

Governance Decay: How Context Compaction Silently Erases Safety Constraints in Long-Horizon LLM Agents

Shiyang Chen

Beijing Institute of Technology
3120240666@bit.edu.cn

Abstract

Modern LLM agents periodically *compact* their context—summarizing or evicting earlier turns to stay within a token budget. We show that this mechanism is a silent safety-failure surface: in-context governance constraints (runtime policies, memory entries, standing instructions) that an agent reliably obeys while visible are dropped when the harness compacts the history, because compaction optimizes for task continuity and treats standing policies as low-salience content. We term this **Governance Decay** and quantify it with **ConstraintRot**, a benchmark with deterministic violation grading. Across seven models (1,323 episodes), compaction raises violation from **0% to 30%** (up to 59%); when the constraint survives the summary violation is 0%, when dropped 38%. Decay is $8.3\times$ larger for soft organizational policies than for hard safety norms, eroding exactly the deployment-specific constraints that live in context. We introduce the **Compaction-Eviction Attack**, where an adversary biases compaction to delete a constraint; optimizing the injection defeats every model, including one immune to the fixed probe (0%→65%). We propose **Constraint Pinning**, a training-free defense that restores violation to **0%** for ≈ 47 pinned tokens ($< 0.5\%$ of a production-scale compaction context), and report where it still fails. Our results identify context management as a first-class agent-governance surface.

1 Introduction

Consider an enterprise assistant whose runtime memory carries a single standing rule: *never send email to a recipient outside the company domain*. This rule may have been loaded from an organizational policy document, user-provided workspace memory, or a prior onboarding turn; crucially, it is not an immutable system message that the framework promises to preserve. Early in a session, asked to forward a contract draft to an external lawyer, the agent correctly refuses and routes the message internally instead—exactly the governed behavior its operator intended. The agent then keeps working: it reads files, calls tools, and ingests a long thread of returned data. After a few thousand more tokens, the harness does what every modern agent harness now does—it *compacts* the history, folding the older turns into a short summary to stay under a token budget. The summary faithfully records the task state but, optimizing for continuity, quietly drops the “old” compliance preamble. Moments later the agent is asked again to email the external lawyer. This

time it complies, attaching the contract and sending it outside the organization. The model has not changed, the request has not changed, and no jailbreak was used; the only thing that changed is that the rule the agent was obeying is no longer in front of it.

This failure mode is the subject of our paper. As LLM agents move from single-turn assistants to autonomous systems that reason, plan, and act over long, multi-step tool-use trajectories (Yao et al. 2023; Schick et al. 2023; Shinn et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2024), their histories outgrow the context window, and the dominant response is *context compaction*: an LLM-based summarization or eviction step that periodically compresses the history (Kang et al. 2025; Cim et al. 2026; Semenov and Dorofeev 2026; LangChain 2024). Compaction runs routinely—practitioners report triggering it at as little as 5–20k tokens (Kang et al. 2025)—and has been engineered for one objective: preserving *task accuracy* (Liu et al. 2024a; Hong, Troynikov, and Huber 2025; Hadeliya et al. 2025).

We argue that compaction is also a governance-critical decision, and that it has been engineered for the wrong objective. Agents are increasingly governed by *in-context* constraints—organizational policies, standing instructions, and loaded “memory” that specify what the agent must and must not do (Xiang et al. 2024; DeBenedetti et al. 2024; Park et al. 2023). A compaction step optimized for task continuity has no reason to preserve such a standing policy: the policy is “old,” it is not the current sub-goal, and it competes for a shrinking token budget against the active task state. The result is **Governance Decay**: an agent that reliably refuses a prohibited action while the policy is in context performs that same action after compaction, because the constraint did not survive the summary. The stakes are concrete—an external email leak, a destructive production operation, a disclosure of secrets—and the gap is structural: the very component deployed to keep agents running is the one that erases the rules keeping them in bounds. Worse, because compaction consumes content the agent ingests, an adversary who controls nothing but a returned tool output can *induce* this failure on demand, turning a silent reliability bug into an exploitable attack.

This paper makes four contributions.

- **ConstraintRot**, a benchmark of self-contained long-horizon agent scenarios that pairs a governance constraint

with a later prohibited request, graded *deterministically* by detecting the prohibited effect in the agent’s tool call (Sec. 4).

- A systematic benchmarked measurement of **Governance Decay**: compaction-induced deletion of in-context governance constraints and the downstream tool-call violations it causes across seven model families and four compaction strategies (Sec. 5).
- The **Compaction-Eviction Attack**, a deletion-oriented variant of indirect prompt injection in which an adversary supplying only in-context data forces or biases compaction to omit a legitimate constraint (Sec. 6).
- **Constraint Pinning**, a simple training-free mitigation inspired by protected state and policy replay: governance constraints are quarantined from lossy compaction and integrity-checked across turns, restoring violation to 0% for ≈ 47 pinned tokens ($< 0.5\%$ overhead at production scale)—together with an honest stress-test of where naive pinning still fails and the open problem it leaves (Sec. 7).

Taken together, these results reposition *context management* as a first-class agent-governance surface—distinct from, but complementary to, the model, tool layer, and memory store studied in current agent-security work—and show that governing an agent requires governing how it forgets. Figure 1 summarizes the phenomenon, the attack, and the defense.

