

Agent Approval Laundering: Transitive Effects Beyond the Approved Invocation

Jinqian Zhang^{1,2}, Haojun Xia^{1,2,†}, Shujiang Wu³, Jingkun Yue⁴, Xia Zhang^{1,2}, Zhangpei Cheng^{1,2}, Bibo Tu^{1,2,†}

¹Institute of Information Engineering, Chinese Academy of Sciences

²School of Cyber Security, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

³Beihang University

⁴State Key Laboratory of Networking and Switching Technology,
Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing, China

[†] Corresponding authors.

Abstract—Coding-agent approval interfaces bind a human decision to a command or tool call, whereas developer tools execute the transitive workflow that invocation activates. Package installation can invoke lifecycle hooks and write files; an MCP tool call can exercise network authority. We call the resulting structural record-coverage failure *approval laundering*: a durable record faithfully names the entry invocation yet omits effects exercised within its workflow.

We present the first systematic security analysis of this record-to-closure relation in approval-gated, tool-using agent systems. We formalize it as *closure-bound approval*, instantiate it in coding-agent workflows with six operational effect classes, and derive an information limit: if executions with identical policy-visible fields require different effect-specific decisions, no deterministic or randomized record-only policy can guarantee both. The Approval-to-Action Security Benchmark binds captured approval objects and inspectable decision-time metadata to immutable post-execution evidence.

Across 111 fixed approval-object/trace pairs, residual records fall from 40 under explicit fields to 17 with command semantics and 13 when post hoc analysis adds metadata available at decision time. Across 11 fixed-SHA project executions, the same retrospective ladder reaches zero metadata residuals; two exact mappings recur across three product frontends.

For prospective recovery, *effect-bound records* commit frozen, source-backed effect predictions and provenance before authorization. On 17 target-executed workflows from a prespecified holdout, predictions achieve 0.926 macro recall and 0.941 macro precision. Binding them cuts residual effect instances from 10 to 3. Finally, a proof-of-concept integration with Claude Code’s `PreToolUse` hook carries the same frozen effect-bound record through the product’s existing permission path without automatic approval.

Together, these results establish approval laundering as a measurable, recurrent record-coverage failure despite truthful invocation identity. They identify the corresponding design requirement: before authorization, bind the entry invocation together with a source-backed prediction of the launched workflow’s transitive effect boundary and its provenance, and preserve that binding with the decision.

I. INTRODUCTION

Approval interfaces for coding agents ask a human to authorize a command or tool call before a side-effecting invocation executes [1]–[3]. Yet the durable record names an entry invocation, whereas the developer tool executes the transitive workflow that invocation activates. In a Vite project pinned

to a fixed commit, an approved package-install command invoked `postinstall` and wrote a workspace file. In an MCP case pinned to a fixed revision, a named documentation-tool call exercised both its represented MCP capability and network authority. In each case, the record faithfully identified the entry invocation while the workflow crossed a wider operational boundary. Exact invocation identity and effect-complete approval are therefore distinct security properties.

Across npm, PEP 517, Cargo, Docker, Git, and VS Code, documented execution semantics expose expansion points through which one developer-facing invocation can activate behavior selected by project, dependency, or configuration artifacts [4]–[9]. MCP introduces a distinct server-side indirection: a named `tools/call` invokes server-exposed behavior that can interact with external systems [10]. In the fixed-SHA cases above, we empirically show that these mechanisms produce multi-step executions crossing file and network boundaries, respectively, while each durable record remains bound to its entry invocation alone.

The mismatch is a representation failure in the durable approval record. We call it *approval laundering*: relative to an operational vocabulary, a durable record faithfully identifies the entry invocation but leaves at least one effect of its transitive workflow unbound. The invocation is truthful; the authority it activates is incompletely represented. The omission directly constrains enforcement: when an omitted effect is policy-relevant, identical policy-visible approval fields can require different decisions, making guaranteed-correct record-only enforcement impossible. Workflow expansion is the mechanism; approval laundering is the resulting structural record-coverage failure. Documented tool semantics produce structural instances, while adversarially controlled metadata or dependencies can exploit the same channel to route security-sensitive effects.

Research gap. Prior work addresses approval–execution binding, task-level closure, delegated capabilities, canonical actions, tool admission, and user permissions [11]–[18]. These lines of work leave a different authorization property unmeasured: whether a durable record sealed before execution covers the transitive operational effects of the workflow activated by the invocation it records. We formalize this record-to-closure

relation over an operational effect vocabulary, systematically measure it in coding-agent workflows, and evaluate a pre-authorization repair.

Our approach. To make this gap measurable, we first formalize closure-bound approval over six operational effect classes and derive a record-only indistinguishability result. We then instantiate the property in the Approval-to-Action Security Benchmark, which binds prompt-visible fields and inspectable decision-time metadata to immutable execution evidence under three nested information views. Finally, we evaluate prospective recovery from frozen decision-time metadata, bind the resulting effect predictions and provenance into an effect-bound record before authorization, and integrate that record into an approval-path prototype. Coding agents provide the concrete instantiation evaluated here; the same relation applies wherever a system exposes an effect vocabulary, inspectable decision-time expansion sources, activation evidence, and post-execution effect evidence. Figure 1 places the structural failure, its closure-bound security condition, and the prospective effect-bound response side by side.

Research questions. The problem decomposes into three questions:

RQ1: Approval-record coverage. How does approval-record coverage change across explicit-field, command-aware, and metadata-aware views, overall and by source?

RQ2: Cross-project and cross-frontend recurrence. Does the same approval-to-effect gap recur in fixed-SHA public-project workflows and across coding-agent frontends?

RQ3: Pre-execution recovery. Can decision-time metadata predict and bind missing effects before execution, and how often does the resulting policy request additional approval?

Results and contributions. This paper makes three contributions:

- *The first systematic analysis of the record-to-closure relation.* We identify and formalize approval laundering as a general, vocabulary-relative record/trace coverage failure in approval-gated, tool-using agent systems and define closure-bound approval over six operational effect classes. We prove that when identical policy-visible fields require different effect-specific decisions, no deterministic or randomized record-only policy can guarantee both.
- *A temporally bound approval-to-action benchmark.* We bind captured approval objects to append-only, hash-bound execution evidence across nine workflow mechanisms. Every mechanism class and all eight protocol-selected fixed-SHA project cases yield an explicit-field gap. Across 111 approval-object/trace pairs held fixed across views, records omitting at least one observed effect fall from 40 under explicit fields to 17 with command semantics and 13 when post hoc analysis adds metadata available at decision time. Across 11 evidence-complete executions of the eight fixed-SHA cases, the corresponding count falls from 10 to 2 to 0. Two exact mappings recur in four qualifying runs across three product frontends.

- *Prospective recovery and effect-bound records.* On 17 target-executed holdout workflows, frozen predictions attain 0.926 macro recall, 0.941 macro precision, and 13/17 exact effect sets versus 9/17 for the command-only baseline. Binding those predictions raises case-macro disclosed-effect coverage from 0.755 to 0.922 and reduces residual effect instances from 10 to 3. We also quantify the resulting demand for additional approvals. A real-hook integration carries the same frozen effect-bound record through an existing product approval boundary.

II. THE APPROVAL-REPRESENTATION LADDER

Approval-time information forms a representation ladder. Explicit record fields state what the interface binds directly. Generic command semantics recover effects implied by the invocation class. Instance-specific metadata exposes effects that the first two layers omit. The following cases isolate the two successive transitions: Vite moves from explicit fields to command semantics, and MCP moves from command semantics to decision-time metadata.

A. Explicit-Field Gap: Vite

Consider a dependency installation in `vitejs/vite` at commit `64dfee12` using the repository-pinned `pnpm` `10.34.3`. An AI coding agent requested approval for one command:

```
pnpm --dir <fixed-sha-workspace>
install --frozen-lockfile
```

Approval-time representation. The approval record identified this shell invocation exactly and represented its process effect. The approved command, however, was the entry point to an installation workflow rather than the complete workflow that executed. Figure 2 separates the approval-time expansion source, the effects realized after authorization, and their alignment under the bound-record and command views.

Executed workflow. After approval, package-manager semantics invoked `postinstall`. The execution transcript binds `simple-git-hooks`, and the workspace delta binds `node_modules/.modules.yaml`. The record therefore represents a process effect, while the executed workflow exercises both process and file effects.

Coverage across views. The explicit record leaves the file effect uncovered. Conservative package-install semantics recover it before execution but also predict network for this execution (Figure 2(b)), closing the residual without yielding an exact set.

Context: one approved invocation can activate a workflow whose realized effects extend beyond what its durable record binds.





Fig. 1. Approval laundering and its effect-bound response. A record can truthfully bind the entry invocation yet omit a transitive file effect (left); closure-bound approval marks criterion violation (cross) or satisfaction (check) beside the residual (center); an effect-bound record binds predictions and provenance before authorization and appends execution evidence afterward (right).

a Fixed-SHA Vite evidence chain



b Effect-view alignment




Fig. 2. Fixed-SHA Vite evidence chain and effect-view alignment. (a) Decision-time metadata explains how the approved install expands, while post-execution artifacts bind the realized process and file effects. (b) The bound record misses file; the conservative command view covers it but overpredicts network.

B. Command-Residual Gap: MCP

The Vite gap closes once conservative command semantics enrich the record. The MCP case identifies the next boundary: command semantics omit an instance-specific network effect.

Approval-time representation. At commit 7b1170d1 of modelcontextprotocol/servers, GitHub Copilot CLI and Qwen Code each issued a successful, named documentation-tool call through the fixed-SHA product con-

figuration `.mcp.json`. Their records represented the MCP capability; generic tool-call semantics likewise exposed only that capability.

Executed workflow. Post-execution evidence binds both the named MCP calls and concrete remote responses. The workflow therefore uses the represented MCP capability and also exercises network authority.

Coverage across views. The network effect remains uncov-

ered under both the explicit-field and command-aware views. The missing information is nevertheless available before execution: the 123-byte instance-specific `.mcp.json` identifies the configured transport. This case therefore locates the next gap between generic invocation semantics and inspectable workflow metadata.

Vite and MCP thus locate different boundaries in one representation ladder. In Vite, command semantics recover an effect omitted by explicit fields; in MCP, instance metadata recovers an effect omitted by generic command semantics. The next section turns this ladder into a property of the sealed approval record and its execution closure.

III. CLOSURE-BOUND APPROVAL AND THREAT MODEL

The representation ladder culminates in one binding question: whether the approval record covers the operational effects reachable through the approved workflow. We formalize that problem as a coverage relation over traces, derive an observable gap predicate and a record-only policy indistinguishability result, and instantiate both over the six effect classes used in our experiments.

A. Approval Transaction and Execution Closure

An approval transaction separates the object presented for a decision from the record produced by that decision. The *approval surface* is the information made available to the decision-maker. A base context $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0$ is committed before any adapter response; it identifies the requested entry invocation a and any effect assertions supplied to the decision path.

