Agent Self-Improvement with Frozen Weights: The Added Value and Limits of Failure Traces

Arkid Mitra
Hopit AI
arkid@hopit.ai

Snehil Saluja
Overlayy
snehil@overlayy.com

arXiv:2611.11342v2 [cs.LG] 11 Nov 2026

Abstract

We evaluate whether an AI agent's harness, the notes around its model, can learn from the agent's failure traces beyond a matched search that never sees them. It can, but less than it looks. We tested an open 9-billion-parameter model with fixed weights; a larger teacher model wrote its notes. On generated customer-service decisions, where both note writers were told the target rules, notes based on the agent's mistakes improved accuracy by 4.0 percentage points over notes from the same process with the mistakes withheld. That process alone, trying and keeping better-scoring notes, reached about 60% of the total improvement. In full customer-service conversations the same notes showed no demonstrated improvement. Separately, a strict screen of single lessons admitted two customer-service lessons, still awaiting tests on new data, and one tool-use lesson, written without seeing the agent's mistakes, which showed no demonstrated gain on new tool-use tasks. A neutral note with no procedure scored higher than the learned lessons (exploratory). A blind audit judged 146 of 240 tool-use test items defective.

1 Introduction

Many deployed agents are small open models whose weights stay fixed. What can still change is the *harness*: the prompt, notes, tools and control logic around the model. A growing literature lets the agent, or a larger teacher, rewrite this harness from the agent's own traces (records of its interactions) [1–4]. We ask whether giving a teacher model access to a frozen Qwen3.5-9B agent's interaction traces helps it write notes that improve the agent's performance. We compare notes written with and without failure traces on generated retail decisions. We then compare the trace-written libraries with the standard harness in official retail conversations. Separately, we screen individual lessons; on BFCL (Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard) multi-turn, the lessons the screen admits are also tested on held-out tasks. Every primary analysis was pre-registered.

Comparing a learned harness with its starting point mixes several sources of gain. The first is *search*: a writer that proposes texts and keeps the best ones on a development set can improve the agent without reading any failure. The second is *evidence*: the writer read the agent's failures and encoded something about them. Our comparison tests the added value of access to the episode contents within this procedure. Our control only partly separates these sources of improvement. It used the same budget limits and retained development feedback, but the actual search could differ. Its gains could therefore come from search, candidate selection, restating supplied rules, or adding text.

The question matters because recent work is sceptical. Under matched budgets, harness evolution did not beat parallel sampling [5]. Failure-derived experience repairs the source tasks of self-evolving agents but rarely transfers to unseen ones, on backbones that include ours [6–8]. Some frontier agents do improve from their own artefacts [9]. On the same retail domain, ALTK-Evolve reports pass^4 rising from 57.5 to 67.5 on 40 held-out tasks from GPT-4.1's own traces, without a matched no-evidence control (a since-closed issue reported that its retail adapter mined test-split tasks by default) [10, 11]. On SkillsBench, skills an agent wrote for itself scored 42.9%, against 45.5% with no skills [12]. Several late-2026 studies report regressions, without significance tests: all sixteen evolved agents in one study lost tasks they had previously solved [13]; a coding harness evolved across successive task types forgot earlier ones [14]; previously solved instances regressed in 8 of 18 method–task pairs [15]; and memories of benign sessions led agents to skip confirmation on later high-stakes tasks [16]. Gains are also reported around frozen models from evolving prompts, tools and memory [17], and exposing the scorer's success criteria to the learner can yield gains that reflect the verifier rather than the task [18]. Model developers instead mostly turn agent failures into training environments for the weights [19], or rewrite the agent's verified runs into training data [20]. What is still missing is a way to tell, when a loop does show a gain, whether the agent's traces produced it.

Findings. (1) On isolated, generated retail decisions, lessons that the teacher wrote from the agent's failures beat a matched search that never saw a failure by +4.0 points; the point estimate is below the 5-point gain we registered as worthwhile, although the interval includes larger gains. (2) That search alone reached about 60% of the gain over the standard harness. (3) The same lesson libraries showed no demonstrated improvement in official τ^2 retail conversations.

(4) A strict screen of single lessons retained two of 12 candidate τ^2 lessons and rejected four that push towards asking again; the two still need held-out confirmation. On BFCL no lesson written from traces passed the screen, and the one that passed, written without traces, did not replicate on held-out tasks. (5) On held-out BFCL a neutral note scored higher than either set of lessons (descriptive), and most instances had scoring defects.

Contributions. (i) A *matched no-evidence search*: the same writer, loop and selection, with the episode contents withheld. (ii) A registered, harm-constrained *gate* that admits a lesson only if randomised experiments show that it meets registered screening thresholds for gain, per-context non-inferiority within a 1-point margin, and bounded harm. (iii) A blind *scorer audit*, each defect list frozen before its evaluation outcomes were opened, reported beside every BFCL estimate. (iv) Registered replications of the null result on transfer, with intervals.