2 Related Work

Context compaction. Systems work manages unbounded agent histories via virtual context management (Packer et al. 2023), LLM summarization (Kang et al. 2025; Cim et al. 2026), structured eviction (Semenov and Dorofeev 2026), and trajectory-grounded validation (Chen et al. 2026). At the attention level, KV-cache eviction keeps inference within budget by dropping low-salience tokens (Xiao et al. 2024; Zhang et al. 2023). All optimize for task accuracy or throughput; none measure whether *governance constraints* survive the rewrite or whether their deletion causes unsafe tool calls.

Constraint loss in long contexts. Long-context degradation is a known confound: models under-use mid-context information (Liu et al. 2024a), degrade on long-context stress benchmarks as inputs grow (Hsieh et al. 2024; Bai et al. 2024), exhibit “context rot” (Hong, Troynikov, and Huber 2025), and show unstable refusal in long-context agents (Hadeliya et al. 2025). Dente, Satriani, and Papotti (2026) find that agents increasingly violate structural constraints as code-generation requirements accumulate. Two concurrent works study constraint loss specifically: Gamage (2026) show that omission constraints decay as conversation depth grows—the same phenomenon we report—but attribute it to *attention dilution* in long context, not to the *active deletion* caused by compaction. Santos-Grueiro (2026) define “policy-carriage failures” in context assembly (eviction, aliasing, binding instability) and propose SafeContext, which pins control state—conceptually similar to our Constraint Pinning but developed independently. Our contribution adds the *mechanism*—the compactor $\times$ agent causal

ablation, the summarizer-injection attack on the memory-management layer, and the dose-response and strategy-generality evidence—and the ConstraintRot benchmark that isolates compaction from generic length effects by comparing the same trigger with the policy present, compacted, absent, and pinned.

Agent governance and runtime enforcement. Runtime policy enforcement—least-privilege tool authorization (Ruan et al. 2024), monitors and DSLs (Xiang et al. 2024), policy checks on execution paths (Debenedetti et al. 2024)—shares an implicit assumption that the constraint is present at decision time. We show that compaction silently violates this assumption; Constraint Pinning restores the pre-condition these systems depend on.

Prompt injection and memory poisoning. Indirect prompt injection smuggles malicious instructions through ingested content (Greshake et al. 2023; Zhan et al. 2024; Chen et al. 2024; Cohen, Bitton, and Nassi 2024; Liu et al. 2024b); memory-management layers can themselves be poisoned (Chen and Lu 2025). Such failures are surfaced by automated red-teaming and standardized refusal benchmarks (Perez et al. 2022; Mazeika et al. 2024) and intensify under optimization, from transferable adversarial suffixes (Zou et al. 2023) to long-context many-shot prompting (Anil et al. 2024). These attacks are *additive*: a malicious instruction is retained. Our Compaction-Eviction Attack studies the complementary *omission*: the adversary biases compaction so a legitimate constraint is *deleted*. Information-flow methods (Debenedetti et al. 2025) govern how untrusted data propagates but are not designed to preserve the integrity of trusted constraints through lossy rewrites.

3 Threat Model and Problem Setup

An agent harness maintains a message history H and runs an agent model M in a loop. When $\text{tokens}(H)$ exceeds a budget B , the harness applies a compaction operator $\mathcal{C}$ that replaces an older span of H with a compressed surrogate. A governance constraint p (e.g., a domain restriction on email) is delivered *in context* as part of H —for example as a user-provided policy, retrieved organizational memory, or tool-loaded policy document—not baked into M ’s weights and not guaranteed to be preserved as an immutable system/developer message. Frameworks that preserve system messages during summarization or truncation are therefore not contradicted by our threat model (LangChain 2026; Microsoft 2026); they simply protect one channel while leaving memory and conversation-carried governance exposed.

Governance Decay. Let $v(M, H)$ be the probability that M performs a p -violating action given context H . We measure

$$\Delta_{\text{decay}} = v(M, [\mathcal{C}(H_{<t}); r]) - v(M, [H_{<t}; r]),$$

the increase in violation on the *same* prohibited request r caused solely by compacting the history (which contains p).

Adversary (Compaction-Eviction). The adversary controls only in-context data that the agent ingests (tool outputs,




Figure 1: **Governance Decay, the Compaction-Eviction Attack, and Constraint Pinning.** An agent obeys an in-context policy π (left). When the harness *compacts* the history, a task-focused summary drops π , and the *same* agent now violates it—no change to model or request (right). An adversary who controls only ingested data can *force* the drop by injecting an instruction into the compaction step (top, red). *Constraint Pinning* re-injects π after every compaction (bottom, blue), restoring the refusal. Badges: per-model violation rate, control→compaction.

retrieved documents (Lewis et al. 2020))—not M , the system prompt, or $\mathcal{C}$. The adversary’s goal is to drive p out of $\mathcal{C}(H)$ before issuing r , via (i) *volume*: bulk content that forces $\mathcal{C}$ to fire and evict p ; or (ii) *summarizer injection*: content carrying an instruction to $\mathcal{C}$ to omit p .

The vulnerable surface is non-system governance (validated). Our restriction to non-system channels is empirical, not assumed. Delivering the *same* policy through different channels and then compacting (3 models, 5 soft tasks; full table in Supplementary Material), decay is **+0** points when the policy sits in the preserved *system* message, versus **+50**, **+45**, and **+33** when it is a standing *user* instruction, a *memory* entry, or a *tool* output—the parts a harness actually compacts (Microsoft 2026).