A staged mediator may then issue a routing outcome $h \in \mathcal{H}$, such as ASK, pass-through, or local denial. The *bound decision context* $b = \langle b_0, h \rangle \in \mathcal{B}$ is the exact machine-readable basis committed before final authorization; for an unstaged mediator, $h = \perp$.

Because the bound basis may carry more information than a particular policy consumes, we distinguish its policy-visible projection. For a concrete policy consumer, $I(b) \in \mathcal{I}$ denotes the complete decision-time input on which its output distribution may depend; any other state affecting that distribution is included in $I(b)$ or fixed across compared instances. Audit-only identifiers and provenance may remain in b without entering $I(b)$. Let $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ denote the distributions over final outcomes. A record-only policy is a possibly randomized rule $F : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{D})$, with deterministic rules represented by point masses.

The completed permission path draws a final outcome $d \sim F(I(b))$ and seals the durable pre-execution record $p = \text{Seal}(b, d)$, with $B(p) = b$ and $D(p) = d$. We call b the decision-time *approval object* and p its sealed *approval record*. $\text{Permit}(D(p))$ holds only when the completed approval path authorizes execution; in particular, $h = \text{ASK}$ is not permission. Post-execution evidence may be appended to form p^+ , with $B(p^+) = B(p)$ and $D(p^+) = D(p)$; it never becomes decision-time information. Here, Seal denotes semantic immutability of the transaction basis and outcome.

A product may expose p as a native audit entry; in our empirical instantiation, a hash-bound evidence bundle preserves contemporaneous product artifacts and supports exactly the fields those artifacts establish.

Execution need not stop at the entry invocation. Given a decision-time initial-state snapshot s_0 committed for execution, a snapshot of inspectable expansion sources m , and identified toolchain semantics Γ , the *execution closure* $C_\Gamma(a, m, s_0)$ contains every reachable trace causally attributable to Γ 's expansion of a . The boundary begins when the permitted invocation starts and ends when its workflow terminates, becomes quiescent, or reaches another independently mediated request. It includes effects produced before a failed workflow terminates and by causally attributable descendants within that boundary. A realized trace τ is the *executed object*.

We write $\text{CtxBind}(p; a, m, \Gamma, s_0)$ when the pre-execution binding commits the exact invocation, source contents and digests, toolchain identity, and initial-state snapshot to the same transaction as p . For an observed trace, $\text{Bind}(p, \tau; a, m, \Gamma, s_0)$ additionally requires causal and temporal attribution of τ to that committed context. An execution using different committed content or identity requires a new decision context. Nondeterministic behavior reachable from the fixed basis remains inside the closure.

To compare an approval object with the executed object, let Ω be a chosen vocabulary of coarse operational labels. Let $\text{Rep}_\Omega(b) \subseteq \Omega$ contain the machine-readable effect assertions carried by the frozen basis b , and let α_Ω project the raw effects $\text{Eff}(\tau)$ of trace τ into that vocabulary. For a sealed record, we use the shorthand $\text{Rep}_\Omega(p) := \text{Rep}_\Omega(B(p))$. We write $\text{Eff}_\Omega(\tau) = \alpha_\Omega(\text{Eff}(\tau))$.

B. Threat Model

Actors and authorization boundary. We study one approval-mediated execution initiated by an AI coding agent. The agent proposes a ; a human principal or automated policy decides through the approval mediator; and, when the completed path permits execution, the developer toolchain expands a into τ . Although mediation originates in a local coding-agent session, the resulting closure may cross process, file, environment, network, container, and MCP boundaries before the next independent mediation point.

Structural and adversarial regimes. The same record-trace coverage failure arises under *structural occurrence*, when ordinary nonmalicious expansion exercises an omitted effect label, and under *adversarial exploitation*, when an actor controls or influences an expansion source consumed by Γ to induce a policy-relevant omitted label behind the same faithfully identified entry invocation. The regimes differ in source control, not in the coverage predicate below.

Adversary capabilities. Before b_0 is committed, the adversary may control or influence an expansion-bearing workspace artifact, local tool configuration or state, or a referenced implementation, for example through a repository contribution or a dependency/supply-chain position. In the studied workflows, these sources include package lifecycle definitions and

reachable scripts, build-backend selection and enabled build scripts, Dockerfile instructions, configured Git hooks, named IDE tasks and their reachable scripts, import-time code in discovered test modules, and MCP configuration selecting a local command or remote transport. The adversary may know the approval schema, a , and ordinary toolchain semantics, and choose the source so that execution activates a target effect class. Normal toolchain expansion carries the effect while the recorded entry invocation remains unchanged.

Trust and binding assumptions. At deployment, we trust the integrity and temporal ordering of the agent–mediator path: p identifies the invocation actually launched, remains immutable once sealed, and binds its decision only to committed context b . This establishes transaction and entry-invocation identity, not effect completeness. Expansion-bearing artifacts, dependencies, configuration, and referenced code remain untrusted.

Establishing a witness against this model also requires measurement integrity. For an empirical witness, the measurement trusted computing base (TCB) additionally includes approval capture, record–trace association, artifact hashing, effect collectors, and frozen projection rules. We assume executed workflow code cannot forge or corrupt those externally preserved objects.

Security objective and adversarial success. The protected property is the integrity of the durable approval record as an effect-bearing authorization object: its effect assertions should cover every label exercised within a permitted, validly bound closure. Let $\text{AdvCtrl}(\omega, \tau; a, m, \Gamma, s_0)$ mean that adversarial control or influence over an expansion source causally induces label ω in τ . Adversarial success occurs when the completed path permits, the trace is validly bound to the approved context, and some omitted label $\omega \in \text{Eff}_\Omega(\tau) \setminus \text{Rep}_\Omega(p)$ is causally induced by that adversarial control. The omitted ω is policy-relevant when the decision required by an effect-specific rule Q depends on whether ω occurs; Lemma 1 gives the consequence for policy-view-identical executions requiring different outcomes. Concretely, let Q permit a P-only `npm install` but re-mediate an attacker-controlled `postinstall` that adds F behind the same policy-visible record. Since F receives identical input, it induces the same decision distribution and cannot guarantee the two required outcomes from that input alone. If the policy draw permits the latter validly bound context, it realizes adversarial success. Removing the adversarial-control condition yields the corresponding structural witness.

Practicality of the threat model. Documented developer toolchains expose executable expansion points in project, dependency, and configuration artifacts [4]–[9], [19]. Under `pnpm 10`, dependency install scripts are eligible to execute only when permitted by project build settings [19]. Within the source-control assumptions above, the adversary controls an expansion source that the selected toolchain already consumes. In the MCP case, committed configuration selects the transport and server endpoint behind the recorded tool name. Our fixed-SHA executions confirm that these existing paths generate the

transitive closures to which approval must bind.

C. Closure-Bound Approval and Witnessed Violation

For those closures, the relevant criterion is coverage rather than object equality. A record may conservatively represent more effects than one execution realizes; the failure of interest occurs when an executed effect is absent from the represented set.

Definition 1 (Closure-bound approval). For a fixed transaction context (p, a, m, Γ, s_0) satisfying $\text{Permit}(D(p))$ and $\text{CtxBind}(p; a, m, \Gamma, s_0)$, an approval is closure-bound with respect to Ω when

$$\forall \tau \in C_\Gamma(a, m, s_0) : \text{Eff}_\Omega(\tau) \subseteq \text{Rep}_\Omega(p). \quad (1)$$

Conservative overrepresentation satisfies this one-sided relation, whereas one omitted label does not. A command-only record may therefore identify the entry invocation exactly while leaving effects triggered by its transitive workflow unstated.

Definition 2 (Approval-object coverage gap). For a captured approval object b and an observed trace $\tau \in C_\Gamma(a, m, s_0)$, define the pure coverage predicate

$$\text{Gap}_\Omega(b, \tau) \iff \text{Eff}_\Omega(\tau) \not\subseteq \text{Rep}_\Omega(b). \quad (2)$$

For a completed record $p = \text{Seal}(b, d)$, a pair (p, τ) is a measured *structural approval-laundering witness* when the completed path permits, τ is validly bound to (p, a, m, Γ, s_0) , and $\text{Gap}_\Omega(B(p), \tau)$ holds. It is adversarial when an omitted label ω is also causally induced by adversarial control over an expansion source.

Observation 1 (One-sided falsification). One structural witness decisively falsifies the closure-bound condition in (1) for its fixed $(p, a, m, \Gamma, s_0, \Omega)$ context. The empirical test is one-sided: observed witnesses falsify the universal property; an observed run without a witness does not establish the property over the entire reachable closure.

The same mismatch has a decision-theoretic consequence when executions that require different effect-specific outcomes remain indistinguishable to the policy.

Lemma 1 (Record-only policy indistinguishability). Let $F : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{D})$ be a possibly randomized record-only decision rule, with deterministic rules represented by point masses, and let $Q : \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be deterministic. For an execution instance i , write $q_i = Q(\text{Eff}_\Omega(\tau_i))$. For two validly bound execution instances, record-level indistinguishability with distinct required outcomes gives

$$\begin{aligned} I(B(p_1)) &= I(B(p_2)), & q_1 &\neq q_2, \\ \implies F(I(B(p_1))) &= F(I(B(p_2))) =: \mu, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and F cannot agree with Q almost surely on both instances: it is impossible that $\mu(\{q_1\}) = \mu(\{q_2\}) = 1$.

Proof. By (3), both instances induce the same output distribution μ . Since $q_1 \neq q_2$, the singleton events $\{q_1\}$ and $\{q_2\}$ are disjoint, so $\mu(\{q_1\}) + \mu(\{q_2\}) \leq 1$. QED

This is the information requirement behind the representation ladder. Because $I(B(p))$ may include the exact invocation, F may interpret generic command semantics. Whenever policy-relevant executions remain indistinguishable under that projection, any record-only policy that implements Q with probability one requires additional decision-time information that separates them. If no such information is available, the decision path must conservatively represent the union, remediate, reject, or contain the unresolved effects. Randomization can trade off error across the two instances, but it cannot recover the missing distinction or guarantee Q on both.

D. Six-Class Operationalization

The experiments instantiate Ω as the six-class operational vocabulary Ω_6 : process, file, environment, network, container, and MCP. The environment class denotes mutation of session or persistent environment state, and MCP denotes a client-observed protocol capability or successful named tool call [10], [20]–[22].

The six labels deliberately span four operational dimensions: process, file, and network denote operations; environment denotes a mutation; container denotes a resource boundary; and MCP denotes a protocol capability. Together, they measure operational effect-class coverage at this abstraction, while destination, intent, severity, credentials, and product-contract status remain separate policy dimensions. Coverage is the representation-layer completeness condition; RQ3 pairs it with precision and the rate of additional approval requests so that conservative disclosure is measured against selectivity.

