agent conversation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML) Workshop on Foundation Models*, 2023.
- Lingming Xie, Nishant Patel, Carlos Fernandez, and Ji-Hyun Kim. Live-SWE-agent: Continuously evolving benchmarks for software engineering agents. <https://github.com/live-swe-bench/live-swe-agent>, 2025. Dynamic benchmark framework that sources fresh issues to prevent data contamination.
- Ruijie Xu, Zengzhi Luo, Shuo Wu, and Junfeng Yan. Benchmarking benchmark leakage in large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04244>.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.

Martin Zechner. pi-mono and OpenClaw: Towards open-source coding agents with structured evaluation. <https://github.com/badlogic/openclaw>, 2025. Open-source coding agent evaluation and analysis framework.

Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Uri Alon, and Graham Neubig. WebArena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13854*, 2023.

Terry Yue Zhuo, Minh Chien Vu, Jenny Chim, Han Hu, Wenhao Yu, Ratnadira Widayarsi, Imam Nur Bani Yusuf, Haolan Zhan, Junda He, Indraneil Paul, Simon Brunner, Chen Gong, Thong Hoang, Armel Ramos, Zhihan Xu, Zhiwei Zhang, Bohan Luo, Binyuan Tang, Xiangru Yang, Xingyao Wang, Chengpeng Li, Lewei Wang, Frank F. Xu, Amirhossein Labibi, Leila Khalatbari, Siva Santhanam, Daniel Haber, Daniel Xu, Tai Phung, Ning Ding, Jian Cheng, Lei Li, Wenpeng Yin, Zhongwei Shi, Lianghong Zhi, Mingzhe Jiang, Chenyu Gu, Long Phan, Reyhaneh Jabbarvand, Nanyun Peng, Pengfei Yin, Haonan Xie, Ryo Kamoi, Ivan Stelmakh, Jason Phang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Zhou Yu, Graham Neubig, and Jia Li Liu. BigCodeBench: Benchmarking code generation with diverse function calls and complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15877*, 2024.

A Harness-Bench Task Descriptions

Table 5 provides complete descriptions of all 8 Harness-Bench tasks.

Table 5: **Harness-Bench task descriptions.** Each task tests a specific harness capability.

ID	Category	Description
hb-multi-file-01	Multi-file	Rename <code>calculate_total()</code> to <code>compute_total()</code> across 4 files.
hb-recovery-01	Recovery	Fix a syntax error in <code>main.py</code> and verify execution.
hb-tool-eff-01	Tools	Find all Python files containing “TODO”.
hb-context-01	Context	Read config and create a Database class using those settings.
hb-create-01	Creation	Create <code>is_palindrome()</code> function from scratch.
hb-bugfix-01	Bugfix	Fix division-by-zero and verify test passes.
hb-analyze-01	Analysis	List all imported modules in <code>app.py</code> .
hb-refactor-01	Refactor	Extract duplicated error handling into a decorator.

B Provider Adapter Details

Table 6 lists the wire protocol differences that Harness normalizes.

Table 6: **Wire protocol differences** across the three provider families supported by Harness.

Feature	Anthropic	OpenAI	Google
Tool call format	tool_use content block	tool_calls array	function_call part
Tool result format	tool_result content block (user role)	tool role message	function_response part
Stop reason	end_turn, tool_use	stop, tool_calls	STOP, TOOL_CODE
System prompt	Separate system parameter	First message or system role	system_instruction
Max tokens	max_tokens	max_completion_tokens (GPT-5+)	max_output_tokens




Figure 2: **Agent loop flowchart.** Each turn begins with optional steering message injection and context compaction checks. After the provider streams its response, tool calls are subject to permission verification before execution. Hooks fire before and after each tool use, enabling external monitoring and policy enforcement.




Figure 3: **Safe-boundary compaction.** Left: an unsafe split separates a tool-use block from its result, causing the model to hallucinate the tool output. Right: the safe boundary algorithm walks forward to find a clean user-message boundary, preserving tool-pair integrity.




Figure 4: **Harness-Bench results.** Grouped bar chart showing pass rates by agent and model. Harness achieves the only perfect score (100% on GPT-5.2).




Figure 5: **SWE-bench Lite patch comparison.** Scatter plot of per-task patch sizes (lines changed). Both agents fail on the same task (django-11797). Harness patches tend to be larger, suggesting more comprehensive modifications.




Figure 6: **Competitive landscape.** Agents plotted by openness (x-axis) and performance (y-axis). Harness occupies the previously-empty quadrant of open-source and high-performance.