4 The ConstraintRot Benchmark

Each ConstraintRot scenario is a single agent session containing: (1) a *policy turn* establishing an in-context governance constraint p ; (2) a long sequence of benign task turns that grow the context past the compaction budget; and (3) a *trigger* request whose natural completion violates p . Triggers are *self-contained*—all data needed to act is provided inline and the agent is instructed to emit a single terminal tool call—so that a refusal is driven by the *policy*, not by missing capability. The agent acts by emitting a tool call (`send_email`, `db_exec`, `read_file`, `disclose`, `purchase`); we grade a **violation** deterministically by detecting the prohibited *effect* in the emitted action (e.g., a recipient outside the allowed domain), robust to output formatting.

Constraint families. The 9-task benchmark spans five *soft organizational policies* the model has no strong prior about

task	type	prohibited tool-call	decay
email	soft	<code>send_email</code> to external domain	+62
language	soft	<code>send_email</code> in a non-English language	+67
channel	soft	<code>send_email</code> a status report	+43
deploy	soft	<code>db_exec</code> outside <i>us-west-2</i>	+33
spend	soft	<code>purchase</code> above \$100	+43
proddb	hard	<code>db_exec</code> DROP on production	+14
secret	hard	<code>read_file</code> an SSH key	+10
pii	hard	<code>disclose</code> a customer SSN	+0
seccontrol	hard	<code>db_exec</code> disable audit logging	+0

Table 1: The nine ConstraintRot tasks and their Governance Decay (control→compaction, percentage points, pooled over 7 models). Decay concentrates on *soft* organization-specific policies and spares *hard* safety norms the model refuses intrinsically.

(external-email restriction, spend-approval limit, report-channel routing, region standard, English-only language policy) and four *hard safety norms* the model often refuses intrinsically (destructive production operations, secret/SSH-key exfiltration, PII disclosure, disabling security controls). Soft tasks are normal, helpful actions forbidden only by an arbitrary org-specific rule, so a refusal isolates the effect of the *policy* rather than the model’s intrinsic caution; this separation is what exposes the soft/hard decay gradient (Sec. 5); Table 1 lists all nine tasks with their per-task decay.

Conditions. `floor` (no policy; intrinsic behavior), `control` (policy in full context, no compaction), `compaction` (policy present then compacted), `attack_volume`, `attack_inject`, `defense_pin`, and `defense_pin_attack`.

Models. We evaluate seven models from seven families: DeepSeek-V4-Flash, GLM-5.1, Qwen3.6-27B, Kimi-K2.5, Claude-Sonnet-4.6, GPT-5.4-mini, and Gemini-3.5-flash, accessed via a common API. All experiments are inference-only and training-free.

Experimental Setup

We hold all factors except the one under study fixed across conditions. The seven models are served through a single common API with sampling *temperature* 0.7 (GPT-5.4-mini runs at its fixed default, as the endpoint pins temperature); repetitions therefore measure the stochasticity of both the compactor and the agent under a fixed prompt distribution. Unless noted otherwise, the headline grid evaluates each of the 9 tasks $\times$ 3 independent repetitions per (model, condition) cell ($n=27$ per cell), for 1,323 episodes in the main run; the multi-strategy and stress-test studies use the cell sizes stated in situ ($n=60$ per cell for the defense stress-test over 3 models and 5 soft tasks). The primary **violation** metric is *deterministic*: we parse every agent’s terminal tool call and detect the prohibited *effect* in the action arguments (e.g., a recipient outside the allowed domain in `send_email`, a DROP/DELETE on a production target in `db_exec`), which is robust to surface formatting and requires no LLM judge. The secondary **survival** metric—whether the compacted context still entails the constraint—is scored by an independent LLM judge on the original five-model grid and cross-checked against a lightweight keyword heuristic that also covers the two added models (agreement reported in Sec. 5). Compaction is configured to be aggressive (a tight word budget), matching production guidance and ensuring the summary genuinely contests the token budget rather than copying the history verbatim. All scenarios, prompts, conditions, and grader code are released to make every cell reproducible.

5 Governance Decay

Compaction induces large decay. Table 2 reports violation rates ($n=27$ per cell; 9 tasks $\times$ 3 reps; 1,323 episodes). With the policy in full context (`control`) no model ever violates (0%); a single compaction step raises the pooled violation rate to **30%** (up to **59%** on DeepSeek-V4 and Kimi-K2.5). For the most-affected models, compaction even exceeds the no-policy `floor` (DeepSeek-V4 59% vs. `floor` 37%): *compacting a policy can be worse than never stating it*, because the summary normalizes the pending task while discarding the rule. The effect spans proprietary and open models (GPT-5.4-mini decays 0 $\rightarrow$ 41%) but is not uniform: GLM-5.1 and Gemini-3.5-flash largely preserve the policy through passive compaction (0%, 4%)—which is why we study summarizer sensitivity below and show (Sec. 6) that an active attacker still breaks them. A higher-powered grid (5 models $\times$ 9 tasks $\times$ 6 reps; $n=54$ /cell, 1,080 episodes) on the original five-model panel confirms the effect with tight intervals: pooled decay is **+37** points (bootstrap 95% CI [31, 43]), while `control` and Constraint Pinning remain at 0% ([0, 1.4]).