Accordingly, $\text{Eff}_6(\tau)$ abbreviates $\alpha_6(\text{Eff}(\tau))$, and $\text{Rep}_6(b)$ contains only labels carried by machine-readable effect assertions in the frozen approval object. For a completed record, $\text{Rep}_6(p) = \text{Rep}_6(B(p))$.

Figure 2 illustrates the measurable predicate. Its explicit projection is $\text{Rep}_6(b) = \{\text{process}\}$, whereas the bound trace yields $\text{Eff}_6(\tau) = \{\text{process}, \text{file}\}$. Therefore $\text{Gap}_6(b, \tau)$ holds; if the completed path permits and the trace is validly bound, the same pair is a structural witness.

This concrete gap also determines how the benchmark is evaluated: it compares one approval-object/trace pair at a time rather than treating a package as the observation. Mechanism classes describe how an invocation expands, whereas effect labels describe the resulting operation, mutation, resource boundary, or protocol capability. The benchmark carries this comparison forward: Section IV fixes the captured approval basis and inspectable sources before execution and derives labels only from post-execution evidence. Where the completed decision and full transaction binding are observed, it also instantiates the permission-bearing record required for a witness.

To measure decision-time recoverability for a fixed approval basis, let $\text{Avail}_6^v(b, a, m, \Gamma, s_0)$ denote the labels recoverable under information view $v \in \{\text{explicit}, \text{command}, \text{metadata}\}$. Section IV evaluates these fixed views. Section VI then makes the metadata prediction a durable approval-time assertion by committing it to b before the decision and preserving it in p .

IV. THE APPROVAL-TO-ACTION SECURITY BENCHMARK

The Approval-to-Action Security Benchmark fixes captured approval fields and the inspectable source snapshot before execution, associates them with immutable post-execution evidence, and evaluates the Definition 2 coverage gap on each approval-object/trace pair. Over the same fixed pair, it compares the explicit-field, command-aware, and metadata-aware Avail_6^v views. The explicit-field view tests the captured approval basis; the richer views estimate counterfactual decision-time recoverability. Section VI tests the prospective construction that commits a frozen prediction before confirmatory execution, evaluates routing over that object, and tests the product decision handoff through a live hook.

A. Benchmark Overview and Temporal Pipeline

The pipeline follows the order approval object, completed decision, execution, and evidence. For captured RQ1 instances, the benchmark preserves the approval object b , identified invocation a , source snapshot m , and initial-state snapshot s_0 . When contemporaneous product artifacts also establish final outcome d , the same transaction instantiates $p = \text{Seal}(b, d)$; Table I specifies the corresponding claim eligibility. The prospective pipeline constructs a distinct approval object by freezing a prediction and its source/rule hashes. The policy evaluation instantiates routing outcome h over that object, while the live hook separately observes the handoff from h to a final product decision; Section VI gives the construction. When that path permits execution, identified toolchain semantics Γ expand a and realize one trace $\tau \in C_\Gamma(a, m, s_0)$. Only afterward do mechanism-specific collectors preserve transcripts, state deltas, and hashes from which $\text{Eff}_6(\tau)$ is derived.

These paths support two no-hindsight checks: RQ1 compares $\text{Eff}_6(\tau)$ with $\text{Rep}_6(b)$, whereas RQ3 compares it with the frozen $\text{Pred}_6(a, m, s_0)$.

Figure 3 shows their shared forward-only evidence discipline; post-execution evidence enters scoring but never the approval basis or recorded prediction.

Protocol invariants. Across this pipeline, every approval-time field used by a view, the invocation, captured source contents and identities, identified toolchain semantics, and initial-state snapshot are fixed before the execution they are used to evaluate; evidence attribution must preserve their approval-object–trace binding.

Formal-to-empirical correspondence. For run r , the hash-bound bundle $\mathcal{E}_r$ preserves the available approval surface, decision evidence, execution context, and trace evidence. Table I maps these artifacts to the logical objects and their acceptance tests.

Claim eligibility. These encodings define nested claim gates. A pair is *coverage-complete* when $\mathcal{E}_r$ preserves b and an attributable τ ; all 111 canonical RQ1 pairs satisfy this gate. It is *decision-complete* only when a receipt or transcript/driver event records the completed ALLOW or DENY for the exact invocation, and *bind-complete* only when the context and




Fig. 3. Forward-only benchmark protocol. RQ1 freezes the captured approval basis b , while RQ3 freezes a prediction before t_0 ; their decision inputs converge with the fixed execution context at a shared permission and evidence spine. The resulting effect projection feeds both read-only checks. Where contemporaneous decision evidence establishes d , the completed record $p = \text{Seal}(b, d)$ feeds $D(p)$ to $\text{Permit}(\cdot)$. Appended hashes leave the decision-time state unchanged. Coverage is scored on b ; Table I operationalizes the additional evidence required for a permission-bearing witness.

TABLE I
FORMAL-TO-EMPIRICAL CORRESPONDENCE. FOR EACH RUN r , THE HASH-BOUND BUNDLE $\mathcal{E}_r$ PRESERVES THE RECORDED EVIDENCE USED TO INSTANTIATE EACH LOGICAL OBJECT; THE RIGHT COLUMN GIVES THE CORRESPONDING ACCEPTANCE CONDITION.

Object	Recorded evidence	Acceptance condition
a, b_0	Exact invocation; captured prompt or fixture approval surface and its displayed effect fields	Capture precedes the adapter/final decision; surface and launched invocation match; capture hash verifies
h, b	Adapter routing outcome, or $h = \perp$ when no routing stage exists; bound basis $b = \langle b_0, h \rangle$	Same transaction; b is committed before final authorization
d, p	Native decision receipt or transcript/driver event for the exact invocation; sealed basis and outcome	ASK is not permission; d precedes launch; missing d remains unobserved
m, Γ, s_0	Source contents and digests or fixed SHA; tool, agent, and version; pre-run workspace/configuration state	Identities and hashes belong to run r
τ, Bind	Non-prompt transcript, event log, state delta, and mechanism-specific effect evidence	Same run; temporal and causal attribution; artifact hashes verify

ordering tests in Table I establish $\text{Bind}(p, \tau; a, m, \Gamma, s_0)$. Coverage completeness supports $\text{Gap}_b(b, \tau)$; only decision and binding completeness together with $\text{Permit}(D(p))$ support a structural witness. Thus calibration, product capture, and permission-bearing evidence retain distinct roles.

B. Unit of Analysis and Evidence Strata

Every execution attempt contributes one append-only ledger row with an immutable terminal snapshot. The ledger retains 149 attempts: 139 terminate in **SUCCESS**, while 10 retain a non-success terminal status. Non-success attempts remain part of the ledger but do not enter the primary RQ1 denominator.

Retries must not receive additional analytical weight. At the same time, a corrected capture must be able to supersede an earlier successful snapshot. The canonical RQ1 view therefore retains the latest successful snapshot for each *agent-task* key, yielding 111 *deduplicated successful agent-task records*; retries thus contribute at most one successful record per key. Each canonical record is paired with its observed trace. RQ1 scores Definition 2 coverage gaps on the 111 coverage-complete pairs; Table I governs the additional eligibility for a structural witness. A qualifying structural witness

therefore falsifies closure-bound approval for its fixed context under Observation 1; adversarial success additionally requires **AdvCtrl**. Appendix Table V gives the complete terminal-state and deduplication accounting for this denominator.

These 111 approval-object/trace pairs form the RQ1 denominator; source provenance determines which claims each pair can support. The *harness/parser fixture stratum* isolates npm lifecycle scripts, PEP 517 hooks, Cargo build scripts, git hooks, IDE tasks, nested shells, test imports, Docker builds, and MCP configuration under known conditions. The *cross-frontend construct control* uses the same fixtures across frontends and requires a captured approval prompt, a non-prompt transcript or driver artifact, agent metadata, observed effects, and hash-bound copied artifacts. *Real-project executions* bind protocol-selected fixed-SHA public repositories to concrete post-approval evidence. *Prospective holdouts* instead bind parser predictions over unmodified raw workflow metadata to outcomes observed only after those predictions are frozen.

These strata have distinct analytical roles. The full RQ1 corpus contains nine successful mechanism classes. *Harness/parser fixtures* isolate the coverage construct, the shared-

fixture stratum controls frontend capture, and qualifying product and fixed-SHA evidence can additionally pass the witness-eligibility gate above. RQ2 interprets fixed-SHA real-project executions alongside that cross-frontend construct control, which covers eight classes; Docker is represented in the harness/parser fixture and fixed-SHA project strata. RQ3 keeps its controlled, natural-project development, and confirmatory fixed-SHA cohorts separate from the retrospective views.

C. RQ1: Approval-Record Coverage

RQ1 holds the 111 coverage-complete approval-object/trace pairs fixed and asks how coverage changes as decision-time information is enriched. On the approval side, let $\text{Cmd}_6(a; \Gamma)$ denote conservative generic semantics of exact invocation a under the identified toolchain. The metadata-aware view uses parser v1.1, developed from the controlled cohort and a natural-project development cohort (A), then frozen before a disjoint fixed-SHA confirmatory cohort (B); Section VI gives the full development-and-freeze sequence. Its output $\text{Pred}_6(a, m, s_0)$ is the full pre-execution set emitted by the frozen predictor for the fixed identified Γ (suppressed in its argument list): it includes the command/surface baseline and labels inferred from transitive metadata, so $\text{Cmd}_6(a; \Gamma) \subseteq \text{Pred}_6(a, m, s_0)$ in the evaluated pipeline. Suppressing common arguments, the three available sets are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Avail}_6^{\text{explicit}} &= \text{Rep}_6(b), \\ \text{Avail}_6^{\text{command}} &= \text{Rep}_6(b) \cup \text{Cmd}_6(a; \Gamma), \\ \text{Avail}_6^{\text{metadata}} &= \text{Rep}_6(b) \cup \text{Pred}_6(a, m, s_0). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

On the trace side, mechanism-specific collectors bind the observed process (P), file (F), environment (E), network (N), container (C), and MCP (M) classes to raw post-execution artifacts. The resulting operational projection spans operations, state mutation, resource boundaries, and protocol capability, with every label grounded in post-execution evidence.

The frozen codebook requires an environment effect to mutate session or persistent environment state. A child workflow that only reads an inherited canary, or declares a task-local variable, does not contribute an environment effect. The MCP class requires either client-observed capability availability under the effective protocol revision, established through legacy initialization or modern discovery and per-request metadata, or a named successful tool call. Fixture-authored protocol-shaped output alone is excluded [10], [20]–[22]. Accordingly, an approved configuration that reports `MCP_NOT_VISIBLE` and has no post-approval child-process evidence contributes no strict M or P effect.