2 Setup

Agent and harness. The agent is Qwen3.5-9B, served with vLLM with the model's built-in reasoning mode ("thinking") off. Its weights are never updated. The *standard harness* (B1) is the benchmark's reference agent: on τ^2 with the benchmark's optional think tool added (a tool call in which the agent writes a note to itself, separate from the thinking mode), and every learned or control text goes into one notes slot of the system prompt; on BFCL it is the official conversation without a notes message, and a text is added as one system message. An empty text gives exactly the standard harness. An *arm* is one experimental condition, specifying the harness and how its notes are assigned.

Benchmarks. *τ^2-bench retail* [21] is a customer-service domain with a written policy. We use it at two levels. At the *decision level*, each case is a synthetic conversation stopped at one decision (a *prefix*; for example, whether to change an address or ask first), scored against a fixed answer: 2,997 sealed test cases over three tasks (address, variant and sequence). A *wrong write* is a write tool call, such as changing an order, that is not exactly the correct one. At the *conversation level*, we run the official benchmark: 114 tasks × 4 trials, on τ^2-bench v1.0.1 (commit `672227c6`); τ-bench 2.0.0 (released 19–20 October 2026) is not score-comparable with 1.x [22], so our numbers hold for the pinned version. *BFCL multi-turn* [23] supplies every needed fact through the request and the tools, so asking the user cannot replace executing the right calls. Each of its 200 *roots* (task scenarios) has a Base and a Long-Context *instance*. We split the roots into 50 discovery, 30 gate and 120 held-out roots (reserved for testing), giving 60 gate and 240 held-out instances; an *episode* is one run of an arm on one instance.

Lessons and controls. A writer turns the agent's failures into short "WHEN situation THEN action" lessons. On τ^2 the writer is a larger teacher (Qwen3.8-Flash-Next-FP8; T+ in Figure 1) in a loop of propose, check on a validation split, keep or revert, over 12 seeded runs per task; each run yields a lesson library. On BFCL the writer is Qwen3.5-397B-A17B, reading 198 discovery episodes. We compare these lessons with two controls.

- On τ^2, the *no-evidence search* uses the same writer, prompts, loop, selection, budget ceilings and development feedback, with episodes replaced by a fixed sentence; it sees exactly what the learned writer sees apart from the episodes. On BFCL, it matches the writer, prompts, loop, step count, budget and candidate screen, but receives the function documentation instead of episodes.
- The *neutral note* (BFCL only) is a fixed system note with no procedure: "You can call the functions provided in this conversation. The user will make one or more requests, one turn at a time. Handle each request using the functions as needed, then reply." It tests whether adding any note changes behaviour.

The gate. Separately from these libraries, the gate screens single candidate lessons for admission: on τ^2, 12 candidates formed from the teacher libraries' lessons, run on training prefixes; on BFCL, the trace and search lessons, run on the gate instances. Each candidate is switched on or off at random across many runs, so its effect is estimated against a random background of the other lessons. A hierarchical Bayesian model pools the estimates across contexts (task × decision type on τ^2, domain family on BFCL). A lesson passes only if it has a credible gain of more than one point, enough exposure in every context, per-context non-inferiority within the registered 1-point margin (in every context, the probability of a loss of more than one point is below 0.10), and bounded harm (a wrong write on τ^2, a wrong final state on BFCL). On τ^2 it must pass under three named priors (sceptical, weakly informative, and slightly negative). On BFCL, lessons that pass go to a separate held-out test on the 120 unseen roots.

Pre-registration. Every primary contrast, interval method, threshold and decision rule was written into a hash-chained registry before the data were opened. GPU experiments were run by an external collaborator from experiment kits (versioned run code and inputs) tagged at the time of each run; the registry records each tag's commit hash. Answer keys stayed with us, and we scored the results.

Scorer audit. An external review had found score-changing defects in 8 of 15 sampled BFCL multi-turn items [24]. Two independent model-based reviewers labelled all 300 gate and test instances from benchmark material only, never

Table 1: Headline registered results. Estimates are in percentage points: contrasts are first arm minus second, gate rows a lesson's estimated gain; intervals are 95% confidence intervals except those marked CrI (90% credible intervals). The BFCL held-out primary is standard harness − lesson, so there a positive value favours the standard harness. Trace lessons were written from the agent's own episodes; the no-evidence search used the same writer and procedure without them.

Test	Estimate	Reading
τ^2 decisions: trace lessons − no-evidence search, accuracy (registered primary)	+4.0 [+2.3, +5.7]	passes superiority; point estimate below the 5-point worthwhile gain
Official τ^2 retail: trace lessons − standard harness, pass^1	−1.3 [−5.9, +3.3]	no demonstrated improvement
τ^2 gate: "address change first" / "list only the first change" / both together	+4.7 [+4.0, +5.4] / +2.7 [+2.0, +3.4] / +7.4 [+6.3, +8.4] (CrI)	passes the screen; no held-out test was run
BFCL gate: best lesson (from the no-evidence search); 0 of 8 trace lessons pass	+4.9 [+1.9, +8.0]; audited +3.9 [−0.4, +8.3] (both CrI)	passes the screen
BFCL held-out: standard harness − that lesson (positive favours the standard harness)	+0.31 [−3.12, +3.65], Holm p 1.000	null; did not replicate
BFCL held-out: neutral note − standard harness (descriptive)	+4.5 [+0.7, +8.4]	registered descriptive secondary; higher observed score, unadjusted for multiple tests; no confirmatory claim
Scorer audit: clearly defective BFCL instances	146 of 240 held-out; 42 of 60 gate (κ 0.84)	qualifies every BFCL estimate