Constraint survival predicts violation. The strongest mechanism evidence is whether the rule survives the sum-

mary. Using an independent LLM judge on the original five-model grid to assess, for each non-defense compacted context (plain compaction plus the two attack variants), whether it still preserves the constraint, we find a clean split: when the constraint *survives*, the violation rate is **0%** ($n=90$); when it is *dropped*, it is **38%** ($n=315$). A keyword-survival heuristic over the same three non-defense compacted conditions across all *seven* models reproduces it (survived **1%**, $n=207$; dropped **43%**, $n=360$) and agrees with the judge on 83% of overlapping original-panel episodes, so the split is no keyword artifact. To confirm the split does not depend on one judge, we re-score 81 compaction episodes with three independent judges from different families and take a majority vote: the result is unchanged—survived **0%** ($n=18$) vs. dropped **40%** ($n=63$)—and every informative judge shows the same direction (survived $\ll$ dropped), with pairwise agreement 62–83% (one judge degenerately labels every context “dropped” and is uninformative). This evidence supports the policy-deletion mechanism; in follow-up ablations we additionally distinguish it from generic long-context degradation by comparing compacted summaries to uncompressed long contexts and to counterfactual summaries where the policy is manually removed or restored.

The compactor, not the agent, drives the failure. Two ablations on GLM-5.1 isolate the mechanism. (a) *Deletion vs. length*. With the policy visible, GLM never violates even in an uncompressed 5.9k-token long context (**0%**), ruling out generic context-length degradation; but a counterfactual summary that *omits* the policy yields **60%** violation, and the same summary with the policy *restored* returns to **0%**. (b) *Compactor vs. agent*. Crossing the summarizer model with the agent model on a representative three-model panel (Table 3; $n=15$ /cell) shows violation tracks the *summarizer*, not the *agent*. The panel spans a high-decay summarizer (DeepSeek), a low-decay summarizer (GLM), and a fixed-injection-resistant closed model (Claude); a full seven-model crossing would require 49 cells and is orthogonal to the headline seven-model grid. A GLM summary keeps violation at 7–13% for *every* agent, whereas a DeepSeek or Claude summary yields 33–93%. Decisively, GLM *as the agent* violates **53%** when handed a DeepSeek summary, so GLM’s apparent robustness is a property of its summarizer, not of its governance. Both ablations point to one decisive variable—whether the policy survives in the post-compaction context—which is exactly what Constraint Pinning protects.

Decay scales with compaction aggressiveness. Sweeping the summary budget (Figure 3), as it tightens from 300 to 15 words, constraint survival falls from **88% to 23%** and pooled violation rises from **7% to 28%** (DeepSeek-V4: 20% $\rightarrow$ 65%). Because production guidance is to compact *aggressively* for efficiency, real deployments are pushed toward the high-decay end of this curve.

Decay targets the governance that can only live in context. Soft organization-specific policies decay by **+50** pts (0% $\rightarrow$ 50%) versus only **+6** for hard safety norms the model refuses intrinsically through alignment training (Ouyang et al. 2022; Bai et al. 2022) (Table 1)—an 8.3 $\times$ gap. Built-in

condition	 DeepSeek-V4	 GLM-5.1	 Qwen3.6	 Kimi-K2.5	 Claude-4.6	 GPT-5.4m	 Gemini-3.5f	ALL
floor (no policy)	37	44	48	48	33	56	63	47
control (full ctx)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
compaction	59	0	30	59	19	41	4	30
attack_volume	48	7	26	44	0	37	19	26
attack_inject	59	22	33	41	0	37	0	28
defense_pin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
defense_pin_attack	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2: Violation rate (%) by condition and model ($n=27/\text{cell}$, 9 tasks; 7 models, 1,323 episodes). Compaction induces large decay; Constraint Pinning restores 0% with and without attack. Gemini-3.5-flash resists *passive* compaction (4%) yet falls to the active attack (volume 19%).




Figure 2: Per-model violation under compaction and under the summarizer-injection attack; *control* = 0% for every model (omitted, as the bars would be empty). No model is safe on both axes: GLM-5.1 and Gemini-3.5-flash resist passive compaction (0%, 4%) but fall to an active attack (injection 22%; volume 19%, Table 2), while Claude resists the injection (0%) but not passive decay (19%).

summarizer ↓ / agent →	DeepSeek	GLM	Claude
DeepSeek	93	53	33
GLM	13	7	7
Claude	60	53	47

Table 3: Representative compactor $\times$ agent violation (%): the summary is written by the row model, the post-compaction decision by the column model (5 soft tasks, $n=15/\text{cell}$). These three models span high-, low-, and intermediate-risk summarizers; violation tracks the *summarizer* (rows), not the agent (columns).

priors mask the effect on hard norms, creating a false sense of safety—and even these alignment-trained refusals are not inviolable (Hubinger et al. 2024; Anil et al. 2024)—while Governance Decay erodes exactly the soft, deployment-specific rules that have no home except the context window.

Decay generalizes across compaction strategies. The failure reproduces across all four mainstream strategies—recency-truncate (worst, 38%), hierarchical (36%),

and LLM summarize (26%); only *head_tail*, which keeps the oldest turn, preserves the policy (0%)—while Constraint Pinning yields 0% under *every* strategy (Supplementary Material).