Under the view-specific sets in (4), a pair remains residual under view v when $\text{Eff}_6(\tau) \not\subseteq \text{Avail}_6^v(b, a, m, \Gamma, s_0)$. By (2), the explicit residuals are observed Definition 2 coverage gaps. Reductions under the richer views estimate counterfactual decision-time recoverability while the captured approval object b remains unchanged. Appendix A provides the complete sensitivity, reclassification, and codebook-reproduction accounting from the append-only, hash-bound evidence.

Results.

Finding 1: Explicit approval fields omit observed effect classes in every benchmark mechanism class. Under the captured explicit-field view, 40 of the 111 canonical records have a nonempty $\text{Eff}_6(\tau) \setminus \text{Rep}_6(b)$ residual. Every one of the nine mechanism classes contributes at least one gap, establishing the occurrence of explicit-field coverage failures throughout this benchmark.

Appendix Table IV localizes those 40 explicit-field gaps and tracks the remaining residual records in each mechanism class after command and metadata information is added.

We next apply the command-semantic and frozen-metadata enrichments to the explicit-field gaps. The frozen metadata predictions are computed over 61 hash-bound source files. Neither enrichment consumes expected-effect annotations or post-execution labels.

For comparison, an annotation-backed reference contrasts prompt-only inference with replay of explicit expected-effect annotations over the same 111 tasks. Appendix A reports this comparison alongside the frozen non-annotation views.

Finding 2: Command semantics resolve 23 of 40 residual records; metadata resolves four more. Across the same 111 records, residual records fall from 40 under explicit fields to 17 after generic command semantics and to 13 after raw metadata. All 13 remaining residual records belong to the harness/parser fixture stratum.

Appendix A reports the complete mutually exclusive source partition. This same-corpus gradient isolates the contribution of each information layer. Appendix Figure 6 carries the $40 \rightarrow 17 \rightarrow 13$ gradient forward as the bridge from retrospective record–trace coverage to prospective decision-time recovery. The next section first tests recurrence across fixed-SHA projects and product frontends.

V. FIXED-SHA RECURRENCE ACROSS PROJECTS AND CODING-AGENT FRONTENDS

RQ1 establishes the decision-time representation gradient. RQ2 asks whether it persists in fixed-SHA public projects and recurs across product frontends.

We test those two steps in order: first individual executions in a fixed-SHA project stratum, then exact represented-to-observed mappings across frontends at the same repository revision.

The paired executions remain nested within the 11 fixed-SHA executions and the enclosing 111-record corpus. A separate cross-frontend construct control uses shared fixtures to test whether frontend-specific capture behavior could create apparent recurrence outside those paired executions. Appendix Figure 6 shows the fixed-SHA representation gradient; Figure 4 shows the exact cross-frontend mappings and the construct-control view.

A. Fixed-SHA Workflow Recurrence

To test whether RQ1’s approval-record coverage gradient persists in real dependency and build graphs, we construct a

fixed-SHA project stratum spanning npm lifecycle, PEP 517, Cargo, Docker, and MCP workflows. The analysis extends the comparison to public-repository executions with file, container, and network effects.

Outcome-blind case selection.

Before any execution entered the ledger, a deterministic fixed-SHA scan of nine predefined public repositories produced 81 mechanism-bearing metadata findings. From those findings, the protocol fixed eight repository–mechanism cases using repository provenance, source hashes, and supported mechanisms.

Those eight fixed-SHA repository–mechanism cases yield 11 imported executions: six cases contribute one execution, Vite two, and `modelcontextprotocol/servers` three. Because gap status is computed from each run’s approval object and observed effects, the analysis evaluates these 11 executions individually.

Evidence protocol.

Each evidence-complete execution contains a captured approval record, agent metadata, a non-prompt transcript or driver artifact, observed-effect evidence, and a hash-bound snapshot. The append-only ledger retains capture attempts; canonicalization fixes the 11 evidence-complete imported executions before coverage-gap computation. Pre-execution metadata identifies workflow expansion, while artifacts captured after approval bind the observed effects.

This three-view comparison yields the following fixed-SHA result.

Finding 3: Residual records fall from 10 to 2 to 0 across fixed-SHA workflows. Across 11 evidence-complete executions of eight repository–mechanism cases, explicit fields leave 10 residual records, command semantics leave 2, and post hoc metadata leaves none.

All eight cases contribute at least one explicit-field gap, and the two command-aware residual records are successful MCP calls. Table II reports all three residual views and the corresponding expansion source per case; Appendix Table VI binds each case to its post-approval evidence. Appendix Figure 6 provides the compact 11-run view comparison.

Evidence behind the gradient. Package, build, and container cases realize $P \rightarrow P,F$ or $P \rightarrow P,F,C$, and conservative command semantics cover every such row. The two successful remote MCP executions realize $M \rightarrow M,N$, remain command-residual, and are covered once instance-specific metadata is added; the retained configuration attempt is the sole fixed-SHA non-gap because it activates no capability. Appendix Table VI binds each row to its post-approval artifact evidence. The next analysis tests frontend-specific capture with the shared-fixture construct control.

B. Cross-Frontend Exact-Mapping Recurrence

Capture comparability. Cross-frontend recurrence is interpretable only if frontend-specific capture behavior does not itself create strict coverage gaps. We therefore use that construct control. The prespecified 42-cell frontend–fixture matrix yields

40 evidence-complete bundles and two fail-closed refusals. The strict label projection places inherited canary reads and fixture-authored protocol-shaped events outside the coverage-gap construct while retaining all 40 records, yielding 0/40 strict gaps across five frontends. This negative control rules out capture-created strict gaps across the tested shared fixtures; the lower portion of Figure 4 shows the projected labels and resulting strict count. Appendix Table VII reports the full configuration matrix; the fixed-SHA paired analysis below tests exact-mapping recurrence.

To isolate frontend variation, we compare codebook-valid executions of the same fixed-SHA case under distinct product frontends. The comparison spans two qualitatively different expansion settings in the fixed-SHA stratum: Vite’s package-lifecycle expansion, covered by command semantics, and MCP’s protocol-mediated expansion, residual under command semantics. Both cases are evaluated under the same run-level eligibility rule. An imported execution enters the comparison only if it provides a captured approval record, agent and version metadata, a non-prompt transcript or driver artifact, observed-effect evidence, and artifact hashes. Each qualifying execution yields a captured explicit-field represented set and an observed effect set. We count an exact represented-to-observed mapping as recurrent across frontends only when two such executions yield that same mapping. Prompt wording, local paths, and model backend remain recorded run attributes rather than matching criteria; command-aware and metadata-aware persistence are evaluated separately.

Applying this exact-mapping rule yields Finding 4.

Finding 4: Two fixed-SHA exact mappings recur across three product frontends. Across four qualifying runs, the Vite $P \rightarrow P,F$ and MCP $M \rightarrow M,N$ mappings each recur under two frontends. Vite resolves under command semantics, whereas MCP remains command-residual; both resolve under the post hoc metadata-aware view.

The four qualifying executions span tested configurations of Claude Code, GitHub Copilot CLI, and Qwen Code. Within these versions and configurations, the paired recurrence rules out a single-frontend explanation for the two exact mappings.

For Vite, two approvals represent the pinned package-install process, and two independent `node_modules/.modules.yaml` snapshots bind the additional file effect. For MCP, two M-only records bind named, successful documentation-tool calls and concrete responses; both executions additionally exercise network authority. Figure 4 identifies each run’s frontend and the two mappings across representation views. Table II reports the fixed-SHA cases and mappings; Appendix Table VI binds each case to its post-approval evidence.

Together, the fixed-SHA workflow result and paired-frontend exact mappings establish recurrence at two levels: the representation gradient persists across project executions, and the same Vite and MCP mappings recur across product frontends. These results provide the retrospective basis for asking whether decision-time metadata can become a bound security object before the approval decision.

TABLE II

PER-CASE RESIDUAL RECORDS ACROSS 11 FIXED-SHA RUNS. EXPLICIT FIELDS, COMMAND SEMANTICS, AND POST HOC METADATA LEAVE 10, 2, AND 0 RESIDUAL RECORDS, RESPECTIVELY. P, F, C, N, AND M DENOTE PROCESS, FILE, CONTAINER, NETWORK, AND MCP.

Case and short SHA	Runs	Residual records				Mechanism / source	Represented $\rightarrow$ observed
		Explicit	Command	Metadata			
webpack/webpack @efeb5ce2	1	1	0	0		npm lifecycle / package.json	P $\rightarrow$ P,F
vitejs/vite @64dfeel2	2	2	0	0		npm lifecycle / package.json	P $\rightarrow$ P,F
pypa/pip @72e6c594	1	1	0	0		PEP 517 / pyproject.toml	P $\rightarrow$ P,F
pallets/flask @36e4a824	1	1	0	0		PEP 517 / examples/celery/ pyproject.toml	P $\rightarrow$ P,F
BurntSushi/ripgrep @dfe4a81d	1	1	0	0		Cargo build script / build.rs	P $\rightarrow$ P,F
microsoft/vscode @8d5908d6	1	1	0	0		Docker build / .devcontainer/Dockerfile	P $\rightarrow$ P,F,C
docker/ awesome-compose @30f4b7f6	1	1	0	0		Docker build / angular/ angular/Dockerfile	P $\rightarrow$ P,F,C
modelcontextprotocol/servers @7b1170d1	1	0	0	0		MCP client configuration / .mcp.json	M $\rightarrow$ $\emptyset$ (strict)
same fixed-SHA case	2	2	2	0		MCP remote calls / client .mcp.json	M $\rightarrow$ M,N
Total	11	10	2	0		8 fixed-SHA cases across five mechanism families	




Fig. 4. Exact mappings recur across product frontends; a construct-control view tests capture comparability. Vite $P \rightarrow P, F$ and MCP $M \rightarrow M, N$ each recur under two product frontends across four qualifying fixed-SHA runs. A strict label projection over the same 40 shared-fixture records retains all 40 and yields 0/40 strict gaps after projecting 36 inherited-read E and four protocol-shaped M labels.

VI. PRE-EXECUTION RECOVERY AND EFFECT-BOUND RECORDS

RQ3 turns retrospective recoverability into a prospective test: whether a source-backed effect prediction can be computed, frozen, and bound before the approval decision. We evaluate this transition from recovery to approval through a prospective predictor, an effect-bound record, and a real-hook integration experiment. The evaluation tests how much

decision-time metadata improves predictive effect coverage, how often the resulting policy requests additional approval at the evaluated operating point, and whether the enriched record integrates with an existing approval path.

A. Prospective Protocol and Freeze Discipline

The evaluation follows a development-and-freeze sequence. Parser v1.0 was frozen before the controlled cohort and natural-project cohort A. We preserved A’s errors, used them to develop v1.1, and then froze v1.1, the evaluation protocol, source hashes, rule hashes, and all B predictions before any confirmatory execution. Each of the 18 primary B cases was run once under the primary protocol; no primary outcome altered the parser or its predictions. Appendix Figure 7 records this freeze-and-score boundary.