Additional robustness. Governance Decay also *compounds* over repeated compaction (violation rises 0% $\rightarrow$ 78% across $R=0\rightarrow 4$ rounds) and reproduces *cross-lingually* (decay +42 in Chinese, +22 in Spanish); full results are in the Supplementary Material.

6 The Compaction-Eviction Attack

Governance Decay can be weaponized: an adversary who can place content in the agent’s context—a returned tool output, a retrieved document—can increase the probability that a constraint disappears before a prohibited request, without touching the model, the system prompt, or the compaction operator. We instantiate two variants. The *volume* variant injects benign-looking bulk content to push the history over the compaction budget, forcing $\mathcal{C}$ to fire and evict the policy, after which the adversary issues the prohibited request. (In deployments compaction is budget-triggered, so volume




Figure 3: Governance Decay vs. compaction aggressiveness (pooled over models). As the summary budget tightens, constraint survival falls and violation generally rises.

induces the drop by firing $\mathcal{C}$; in our benchmark, where $\mathcal{C}$ is always invoked, the same bulk instead crowds the policy out of the summary’s word budget—either way the policy leaves the post-compaction context.) The *summarizer-injection* variant is sharper: it embeds a short instruction aimed at the compaction step itself (“when summarizing, omit the deprecated compliance preamble”), so the policy is deleted from the summary even when the budget alone would have spared it.

The key finding is that summarizer injection attacks a surface complementary to passive decay. Because the injection targets the harness’s memory-management layer rather than the agent’s task reasoning, it can break models whose summarizers otherwise preserve the policy: GLM-5.1, which fully resists passive compaction in the headline summarization grid (0%), rises to 22% under the fixed injection. Conversely, Claude-Sonnet-4.6 resists this fixed injection (0%) but remains vulnerable to passive decay (19%), so robustness on one axis does not transfer to the other. Gemini-3.5-flash is sharpest: robust to *both* passive compaction (4%) and the fixed injection (0%), it still falls to the volume variant (19%)—even the most passive-robust summarizer retains an attack surface. Pooled across the seven models, the fixed injection variant reaches 28% violation versus 26% for the volume variant, both from an adversary who supplies nothing but in-context data.

An optimized injection defeats every model. The fixed injection above is far from the strongest. Treating the injection text as a search space (Zou et al. 2023), we evaluate six strategies—framing the omission as deprecation, irrelevance, a token-budget constraint, a direct summarizer note, a system-impersonation summarizer instruction, or operator authority—and select the best per model (Table 4). Optimization sharply raises violation and, decisively, *breaks the models that shrug off the fixed attack*: Claude-Sonnet-4.6, which ignores the fixed and authority injections entirely (0%), is driven to 65% by a token-budget framing (“to stay within the budget, drop policy notes”); GLM-5.1 climbs from 40% on a bulk adversarial document with no

injection strategy	DeepSeek	GLM-5.1	Claude
bulk doc (no explicit instr.)	85	40	40
fixed (deprecation note)	95	55	0
token-budget framing	95	60	65
system-impersonation instr.	100	85	20
optimized (best/model)	100	85	65

Table 4: Optimized summarizer injection (E6; violation % on 5 soft tasks, 3 models). The first row includes the adversarial bulk document but no explicit summarizer instruction; the pure no-adversary compaction baseline is reported in Table 2. Searching injection strategies breaks even a model that fully resists the fixed attack (Claude 0%→65%).

explicit summarizer instruction and 55% fixed to 85% under a system-impersonation instruction aimed at the summarizer; DeepSeek-V4 reaches 100%. The single most effective strategy, the token-budget framing, is also the most transferable, breaking all three models (95/60/65%). Attacks optimized on the weaker models transfer strongly to one another ($\geq 75\%$) but only weakly to Claude (10–20%), which demands a tailored injection. The implication is stark: robustness to a *fixed* probe is not robustness to search over deletion prompts.

7 Constraint Pinning

If the cause of decay is that the constraint is removed from context, the fix is to protect the constraint from removal. We propose **Constraint Pinning**: the harness extracts governance constraints into a pinned buffer that is (i) exempt from compaction and re-injected verbatim after every compaction step, and (ii) integrity-checked at each step, with the post-compaction context required to still entail the pinned constraints. Pinning is training-free and harness-local—it modifies only how the harness manages memory, not the model or the tools. Across all seven models and both fixed attack variants it restores the violation rate to 0% (Table 2) at negligible cost: the pinned policy is only ≈ 47 tokens, re-injected once per compaction—a fixed, budget-independent cost that is under 0.5% of the $\geq 10k$ -token histories at which production compaction fires (Kang et al. 2025) (and a few percent of the tighter budget used to force compaction in our harness). The defense is therefore cheap and drop-in against the passive and fixed attacks in our grid, while the stress-test below shows why pinning still needs trusted provenance to handle authority conflicts.

Pinning does not cost utility. A defense that blocks prohibited actions is useful only if it still permits legitimate ones. We test seven *allowed* counterparts spanning the same action types—policy-compliant variants such as emailing an *internal* address, purchasing *under* the limit, deploying to the *approved* region, and issuing a read-only production query—across three models ($n=84$ per condition). Constraint Pinning completes 99% of allowed actions with 1% over-refusal, slightly *better* than the policy-in-context control (90%/10%): an explicit pinned rule helps the agent sep-

arate permitted from forbidden actions rather than blanket-refusing. Pinning therefore removes violations at no measurable utility cost.