At the center of the frozen pipeline is a decision-time metadata parser. It reads raw local `package.json`, `pyproject.toml`, `Cargo.toml` and `build.rs`, `Dockerfile` instructions, VS Code task JSONC, MCP configuration, Git hooks, and referenced shell or PowerShell scripts. It excludes benchmark-generated reports, execution traces, observed-effect files, and harness instrumentation. For comparison, the command-only baseline sees only the prompt-visible surface invocation and maps generic command semantics to a conservative effect set.

For each target-executed workflow i , let $E_i \subseteq \Omega_6$ be the independently observed effect set and $\hat{E}_i \subseteq \Omega_6$ the frozen prediction. Case-level effect recall is the fraction of observed effects included in the prediction, and precision is the fraction of predicted effects that are observed. Recall is one when the observed set is empty; precision is one only when both sets are empty and zero when exactly one set is empty. We macro-average both metrics equally across target-executed

workflows and report exact-set accuracy as the fraction with $\hat{E}_i = E_i$. A case that does not reach target execution contributes to protocol accounting but not to these outcome-dependent metrics. Appendix B-A gives the complete metric definitions and denominators. Appendix Figure 8 summarizes the three cohorts, while Figure 5 reports the paired command-versus-metadata comparison on B.

B. Development Cohorts

Parser v1.0 was evaluated on a controlled cohort and a disjoint Natural-A fixed-SHA development cohort. Preserved Natural-A errors provided the development evidence for v1.1; before Confirmatory B, we froze v1.1, the protocol, source/rule hashes, and both B prediction sets. Appendices A and B report the development scores and error profiles, respectively.

C. Prespecified Confirmatory Holdout B

B prespecifies 18 workflows from 18 previously unseen fixed-SHA repositories: one positive and one negative or low-risk control for each of npm, PEP 517, Cargo, Docker, IDE tasks, MCP, Git hooks, nested shell, and unittest import. Seventeen workflows reach target execution. Thirteen complete successfully, and four terminate after producing effect evidence. One fails during setup before the target workflow. The 17 target-executed cases form the prediction-accuracy denominator; the setup failure remains in protocol and terminal-flow accounting but supplies no realized effect set.

On those 17 cases, frozen metadata predictions achieve 0.926 macro recall, 0.941 macro precision, and exact effect sets in 13/17 executions. Positive recall and precision are 0.972 and 1.000; control recall and precision are both 0.875. All three predeclared targets pass: overall recall $\geq .80$, overall precision $\geq .80$, and executed-control precision $\geq .80$.

The command-only baseline on the same 17 cases obtains 0.770 macro recall, 0.941 macro precision, and exact effect sets in 9/17 executions. Both prediction sets, their freeze time, the parser/rule hash, and the source hashes are bound in the pre-execution bundle. Figure 5 exposes the paired score change and the direction of every exact-set transition.

Finding 5: Frozen metadata improves prospective recovery on the paired holdout. Metadata raises macro recall from .770 to .926 at the same .941 macro precision, while exact-set matches rise from 9/17 to 13/17 through four repairs and zero exact-set regressions.

Independent effect-set reconstruction. A separately implemented verifier hash-checks 109 artifacts and reconstructs all 17 target-executed effect sets independently of the predictor and original collector labels, with zero effect-set or artifact-hash mismatches; it marks the setup failure NOT_EXECUTED. Six prespecified cases rerun three times each have mean pairwise effect-set Jaccard 1.000. Appendix Table VIII gives the scoring predicates; Appendix B provides the error localization and sensitivity analyses.




Fig. 5. Confirmatory-B paired comparison across the 17 target-executed cases. The transition matrix tracks how command-only exact-set status changes under frozen metadata v1.1.

D. Effect-Bound Approval Record

Turning prospective recovery into an approval object requires committing the frozen prediction and its provenance to the decision context before authorization and preserving that binding in the durable record. A product interface can make this binding concrete by displaying the surface invocation and predicted effects as distinct fields, attaching each effect to its metadata source, and persisting the prediction and provenance with the decision. Sandboxing constrains what execution may do after the decision; an effect-bound record improves what the approval object represents before execution. The two controls protect different temporal boundaries and compose in one approval path.

We instantiate the approval transaction model from Section III. Let b_{cmd} denote the prospective command-only object for the same invocation. Because its represented and command-semantic sets are contained in the frozen metadata prediction, the effect-bound object seals that complete set:

$$p_{\text{EB}} = \text{Seal}(b_{\text{EB}}, d),$$

$$\text{Rep}_6(p_{\text{EB}}) = \hat{E}_6 = \text{Pred}_6(a, m, s_0). \quad (5)$$

Before the decision, b_{EB} binds the invocation, frozen prediction, metadata sources and hashes, parser/rule provenance, binding mode, and adapter routing outcome; sealing adds the final permission outcome d . After a permitted execution, transcript and realized-effect hashes are appended for audit but cannot retroactively become approval-time disclosure. This construction composes directly with CtxBind: in a closure-bound deployment, the mediator’s binding layer supplies the full transaction context, while the effect-bound record supplies its effect-assertion component. Appendix Table IX gives the field-level schema.

Having established what the record contains, we next test whether it can be produced synchronously on the approval path. At the evaluated scale, the parser satisfies that requirement. Across 12 controlled and 8 fixed-SHA real-project metadata snapshots, every prediction is stable, with no parser failure or timeout. Worst same-process P95 is 12.3 ms; the all-case fresh-process maximum P95, including Python startup, is 168.2 ms. These measurements establish parser-level preflight cost; the hook experiment below measures integrated adapter overhead.

E. Approval-Path Integration and Policy Operating Point

We next reuse the frozen B predictions in an approval-path policy to measure one disclosure-selectivity operating point. The policy returns routing outcome $h = \text{ASK}$, requesting an additional approval decision, when metadata identifies induced mechanisms, added effects, or warnings. ASK delegates to the existing permission flow; it is not the final outcome $D(p)$. If metadata produces no signal, the request passes through to that flow. Invalid output fails closed, and the policy never auto-allows. We operationalize demand for additional approvals as the fraction of prespecified cases routed to ASK, directly measuring how often this policy invokes another decision at the product boundary.

To quantify disclosure independently of the policy consumer, let $E_i = \text{Eff}_6(\tau_i)$ and let R_i be the effect set disclosed by the evaluated record. For an effect-bound record, instantiating (5) per workflow gives $R_i = \hat{E}_{6,i} = \text{Rep}_6(p_{\text{EB},i})$ once sealed. Of the 17 target-executed cases, 16 have nonempty E_i and therefore a defined per-case coverage fraction. Equation (7) in Appendix B-A averages these 16 fractions while counting residual effect instances over all 17. For the remaining control case, $E_i = \emptyset$ while $R_i \neq \emptyset$, so $|R_i \cap E_i|/|E_i| = 0/0$ and no coverage score is defined. The case remains in the other outcome analyses: under (6), it receives recall one and precision zero, is not an exact-set match, and contributes zero residuals.

Table III reports the resulting operating point, separating overall disclosure from the positive and control strata and placing the corresponding policy-routing demand alongside each stratum.

TABLE III
CONFIRMATORY-B DISCLOSURE AND ROUTING BY STRATUM.

Scope	Coverage Cmd.→EB	Residual Cmd.→EB	Exact sets Cmd.→EB	ASK protocol	No-added- effect ASK
Overall	.755→.922	10→3	9/17→13/17	17/18	9/17
Positive	.676→.972	8→1	4/9→8/9	9/9	4/9
Controls	.857→.857	2→2	5/8→5/8	8/9	5/8

Note. Cmd. and EB denote command-only and effect-bound records, respectively. Denominators are overall/positive/control: 16/9/7 for coverage over nonempty observed effect sets; 17/9/8 for residual and exact-set results over target-executed cases; 18/9/9 for ASK routing over all protocol cases; and 17/9/8 for no-added-effect ASK over reached cases. A no-added-effect ASK is a reached case routed to ASK whose realized trace exercises no effect class beyond those disclosed by the command-only record.

The seven newly disclosed effect instances all occur in the positive stratum, while control disclosure remains unchanged. Because these are record-level comparisons, the disclosure gain is independent of the policy consumer. The evaluated consumer routes every positive and all but one control to ASK; 9/17 reached cases are no-added-effect ASK cases under the realized-trace proxy, with one warning and no parser failures. This operating point separates the record-level disclosure gain from policy-specific routing demand.

Finding 6: Effect-bound records disclose seven additional effect instances. Reusing the frozen predictions raises case-macro coverage from .755 to .922 and reduces residual effect instances from 10 to 3. The evaluated conservative policy makes the disclosure-selectivity tradeoff explicit.

The B operating point measures cohort-level policy behavior; we next exercise insertion of the same frozen record into an existing product approval path. In the predeclared npm case, 100 in-process preflights have P95 1.51 ms; 30 fresh hook processes have median 87.8 ms and P95 98.1 ms, including startup, hook input, parsing, and serialization. An isolated Claude Code 2.1.205 PreToolUse integration run then issues the exact `npm run build` request. The hook emits $h = \text{ASK}$, the noninteractive permission path returns final outcome $d = \text{DENY}$, no automatic allow occurs, and the workspace remains hash-identical. This run exercises the evaluated product approval-path boundary: the adapter receives the request, binds the predicted effects into an ASK routing outcome, and returns that outcome to the existing permission flow.

VII. DISCUSSION

Security implication. Closure-bound approval separates effect coverage from invocation identity: a truthfully identified invocation remains insufficient when the decision-time approval object b omits effects activated by its workflow. Binding recovered effects and their provenance into b makes that workflow knowledge policy-visible; sealing that enriched object with decision d produces the completed effect-bound record p . Recurrence across the evaluated mechanisms and frontends, together with the record-only indistinguishability result, locates the repair at the approval boundary. When an omitted effect changes the required decision, a policy restricted to unchanged visible fields cannot recover that distinction. Record construction and policy calibration remain independent design axes: deployments can tune predicates over destinations, arguments, credentials, severity, or outcomes without discarding the predicted boundary or its provenance from the durable record.

Bind–Enforce–Contain. The architecture carries one transaction context through a forward-only chain. *Bind* derives source-backed predictions from workflow-expansion sources and commits the frozen effect set, supporting inputs, and provenance to b before authorization. Toolchains can expose versioned, provenance-carrying effect declarations, which agents combine with command semantics and instance-specific

metadata. *Enforce* evaluates product policy over $I(b)$ to produce d ; the completed record $p = \text{Seal}(b, d)$ then preserves both. For permitted execution, *Contain* restricts behavior to the effect boundary recorded in $B(p)$. Post-execution audit appends artifact-bound observations to form p^+ , comparing realized effects with the frozen prediction while leaving $B(p^+) = B(p)$ and $D(p^+) = D(p)$. Missing or unverifiable decision-time evidence must not yield automatic approval. Toolchain declarations, agent prediction, policy, containment, and audit thereby operate on one temporally coherent record lineage.

Generalization and design principle. The relation extends beyond coding agents wherever a system supplies an effect vocabulary, inspectable decision-time expansion sources, activation evidence, and post-execution effect evidence. Browser, SaaS/API, nested-agent, and other tool-using systems are natural instantiation targets under these conditions. The six-class projection Ω_6 instantiates the relation here; deployments can refine its labels with destinations, arguments, credentials, severity, timing, or outcomes without changing the binding relation. **Design principle: bind the effect boundary before the decision, enforce from the bound record, and contain execution to that boundary.** This forward-only chain turns approval from an invocation-level checkpoint into an auditable control over the workflow that executes.

VIII. RELATED WORK

Prior work addresses neighboring security objects across agent execution, authorization, and workflow expansion. We organize these lines by the property they constrain.

Agent execution and tool security. XTHP studies malicious companion tools that redirect selection and control flow in tool pools [23]. IsolateGPT isolates application execution, while ACE constrains planning and execution under information-flow and capability policies [24], [25]. Tool-Guardian derives facts from descriptions, traces, mock execution, and source analysis for tool admission and runtime authorization [18]. Adjacent work studies prompt injection, tool emulation, excessive agency, coding-assistant behavior, permission gates, and agent-human interaction [26]–[33]. These approaches constrain which tools execute, where execution occurs, or how behavior conforms to policy. We instead hold the selected entry invocation fixed and faithfully identified, then measure whether its decision-time approval object covers the transitive operational effects activated by the selected implementation.

Authorization scope, action identity, and provenance. Classic authorization establishes complete mediation, exposes confused-deputy risks, and constrains delegation [34]–[37]. Prior work on cross-layer systems shows that individually meaningful authorization policies can fail to compose across software layers [38]. Approval laundering exposes a record-level form of this broader compositional hazard: even when entry-invocation identity is preserved, the durable decision-time record may not cover the selected implementation’s

execution closure. Permission studies examine whether authorization boundaries are intelligible and how agents request and enforce user permission [15], [39], [40]. Recent agent work protects adjacent properties. AuthBench infers task-level file policies and evaluates execution-closure proxies [14], while Consent Integrity binds approval to the exact boundary action rendered by a trusted mediator [11]. The distinction is direct: AuthBench asks which authority a task requires; Consent Integrity asks whether the approved action is the action that executes; we ask whether the decision-time approval object for a faithfully identified invocation covers the transitive operational effects activated by its selected implementation. OverEager-Bench applies rule oracles to agent actions, and Schmotz et al. show how malicious skills can reuse task authorization [41], [42]. The Authorization-Execution Gap frames broader intent-to-execution divergence [12]. Proof-Carrying Agent Actions and CAVA bind action identity, receipts, canonicalization, and attestation [16], [17]; ChainCaps attenuates explicit proxy-visible capability flows [13], Approval-Framed Delegation studies downstream compliance [43], and GhostApproval exposes canonical-target substitution behind a displayed path [44]. These works structure authority, identity, provenance, or delegated flow; closure-bound approval adds a measurable coverage relation between the decision-time approval object and the selected invocation’s execution closure.

Transitive expansion sources and approval envelopes.

Software-supply-chain studies characterize malicious packages, dependency exposure, and registry abuse [45]–[47], while Latch mediates package capabilities at installation time [48]. Documented npm, pnpm, PEP 517, Cargo, Git, IDE, and Docker mechanisms expose concrete sources of transitive expansion [4]–[9], [19]; MCP exposes named tools whose server implementations can interact with external systems [10]. At the authorization boundary, compound-action representations expose explicit sub-actions [49]; skill packages combine discoverable instructions, scripts, and resources [50], [51]; and MCP provides versioned discovery and routing metadata [22], [52], [53]. AuthZEN, COAZ, and COAZ-MCP define structured authorization and approval-request envelopes [54]–[56], while deployed systems mediate explicit commands and tool calls [1]–[3], [57]. These mechanisms expose either the sources from which transitive behavior arises or structured boundaries at which authorization is mediated.

Together, these lines of work constrain origin, authority, identity, delegation, request structure, and execution; closure-bound approval makes record-to-closure coverage measurable as a distinct approval-boundary property.

IX. CONCLUSION

Approval laundering is a record-to-closure security failure: a durable record faithfully identifies an entry invocation yet omits effects activated by its selected implementation. We present the first systematic analysis of this relation across controlled mechanisms, fixed-SHA projects, and product frontends. We formalize closure-bound approval and prove its information limit: no deterministic or randomized record-only

policy can guarantee correctness for validly bound executions with identical policy-visible inputs but different required effect-specific decisions. On the prespecified holdout, binding frozen, source-backed predictions cuts residual effect instances from 10 to 3; a Claude Code hook routes an effect-bound ASK via an existing permission path without automatic approval. Authorization should bind the invocation, predicted transitive effect boundary, and provenance before deciding, preserving that commitment through execution and audit.

ETHICS CONSIDERATIONS

Study conduct. This defensive study executes controlled fixtures and public fixed-SHA repositories in isolated workspaces. It involves no human subjects or personal data and accesses no private repository or unrelated production target. Authentication uses researcher-controlled accounts; credential checks use synthetic canaries or non-reversible evidence. Network activity is limited to ordinary product access and task-bounded calls to a documented public MCP endpoint. The experiments neither submit upstream changes nor generate traffic intended to affect maintainers or users.

Attribution and release. Because the evaluated mechanisms are documented workflows in protocol-selected public projects, we attribute those mechanisms to the projects while evaluating the approval-record boundary on the agent side. This preprint is paper-only and does not include a public artifact URL, the experiment ledger, or raw execution captures. The paper reports the evaluation protocol and claim-bound results from sanitized, frozen evidence. Any future public artifact release, if made, will be version-matched and announced separately; this version makes no artifact-availability claim.

Responsible disclosure. We privately disclosed the product-specific approval-record findings for Claude Code, GitHub Copilot CLI, and Qwen Code to Anthropic, GitHub, and Alibaba, respectively. Each disclosure included version-specific reproduction instructions and supporting evidence to facilitate independent validation.

Authorized use and dual use. The controlled demonstrations have dual-use potential and are intended only for authorized reproduction, defensive evaluation, and improvement of agent approval mechanisms. The paper does not grant authorization to probe, exploit, or disrupt third-party systems; reproduction should be limited to systems the evaluator owns, controls, or has explicit permission to test.

Deployment responsibility. Effect-bound approval can create harm if incomplete predictions produce false assurance, over-broad ASK routing produces approval fatigue, or durable records expose repository and infrastructure metadata. Deployers should retain accountable policy ownership, minimize secret-bearing content before sealing, and govern records as sensitive security telemetry through access and retention controls. Deployment should be staged and reversible; unexplained residual effects or excessive additional-approval demand should pause rollout and trigger review, with rollback if either remains unresolved.

REFERENCES

- [1] OpenAI. Agent approvals & security. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://learn.chatgpt.com/docs/agent-approvals-security>
- [2] Anthropic. Claude Code settings. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://code.claude.com/docs/en/settings>
- [3] GitHub. Configuring GitHub Copilot CLI. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.github.com/en/copilot/how-tos/copilot-cli/set-up-copilot-cli/configure-copilot-cli>
- [4] npm, Inc. Scripts. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.npmjs.com/cli/v10/using-npm/scripts/>
- [5] N. J. Smith and T. Kluyver. (2015, Sep. 30) PEP 517 – a build-system independent format for source trees. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://peps.python.org/pep-0517/>
- [6] The Rust Project Developers. Build scripts. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://doc.rust-lang.org/cargo/reference/build-scripts.html>
- [7] Docker, Inc. Dockerfile reference. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.docker.com/reference/dockerfile/>
- [8] The Git Project. githooks documentation. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://git-scm.com/docs/githooks>
- [9] Microsoft. Integrate with external tools via tasks. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://code.visualstudio.com/docs/debugtest/tasks>
- [10] Model Context Protocol. (2026, Jul. 28) Tools. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/specification/2026-07-28/server/tools>
- [11] X. Weng, “What you approve is what executes: Consent integrity for black-box LLM agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.02668*, Jun. 2026.
- [12] B. Wu, Q. Liu, A. Bibi, I. King, and S. Lyu, “The authorization-execution gap is a major safety and security problem in open-world agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.11003*, May 2026.
- [13] X. Jiang, S. Yang, Z. Li, L. Liu, H. Yu, and Y. Liu, “ChainCaps: Composition-safe tool-using agents via monotonic capability attenuation,” in *Second Workshop on Agents in the Wild: Safety, Security, and Beyond*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KtrAm71ER9>
- [14] Z. Yan, J. Weng, C. Chen, D. Peng, E. Qin, J. Guan, J. Liu, Q. Yu, Y. Yuan, F. Meng, C. Che, and M. Hu, “Do coding agents understand least-privilege authorization?” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.14859*, May 2026.
- [15] A. E. Michael and F. Roesner, “How agents ask for permission: User permissions for AI agents, from interfaces to enforcement,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.13718*, Jul. 2026.
- [16] Z. Wang, “Proof-carrying agent actions: Model-agnostic runtime governance for heterogeneous agent systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.04104*, Jun. 2026.
- [17] —, “CAVA: Canonical action verification and attestation for runtime governance of agentic AI systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.13716*, Jul. 2026.
- [18] A. Ravindran and S. Deochake, “ToolGuardian: Declarative security for AI agent-tool interactions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.21835*, Jul. 2026.
- [19] pnpm. pnpm 10.x settings: Build settings. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://pnpm.io/10.x/settings#allowbuilds>
- [20] Model Context Protocol. (2025, Nov. 25) Tools. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/specification/2025-11-25/server/tools>
- [21] —. (2025, Nov. 25) Lifecycle. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/specification/2025-11-25/basic/lifecycle>
- [22] —. (2026, Jul. 28) Versioning and compatibility. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/specification/2026-07-28/basic/versioning>
- [23] Z. Li, J. Cui, X. Liao, and L. Xing, “Les dissonances: Cross-tool harvesting and polluting in pool-of-tools empowered LLM agents,” in *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2026.
- [24] Y. Wu, F. Roesner, T. Kohno, N. Zhang, and U. Iqbal, “IsolateGPT: An execution isolation architecture for LLM-based agentic systems,” in *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2025.
- [25] E. Li, T. Mallick, E. Rose, W. Robertson, A. Oprea, and C. Nita-Rotaru, “ACE: A security architecture for LLM-integrated app systems,” in

Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS), 2026.