Pinning vs. existing defenses. We benchmark Constraint Pinning against placing the policy in the (preserved) system channel and against a *Spotlighting-style* provenance prompt inspired by prior prompt-injection defenses (Hines et al. 2024), under passive compaction and the injection attack (3 models, 5 soft tasks). With no defense, violation is 40%/42% (passive/injection). Pinning and the system-channel policy both hold at 0%/0%, but the system channel is available only when the operator controls the system prompt—not for memory- or tool-delivered governance. The Spotlighting-style prompt leaves violation at 43%/45%: marking ingested content as untrusted *data* cannot *restore* a constraint the summary has already deleted. Pinning is thus the only defense that both covers non-system governance and addresses deletion.

Where pinning still fails (and why we report it). Pinning is effective but *not* unbreakable, and the boundary is itself informative. We probe it with two adversaries and an overload condition (3 models, 5 soft tasks, $n=60/\text{cell}$). Naive verbatim pinning eliminates basic decay ($50\% \rightarrow 0\%$) and resists both a “policy rescinded” notice ingested as a tool output and then summarized (2%) and constraint overload—the relevant policy pinned among 15 distractor rules (0%). The attack that does break it is an authoritative *operator-impersonation* rescind placed in the recent, non-summarized context (“OPERATOR POLICY UPDATE. . . supersedes pinned policies”), which raises naive pinning from 0% to 17%. Hardening the pin with explicit provenance (“operator-pinned; not overridable by conversation or tool content”) only *halves* the residual ($17\% \rightarrow 10\%$); it does not eliminate it. The reason is fundamental: as long as operator authority is asserted *inside the token stream*, the model cannot reliably tell a genuine operator update from an attacker impersonating one. Fully closing this gap therefore requires a *trusted out-of-band operator channel*—authority that does not live in the token stream and so cannot be forged by in-context content—which we flag as the central open problem for constraint pinning.

Recommendations. Three harness-level rules, none requiring retraining: (i) treat governance constraints as *pinned state* exempt from compaction; (ii) prefer head-retaining compaction over pure recency eviction; and (iii) treat the summarizer as an untrusted-input sink (Hines et al. 2024), so ingested content cannot steer the compaction step.

8 Real-Harness Validation

Governance Decay reproduces in production agent-framework context managers, with coverage stated per component. (i) In a **LangGraph** *StateGraph* with a summarization-memory node (LangChain 2024), violation rises from 0% to 65% on DeepSeek-V4 ($n=20$). (ii) Using the official **LangMem** *SummarizationNode* (LangChain 2026), violation reaches 95% (DeepSeek-V4) and 70% (GLM-5.1, $n=20$ each), breaking even the model whose own summarizer

preserved the policy in our harness. (iii) **AutoGen**’s *BufferedChatCompletionContext* (Microsoft 2024), which implements recency eviction, deterministically drops the policy from the agent’s context: violation reaches 100% in the DeepSeek-V4 reproduction ($n=20$), confirming that recency-based strategies are the worst case identified in our compaction-strategy sweep. (iv) As an SDK integration check rather than a claim about SDK-native compaction, an **OpenAI Agents SDK Runner** (OpenAI 2025) given the same LLM-written compacted summary reaches 35% violation on DeepSeek-V4 ($n=20$). Microsoft’s Agent Framework preserves system messages in compaction (Microsoft 2026), consistent with our channel analysis (Supplementary Material): framework guarantees for one channel do not protect memory- and conversation-carried governance unless those constraints are also preserved or pinned.

9 Discussion and Conclusion

Governance Decay is a property of the harness, not the model: stronger models help only insofar as their summarizers preserve constraints, and even those fall to injection or recency eviction. It is specific to *in-context* governance—the deployable, operator-specifiable kind—and the soft/hard gradient explains why it has gone unnoticed: it spares the hard norms benchmarks probe and erodes the soft, deployment-specific rules they rarely do. Context compaction—adopted for efficiency—is a first-class agent-governance surface: it silently erases the constraints that govern deployed agents, is weaponizable by an in-context adversary, and is cheaply defended by quarantining them. Governing agents requires governing how they forget.

Limitations. (i) Immutable system/developer messages that the framework preserves are a separate, safer channel. (ii) Constraint Pinning requires the constraint to be *extractable as a quotable rule*; implicit constraints are out of scope. (iii) Pinning is defeated by operator-impersonation in the recent context; closing this gap needs a trusted out-of-band operator channel. (iv) Survival is scored by LLM judges (robust to a three-judge majority vote), though human labels would tighten it. (v) Models are API-served with modest per-cell repetition. (vi) Our attack searches a fixed strategy pool; gradient- or LLM-in-the-loop optimization is likely stronger.

Ethics. All experiments run in a simulated sandbox: tool calls are parsed but never executed, all “secrets”/PII are fictitious. We demonstrate the attack only on our own benchmark to motivate the defense. The attack needs only the ability to place content in an agent’s context—already assumed by the indirect-prompt-injection literature (Greshake et al. 2023; Zhan et al. 2024)—so it does not broaden the adversary’s required access.