- [26] K. Greshake, S. Abdelnabi, S. Mishra, C. Endres, T. Holz, and M. Fritz, “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)*, 2023, pp. 79–90.
- [27] Y. Ruan, H. Dong, A. Wang, S. Pitis, Y. Zhou, J. Ba, Y. Dubois, C. J. Maddison, and T. Hashimoto, “Identifying the risks of LM agents with an LM-emulated sandbox,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=GEcwtMk1uA>
- [28] E. Debenedetti, J. Zhang, M. Balunović, L. Beurer-Kellner, M. Fischer, and F. Tramèr, “AgentDojo: A dynamic environment to evaluate prompt injection attacks and defenses for LLM agents,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37, Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024, pp. 82 895–82 920.
- [29] OWASP Gen AI Security Project. LLM06:2025 Excessive Agency. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://genai.owasp.org/llmrisk/llm062025-excessive-agency/>
- [30] N. Perry, M. Srivastava, D. Kumar, and D. Boneh, “Do users write more insecure code with AI assistants?” in *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2023, pp. 2785–2799.
- [31] J. Yang, C. E. Jimenez, A. Wettig, K. Lieret, S. Yao, K. Narasimhan, and O. Press, “SWE-agent: Agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37*, 2024, pp. 50 528–50 652.
- [32] Z. Ji, Z. Li, W. Jiang, Y. Gao, and S. Wang, “Measuring the permission gate: A stress-test evaluation of Claude Code’s auto mode,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.04978*, Apr. 2026.
- [33] P. Wang, Y. Li, and Y. Tian, “Reframing LLM agent security as an agent-human interaction problem,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.24309*, May 2026.
- [34] J. H. Saltzer and M. D. Schroeder, “The protection of information in computer systems,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 1278–1308, Sep. 1975.
- [35] N. Hardy, “The confused deputy: (or why capabilities might have been invented),” *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 36–38, Oct. 1988.
- [36] A. Birgisson, J. G. Politz, Ú. Erlingsson, A. Taly, M. Vrabie, and M. Lentczner, “Macaroons: Cookies with contextual caveats for decentralized authorization in the cloud,” in *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2014.
- [37] A. Ibrahim and Y. Li, “Overlaying governance: A compositional authorization framework for delegation and scope in agentic AI,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.03518*, Jun. 2026.
- [38] M. Georgiev, S. Jana, and V. Shmatikov, “Breaking and fixing origin-based access control in hybrid web/mobile application frameworks,” in *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2014.
- [39] A. P. Felt, E. Ha, S. Egelman, A. Haney, E. Chin, and D. Wagner, “Android permissions: User attention, comprehension, and behavior,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS)*, 2012, pp. 1–14.
- [40] P. Wijesekera, A. Baokar, A. Hosseini, S. Egelman, D. Wagner, and K. Beznosov, “Android permissions remystified: A field study on contextual integrity,” in *24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15)*, Aug. 2015, pp. 499–514. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity15/technical-sessions/presentation/wijesekera>
- [41] Y. Qu, Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, G. Deng, Y. Li, L. Y. Zhang, and Y. Liu, “Overeager coding agents: Measuring out-of-scope actions on benign tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18583*, May 2026.
- [42] D. Schmotz, S. Abdelnabi, and M. Andriushchenko, “Agent skills enable a new class of realistic and trivially simple prompt injections,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26328*, Oct. 2025.
- [43] L. Liu, H. Yu, X. Jiang, S. Wang, P. Qian, and Y. Chen, “Operational reframing and approval-framed delegation in multi-agent LLM safety,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.07097*, Jul. 2026.
- [44] M. Dokhanian. (2026, Jul. 8) GhostApproval: A trust boundary gap in AI coding assistants. Wiz Research. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.wiz.io/blog/ghostapproval-a-trust-boundary-gap-in-ai-coding-assistants>
- [45] M. Ohm, H. Plate, A. Sykosch, and M. Meier, “Backstabber’s knife collection: A review of open source software supply chain attacks,” in *Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment (DIMVA)*, 2020, pp. 23–43.
- [46] M. Zimmermann, C.-A. Staicu, C. Tenny, and M. Pradel, “Small world with high risks: A study of security threats in the npm ecosystem,” in *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, Aug. 2019, pp. 995–1010. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity19/presentation/zimmerman>
- [47] R. Duan, O. Alrawi, R. P. Kasturi, R. Elder, B. Saltaformaggio, and W. Lee, “Towards measuring supply chain attacks on package managers for interpreted languages,” in *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2021.
- [48] E. Wyss, A. Wittman, D. Davidson, and L. D. Carli, “Wolf at the door: Preventing install-time attacks in npm with Latch,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (ASIA CCS)*, 2022, pp. 1139–1153.
- [49] Microsoft AI Red Team, “Taxonomy of failure modes in agentic AI systems, version 2.0,” Microsoft, Technical report, Apr. 2026, accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://cdn-dynmedia-1.microsoft.com/is/content/microsoftcorp/microsoft/bade/documents/products-and-services/en-us/security/Taxonomy-of-Failure-Modes-in-Agentic-AI-Systems-v2-0.pdf>
- [50] Anthropic. Extend Claude with skills. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://code.claude.com/docs/en/skills>
- [51] GitHub. About agent skills. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.github.com/en/copilot/concepts/agents/about-agent-skills>
- [52] Model Context Protocol. (2026, Jul. 28) Specification. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/specification/2026-07-28>
- [53] ———. (2026, Jul. 28) Key changes. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/specification/2026-07-28/changelog>
- [54] K. McGuinness. (2026, Aug. 13) AuthZEN access request and approval profile – draft 1. OpenID AuthZEN Working Group. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://openid.github.io/authzen/authzen-access-request-approval-profile-1_0.html
- [55] A. Olivier and A. Tulshibagwale. (2026, Feb. 13) COAZ: A framework for mapping information models to AuthZEN authorization requests – draft 1. OpenID AuthZEN Working Group. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://openid.github.io/authzen/authzen-coaz-framework-1_0.html
- [56] A. Tulshibagwale and A. Olivier. (2026, Feb. 13) COAZ-MCP: COAZ binding for the Model Context Protocol – draft 1. OpenID AuthZEN Working Group. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://openid.github.io/authzen/authzen-coaz-mcp-binding-1_0.html
- [57] OpenAI. Human-in-the-loop. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://openai.github.io/openai-agents-python/human_in_the_loop/

APPENDIX A SUPPLEMENTARY EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE

This appendix provides the detailed evidence tables, denominator accounting, and claim-level analyses referenced from the main paper.

A. Claim Evidence and Denominator Accounting

This appendix follows the paper’s research questions. C1 reconstructs the 111-record RQ1 coverage ladder, C2 isolates the fixed-SHA and cross-frontend RQ2 evidence, C3 follows the frozen cohorts used by RQ3, and C4 carries those frozen predictions through independent reconstruction and approval-path integration. Each group identifies its primary denominator and keeps analytically distinct views separate.

C1: Approval-record coverage and representation ladder. Across the 111 canonical records, the experiment summary

TABLE IV
MECHANISM-LEVEL RESIDUAL COUNTS ACROSS THREE RQ1
REPRESENTATION VIEWS.

Mechanism	<i>n</i>	Explicit	+Command	+Metadata
Cargo build script	15	5	0	0
Docker build	2	2	0	0
Git hook	11	3	0	0
IDE task	13	4	3	3
MCP server	14	6	6	4
npm lifecycle	17	7	3	2
Python PEP 517	15	6	0	0
Nested shell	13	4	3	2
Test-runner import	11	3	2	2
Total	111	40	17	13

Note. All three views use the same 111 canonical records. Explicit uses captured approval fields; +Command adds generic command semantics; +Metadata applies the frozen v1.1 parser post hoc to raw metadata available at decision time.

TABLE V
RQ1 DENOMINATOR AND LEDGER ACCOUNTING.

Unit	Count	Selection
Execution attempts / run snapshots	149	Ledger total
SUCCESS terminal snapshots	139	10 non-success
Deduplicated successful agent-task records	111	Latest success/key

contains 81 trace-reported effect-label assignments and re-constructs 40/111 strict explicit-field gaps under the latest-success rule. An alternative first-success rule changes only three agent-task keys and yields 39/111. The construct-validity audit excludes inherited-read E labels from 68 records, fixture-authored protocol-shaped M labels from 11 records, and strict M/P labels from the MCP_NOT_VISIBLE attempt. These operations produce 41 trace-preserving label reclassifications without modifying a ledger row or run snapshot.

Over the same 111 canonical records, conservative command semantics leave 17/111 residual records and the frozen raw-metadata parser leaves 13/111; the first-success sensitivities are 16/111 and 12/111. In explicit/command/metadata order, the harness/parser fixture stratum contributes 30/15/13 over 60 records, and all 13 metadata-aware residual records belong to that stratum.

The separate 111-task annotation-backed reference supplies an independent comparison for this representation ladder. Prompt-only recall is 0.616; annotation replay gives recall 1.000, precision 0.976, eight false-positive rows, and 0.072 additional predictions per row, with none among 22 controls. Expected-effect annotations make this the annotation-backed reference, while headline estimates use the frozen non-annotation views. Its provenance records the parser and rule versions, prediction time, source and outcome hashes, leakage status, collector, terminal state, and artifact-predicate recomputation.

C2: Fixed-SHA project evidence and recurrence. The real-project views reconstruct 10 explicit-field gaps, two command-residual MCP runs, zero metadata-aware residual records, and

Residual records	Representation view		
	Explicit	+ command	+ metadata
Enclosing corpus (<i>n</i> = 111)	40	17	13
Fixed-SHA executions (same <i>n</i> = 11)	10/11	2/11	0/11

Fig. 6. Fixed-SHA residuals under richer decision-time representation views. Across the same 11 evidence-complete fixed-SHA executions, residual records fall from 10/11 under explicit fields to 2/11 with command semantics and to 0/11 under the post hoc metadata-aware view over metadata available at decision time. The enclosing 111-record corpus follows the same direction (40 → 17 → 13). One of the 11 executions is already non-residual under the explicit-field view.

one retained MCP-configuration non-gap among 11 fixed-SHA executions spanning eight selected cases. The recurrence view contains two exact pairs for $P \rightarrow P, F$ and $M \rightarrow M, N$, spanning four runs across three product frontends; both recurrent mappings have hash-bound evidence.

The separate cross-frontend construct control uses shared fixtures across five frontends, six configurations, and eight classes. In explicit/command/metadata order it contributes 0/0/0 over 40 evidence-complete cells, including 0/40 strict gaps. Together with the 60-record harness/parser stratum in C1 and the 10/2/0 fixed-SHA stratum over 11 executions, these views form the mutually exclusive 111-record source partition. RQ2 uses the fixed-SHA recurrence denominator rather than the construct-control cells.