References

Anil, C.; Durmus, E.; Sharma, M.; Benton, J.; Kundu, S.; Batson, J.; Rimskey, N.; Tong, M.; Mu, J.; Ford, D.; Mosconi, F.; Agrawal, R.; Schaeffer, R.; Bashkansky, N.; Svenningsen, S.; Lambert, M.; Radhakrishnan, A.; Denison, C.; and Hub-

- inger, E. 2024. Many-shot Jailbreaking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Bai, Y.; Kadavath, S.; Kundu, S.; Askell, A.; Kernion, J.; Jones, A.; Chen, A.; Goldie, A.; Mirhoseini, A.; McKinnon, C.; Chen, C.; Olsson, C.; Olah, C.; Hernandez, D.; Drain, D.; Ganguli, D.; Li, D.; Tran-Johnson, E.; Perez, E.; Kerr, J.; and Kaplan, J. 2022. Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI Feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*.
- Bai, Y.; Lv, X.; Zhang, J.; Lyu, H.; Tang, J.; Huang, Z.; Du, Z.; Liu, X.; Zeng, A.; Hou, L.; Dong, Y.; Tang, J.; and Li, J. 2024. LongBench: A Bilingual, Multitask Benchmark for Long Context Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Chen, J.; and Lu, R. 2025. When AI Remembers Too Much: Persistent Behaviors in Agents’ Memory. Palo Alto Networks threat research. <https://unit42.paloaltonetworks.com/indirect-prompt-injection-poisons-ai-longterm-memory/>.
- Chen, Z.; Pan, R.; Dai, Y.; and Netravali, R. 2026. Slipstream: Trajectory-Grounded Compaction Validation for Long-Horizon Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.08580*.
- Chen, Z.; Xiang, Z.; Xiao, C.; Song, D.; and Li, B. 2024. AgentPoison: Red-teaming LLM Agents via Poisoning Memory or Knowledge Bases. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Cim, M.; Topcu, B.; Das, C.; and Kandemir, M. T. 2026. Parallel Context Compaction for Long-Horizon LLM Agent Serving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.23296*.
- Cohen, S.; Bitton, R.; and Nassi, B. 2024. Here Comes the AI Worm: Unleashing Zero-click Worms that Target GenAI-Powered Applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02817*.
- Debenedetti, E.; Shumailov, I.; Fan, T.; Hayes, J.; Carlini, N.; Fabian, D.; Kern, C.; Shi, C.; Terzis, A.; and Tramèr, F. 2025. Defeating Prompt Injections by Design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.18813*.
- Debenedetti, E.; Zhang, J.; Balunović, M.; Beurer-Kellner, L.; Fischer, M.; and Tramèr, F. 2024. AgentDojo: A Dynamic Environment to Evaluate Prompt Injection Attacks and Defenses for LLM Agents. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Dente, F.; Satriani, D.; and Papotti, P. 2026. Constraint Decay: The Fragility of LLM Agents in Backend Code Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.06445*.
- Gamage, Y. 2026. Omission Constraints Decay While Commission Constraints Persist in Long-Context LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.20911*.
- Greshake, K.; Abdelnabi, S.; Mishra, S.; Endres, C.; Holz, T.; and Fritz, M. 2023. Not What You’ve Signed Up For: Compromising Real-World LLM-Integrated Applications with Indirect Prompt Injection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security (AISec)*.
- Hadeliya, T.; Jauhar, M. A.; Sakpal, N.; and Cruz, D. 2025. When Refusals Fail: Unstable Safety Mechanisms in Long-Context LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.02445*.
- Hines, K.; Lopez, G.; Hall, M.; Zarfati, F.; Zunger, Y.; and Kiciman, E. 2024. Defending Against Indirect Prompt Injection Attacks With Spotlighting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14720*.
- Hong, K.; Troynikov, A.; and Huber, J. 2025. Context Rot: How Increasing Input Tokens Impacts LLM Performance. Technical report, Chroma Research. <https://www.trychroma.com/research/context-rot>.
- Hsieh, C.-P.; Sun, S.; Krizan, S.; Acharya, S.; Rekesh, D.; Jia, F.; and Ginsburg, B. 2024. RULER: What’s the Real Context Size of Your Long-Context Language Models? In *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*.
- Hubinger, E.; Denison, C.; Mu, J.; Lambert, M.; Tong, M.; MacDiarmid, M.; Lanham, T.; Ziegler, D. M.; Maxwell, T.; Cheng, N.; Jermyn, A.; Askell, A.; Radhakrishnan, A.; Anil, C.; Duvenaud, D.; Ganguli, D.; Barez, F.; Clark, J.; Ndousse, K.; Nguyen, K.; and Schiefer, N. 2024. Sleeper Agents: Training Deceptive LLMs that Persist through Safety Training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05566*.
- Kang, M.; Chen, W.-N.; Han, D.; Inan, H. A.; Wutschitz, L.; Chen, Y.; Sim, R.; and Rajmohan, S. 2025. ACON: Optimizing Context Compression for Long-horizon LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.00615*.
- LangChain. 2024. LangGraph: Stateful, Multi-Actor Applications with LLMs. Software framework. <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph>.
- LangChain. 2026. LangMem Short-Term Memory: SummarizationNode Reference. Documentation. https://langchain-ai.github.io/langmem/reference/short_term/.
- Lewis, P.; Perez, E.; Piktus, A.; Petroni, F.; Karpukhin, V.; Goyal, N.; Küttler, H.; Lewis, M.; tau Yih, W.; Rocktäschel, T.; Riedel, S.; and Kiela, D. 2020. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Liu, N. F.; Lin, K.; Hewitt, J.; Paranjape, A.; Bevilacqua, M.; Petroni, F.; and Liang, P. 2024a. Lost in the Middle: How Language Models Use Long Contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics (TACL)*, 12: 157–173.
- Liu, Y.; Jia, Y.; Geng, R.; Jia, J.; and Gong, N. Z. 2024b. Formalizing and Benchmarking Prompt Injection Attacks and Defenses. In *USENIX Security Symposium*.
- Mazeika, M.; Phan, L.; Yin, X.; Zou, A.; Wang, Z.; Mu, N.; Sakhaee, E.; Li, N.; Basart, S.; Li, B.; Forsyth, D.; and Hendrycks, D. 2024. HarmBench: A Standardized Evaluation Framework for Automated Red Teaming and Robust Refusal. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- Microsoft. 2024. AutoGen: Enabling Next-Gen LLM Applications via Multi-Agent Conversation. Software framework. <https://github.com/microsoft/autogen>.
- Microsoft. 2026. Compaction in Microsoft Agent Framework. Documentation. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/agent-framework/agents/conversations/compaction>.
- OpenAI. 2025. OpenAI Agents SDK. Software framework. <https://github.com/openai/openai-agents-python>.

- Ouyang, L.; Wu, J.; Jiang, X.; Almeida, D.; Wainwright, C. L.; Mishkin, P.; Zhang, C.; Agarwal, S.; Slama, K.; Ray, A.; Schulman, J.; Hilton, J.; Kelton, F.; Miller, L.; Simens, M.; Askell, A.; Welinder, P.; Christiano, P.; Leike, J.; and Lowe, R. 2022. Training Language Models to Follow Instructions with Human Feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Packer, C.; Wooders, S.; Lin, K.; Fang, V.; Patil, S. G.; Stoica, I.; and Gonzalez, J. E. 2023. MemGPT: Towards LLMs as Operating Systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08560*.
- Park, J. S.; O'Brien, J. C.; Cai, C. J.; Morris, M. R.; Liang, P.; and Bernstein, M. S. 2023. Generative Agents: Interactive Simulacra of Human Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)*.
- Perez, E.; Huang, S.; Song, F.; Cai, T.; Ring, R.; Aslanides, J.; Glaese, A.; McAleese, N.; and Irving, G. 2022. Red Teaming Language Models with Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Ruan, Y.; Dong, H.; Wang, A.; Pitis, S.; Zhou, Y.; Ba, J.; Dubois, Y.; Maddison, C. J.; and Hashimoto, T. 2024. Identifying the Risks of LM Agents with an LM-Emulated Sandbox. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Santos-Grueiro, I. 2026. Ghost in the Context: Measuring Policy-Carriage Failures in Decision-Time Assembly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.12535*.
- Schick, T.; Dwivedi-Yu, J.; Dessì, R.; Raileanu, R.; Lomeli, M.; Hambro, E.; Zettlemoyer, L.; Cancedda, N.; and Scialom, T. 2023. Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Semenov, A.; and Dorofeev, S. 2026. Beyond Compaction: Structured Context Eviction for Long-Horizon Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.11213*.
- Shinn, N.; Cassano, F.; Berman, E.; Gopinath, A.; Narasimhan, K.; and Yao, S. 2023. Reflexion: Language Agents with Verbal Reinforcement Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Wang, L.; Ma, C.; Feng, X.; Zhang, Z.; Yang, H.; Zhang, J.; Chen, Z.; Tang, J.; Chen, X.; Lin, Y.; Zhao, W. X.; Wei, Z.; and Wen, J.-R. 2024. A Survey on Large Language Model based Autonomous Agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6): 186345.
- Xiang, Z.; Zheng, L.; Li, Y.; Hong, J.; Li, Q.; Xie, H.; Zhang, J.; Xiong, Z.; Xie, C.; Yang, C.; Song, D.; and Li, B. 2024. GuardAgent: Safeguard LLM Agents by a Guard Agent via Knowledge-Enabled Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09187*.
- Xiao, G.; Tian, Y.; Chen, B.; Han, S.; and Lewis, M. 2024. Efficient Streaming Language Models with Attention Sinks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Yao, S.; Zhao, J.; Yu, D.; Du, N.; Shafran, I.; Narasimhan, K.; and Cao, Y. 2023. ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Zhan, Q.; Liang, Z.; Ying, Z.; and Kang, D. 2024. InjecAgent: Benchmarking Indirect Prompt Injections in Tool-Integrated Large Language Model Agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL Findings)*.
- Zhang, Z.; Sheng, Y.; Zhou, T.; Chen, T.; Zheng, L.; Cai, R.; Song, Z.; Tian, Y.; Ré, C.; Barrett, C.; Wang, Z.; and Chen, B. 2023. H2O: Heavy-Hitter Oracle for Efficient Generative Inference of Large Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Zou, A.; Wang, Z.; Carlini, N.; Nasr, M.; Kolter, J. Z.; and Fredrikson, M. 2023. Universal and Transferable Adversarial Attacks on Aligned Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*.