Separate artifact-only npm, Cargo, and MCP checks provide three passing external trace validations without fixture event logs. The package also inventories 48 controlled successful runs, 22 successful audit-control runs, 40 agent-measured successful runs, and 11 real-project agent executions. These overlapping or distinct views answer separate questions about construct coverage, agent behavior, project recurrence, and external trace validity.

Table VII separates evaluated cells from refusals and configurations that were not scheduled.

C3: Frozen pre-execution recovery. The prospective sequence moves from the controlled cohort to Natural A and then to confirmatory B. The controlled cohort contains 12 workflows, including six controls, and yields macro recall 0.903 and macro precision 0.917. Natural A contains 12 workflows from nine repositories, including six controls, and yields recall 0.694 and precision 0.732. Appendix Figure 8 reports the fixed-cohort stability intervals while keeping the v1.0 development cohorts separate from the frozen v1.1 confirmation.

Confirmatory B contains 18 prespecified workflows across 18 repositories, including nine controls and nine workflow classes. Seventeen cases reach target execution and yield recall 0.926, precision 0.941, exact-set accuracy 0.765, and control precision 0.875. Frozen hashes bind the predictions and inputs for every cohort. Appendix B supplies the class-level error

TABLE VI
POST-APPROVAL EVIDENCE FOR THE 11 FIXED-SHA EXECUTIONS IN TABLE II; THE VITE AND MCP REMOTE-CALL ROWS EACH AGGREGATE TWO RUNS.

Case, short SHA, and execution view	Runs	Post-approval evidence
webpack/webpack @efeb5ce2	1	transcript, file delta, and Husky-created .husky/_ shims
vitejs/vite @64dfee12	2	two agent transcripts and two node_modules/.modules.yaml snapshots
pypa/pip @72e6c594	1	file delta and generated wheel
pallets/flask @36e4a824	1	file delta and generated example wheel
BurntSushi/ripgrep @dfe4a81d	1	transcript and target/debug/rg.exe
microsoft/vscode @8d5908d6	1	iidfile, image inspection, and image history
docker/awesome-compose @30f4b7f6	1	iidfile and Docker image inspection
modelcontextprotocol/servers @7b1170d1 (configuration)	1	MCP_NOT_VISIBLE; no activated capability or post-approval child process
modelcontextprotocol/servers @7b1170d1 (remote calls)	2	named documentation-tool calls and concrete responses

TABLE VII
SHARED-FIXTURE CROSS-FRONTEND CONSTRUCT CONTROL.

Configuration	Version	Evaluable/		
		Scheduled	Refused	Unscheduled
Claude Code (primary)	2.1.193	8/8	0	0
Claude Code (Gemma, supp.)	2.1.193	2/2	0	6
Codex CLI	0.142.0	8/8	0	0
GitHub Copilot CLI	1.0.65	8/8	0	0
OpenCode	1.1.25	6/8	2	0
Qwen Code	0.19.2	8/8	0	0
Total	—	40/42	2	6

Note. All 40 evidence-complete cells yield zero strict gaps. RQ2 recurrence is evaluated separately on the fixed-SHA view.

TABLE VIII
CONFIRMATORY-B RAW-ARTIFACT PREDICATES (ORACLE v1.0.1).

Effect	Raw-artifact predicate
Process	At least one process-observation step, or a successful MCP stdio exchange.
File	A workspace or sandbox delta contains a created, modified, or deleted path; Git HEAD changes; or a Docker image is successfully inspected.
Network	At least one captured network connection, or a successful MCP Streamable HTTP exchange.
Container	Successful Docker inspection with a nonempty image identifier.
MCP	mcp_protocol.json records at least one successful stdio or Streamable HTTP server exchange.
Environment	Not measured by the confirmatory-B outcome collector; B prespecifies no environment-positive target.

Note. All 109 raw artifacts pass hash verification. A separately implemented verifier exactly reconstructs the effect sets of all 17 target-executed cases, marks the remaining setup-failure case as NOT_EXECUTED, and reports no effect-set or artifact-hash mismatches.

profiles, terminal-state sensitivities, and repeated-run stability analysis.

C4: Evidence recomputation and approval-path integration. Starting from the frozen predictions and inputs in C3, the separately implemented verifier hash-checks 109 raw artifacts and exactly reconstructs the effect sets of all 17 target-executed B cases, with zero mismatches; the remaining setup failure is marked NOT_EXECUTED. Deterministic artifact predicates and frozen-codebook reconstruction establish exact, hash-bound evidence-to-label reproducibility.

The reconstructed effects score the two approval-record con-

DEVELOPMENT




Fig. 7. Pre-B freeze and scoring boundary. Natural A may inform development of v1.1; parser v1.1, the B protocol, source/rule hashes, and both B prediction sets are frozen before any Confirmatory-B outcome. Frozen predictions and independently observed effects meet only at scoring.

structions. Command-only and effect-bound records provide coverage 0.755 and 0.922 and leave 10 and three residual effect instances, respectively. The frozen policy then emits ASK to request an additional approval decision in 17/18 prespecified protocol cases. Among the 17 reached executions, nine are no-added-effect ASK cases under the realized-trace ex-post proxy; no parser failure or automatic allow occurs. The real hook integration run exercises the adapter-to-permission handoff: it emits one ASK, receives one denial from the permission path, and leaves the workspace unchanged.

The parser microbenchmark contains 12 controlled and eight selected-project inputs. After five warmups, each is evaluated in 100 same-process repetitions and 30 fresh processes. Every prediction digest is stable, with no failure or timeout; the worst same-process P95 is 12.298 ms, and the selected-project and all-case fresh-process maximum P95 values are 164.752 and 168.241 ms.

Missed effects concentrate in the file class, while exact-set accuracy and control precision vary most across the reported confirmatory-B profiles. Table X localizes the cohort errors, while Appendix Figure 9 shows how the headline metrics change under denominator and cache-treatment alternatives.

The product-facing record schema below makes the order of prediction, routing, final authorization, and post-run binding explicit.

TABLE IX
BINDING ORDER OF THE PRODUCT-FACING EFFECT-BOUND RECORD.

Field	Purpose
Before routing	
Surface invocation	Preserve the exact prompt-visible request.
Predicted effects	Store the frozen surface-plus-metadata set over six effect classes.
Evidence sources	Bind predictions to scripts, backends, Dockerfiles, task files, hooks, or MCP definitions.
Binding mode	Pre-bind frozen effects and provenance to the invocation.
Prediction provenance	Persist parser/rule version, decision time, and source hashes.
Permission path	
Adapter outcome	Record ASK, pass-through, or local denial.
Final decision	Record the permission path's final allow/deny outcome.
After execution	
Post-run binding	Append transcript and realized-effect evidence hashes.

APPENDIX B SECONDARY AUDIT ANALYSES

Building on the frozen denominators and runtime headline in C3–C4, these analyses add class-level error localization, terminal-state sensitivity, repeated-run stability, and runtime detail while preserving the primary estimates in Section VI.

A. Metric Definitions and Denominators

For each target-executed workflow i , let $E_i \subseteq \Omega_6$ and $\hat{E}_i \subseteq \Omega_6$ denote the independently observed and frozen predicted effect sets. Section VI uses the following case-level scores.

$$\rho_i = \begin{cases} 1, & E_i = \emptyset, \\ |\hat{E}_i \cap E_i|/|E_i|, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$\pi_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \hat{E}_i = E_i = \emptyset, \\ |\hat{E}_i \cap E_i|/|\hat{E}_i|, & |\hat{E}_i| > 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Macro recall and precision average the case-level scores in (6) equally over the target-executed workflows in each cohort; the primary Confirmatory-B denominator is 17. Its one additional workflow that does not reach target execution remains in protocol accounting but not in these outcome-dependent metrics.




Fig. 8. Cohort-separated prospective estimates. Controlled and Natural A are v1.0 development-side cohorts; Confirmatory B evaluates the frozen v1.1 parser. Points report cohort-level macro recall and precision; whiskers show 95% fixed-cohort case-resampling stability intervals, not population confidence intervals.




Fig. 9. Confirmatory-B sensitivity to denominator and cache treatment. The primary target-executed profile (17 overall/8 controls) is compared with all-terminal (18/9), successful-only (13/6), and post hoc cache-excluded (18/9) profiles; gray segments span their range.

For a disclosed effect set R_i , 16 of the 17 target-executed cases have a nonempty observed set. Case-macro coverage and residual effect instances are

$$\text{Cov}(R) = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{i: |E_i| > 0} \frac{|R_i \cap E_i|}{|E_i|}, \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Residual}(R) = \sum_{i=1}^{17} |E_i \setminus R_i|.$$

The empty-observed case contributes zero residuals and is excluded only from the undefined per-case coverage ratio.

B. Prospective Cohort Error Profiles

Controlled v1.0 pairs one positive with one control in each of six classes; class recall/precision are Cargo 1.000/0.833, IDE 0.833/1.000, MCP 0.583/1.000, npm 1.000/1.000, PEP 517 1.000/0.667, and shell 1.000/1.000.

Natural A has ten successful executions and two evidence-complete command failures. Exact-set accuracy is 0.167; positive and control recall/precision are 0.778/0.819 and 0.611/0.644. The successful-only view gives 0.733/0.678/0.200. Five missed file effects and five extra environment predictions dominate; the post hoc surface/metadata partition localizes them to the corresponding prediction layer.

Across the 17 target-executed Confirmatory B cases, three cases miss a file effect, while one process effect and one MCP effect are extra.

TABLE X
EFFECT-CLASS ERRORS ACROSS PROSPECTIVE COHORTS. ENTRIES ARE CASES WITH MISSED (M) OR EXTRA (E) EFFECTS; GRAY ZEROS DENOTE NO CASES.

Effect	Controlled <i>n</i> = 12		Natural A <i>n</i> = 12		Confirmatory B <i>n</i> = 17	
	M	E	M	E	M	E
Process	0	0	1	0	0	1
File	3	0	5	1	3	0
Environment	0	3	0	5	0	0
Network	0	0	2	2	0	0
Container	0	0	0	1	0	0
MCP	0	0	0	0	0	1

C. Confirmatory-B Sensitivities

Confirmatory B contains 18 prespecified cases: 13 successes, four evidence-complete command failures, and one setup failure. The primary target-executed view reports 0.875 control recall/precision. Treating NOT_EXECUTED as empty yields recall/precision/exact-set accuracy 0.931/0.889/0.722 and 0.778 control precision; restricting to successes yields 0.942/0.923/0.769 and 0.833. The setup failure never reached target execution.

Six predeclared three-run cases have mean pairwise Jaccard 1.000. Excluding Node/V8 cache deltas yields recall/exact-set accuracy 1.000/0.889. For the one target-executed empty-observed case, scoring recall as one, excluded, or zero yields 0.926/0.922/0.868; all exceed 0.80. Precision (0.941) and exact sets (13/17) are unchanged.