from agent trajectories. An instance is *defective* if a plausible, natural response would have its official verdict flipped and the reviewers judge the case clear. The lists were frozen and registered before outcomes were opened. Official scores stay primary; the audited estimate (defective instances removed) is reported beside them and never used to choose anything.

3 Results

Decision level: the traces add a little. On the 2,997 sealed τ^2 decisions, the standard harness scored 70.3%, the no-evidence search 76.8% and the trace-written lessons 80.9% (Figure 1a, Table 1). The registered contrast, lessons minus search, is +4.0 [+2.3, +5.7]. It passes the superiority test; its point estimate falls below the 5-point gain we registered as worthwhile, though the interval includes larger gains. Relative to the search, wrong writes fell by 3.1 points [−4.6, −1.7]. The lessons improve on the standard harness by +10.5 points [+8.5, +12.5]. The control achieves 6.5 of those 10.5 points, about 60%, without traces. That entire control gain occurs on the task whose rule is stated in the writer's task description.

Conversations: no demonstrated improvement. In official τ^2 retail (114 tasks × 4 trials), pass^1 (the single-trial task success rate) was 82.9% for the standard harness and 81.6% with the lessons: −1.3 [−5.9, +3.3]. On the 40 tasks we had never used in development it was −0.6 [−6.9, +6.3]. The lessons changed the targeted behaviour: the number of conversations in which the agent changed items before changing the address fell from 6 to 0. These behaviours can affect which final states are reachable, and τ^2 rewards the final state.

The τ^2 gate admits two lessons, as a screen. From 12 candidate teacher lessons, run on 20,400 decisions over 1,200 prefixes, two passed every check under every prior: "change the address first" (+4.7 [+4.0, +5.4]) and "list only the first change" (+2.7 [+2.0, +3.4]); together +7.4 [+6.3, +8.4] (all three are 90% CrIs). Four lessons that push towards asking or confirming again were rejected, because each credibly hurt at least one context. These are estimates on the data used to select them. No held-out test was run, and the first lesson states the rule that the no-evidence search also wrote almost word for word.

BFCL gate: only the search passes. On 60 gate instances (2,820 episodes), none of the 8 trace-written lessons passed; every estimate lay within ±2.5 points. The one lesson that passed came from the no-evidence search: "when the current directory is unknown, call `pwd`", at +4.9 [+1.9, +8.0] (CrI). On the 18 instances the audit judged clean, its estimate fell to +3.9 [−0.4, +8.3] (CrI), an interval that includes zero.

BFCL held-out: no demonstrated gain. On 120 held-out roots (240 instances, 5,760 episodes), the registered difference between the standard harness and the search lesson was +0.31 [−3.12, +3.65] (Holm-adjusted p 1.000). As




Figure 1: (a) Decision-level ("Stage 1") accuracy on 2,997 sealed τ^2 retail cases: model only (B0), standard harness (B1), no-evidence search ("T+ search control"), trace lessons ("T+ learned library"; T+ is the teacher writer) and a person-written reference. Markers are per-task values for the address, variant and sequence tasks. (b) Wrong writes (write calls that are not exactly the correct one) for the same arms. (c) Official τ^2 retail conversations ("Stage 2"; 114 tasks × 4 trials): pass^k for the standard harness and the trace lessons. pass^k is the chance that all k trials of a task succeed, so it cannot increase as k grows (unlike pass@k, where any one success counts). The learned arm uses a different lesson library in each trial while the standard harness uses one prompt, so for $k > 1$ its pass^k also reflects variation across libraries; the pass^4 gap is exploratory.

the lesson's gain this is −0.31 [−3.65, +3.12], against +4.9 at the gate, which lies outside the interval; smaller positive effects remain compatible. The other registered contrast, standard harness minus all eight trace lessons run without the gate, was −0.52 [−4.38, +3.33] (Holm p 1.000). In registered descriptive secondary analyses, not corrected for multiple tests, the neutral note gained +4.5 [+0.7, +8.4] over the standard harness, more than either set of lessons; on clean instances this shrank to +3.4 [−1.9, +9.1]. The secondary analyses were registered, but the observation that the neutral note outperformed both lesson sets was not.

Scorer defects. The audit judged 146 of 240 held-out instances (60.8% [54.5, 66.8]) and 42 of 60 gate instances clearly defective, almost all because a correct response is scored wrong. Reviewer agreement was $\kappa = 0.84$. On clean held-out instances both learned-lesson arms sat about 6 points *below* the standard harness: standard harness − search lesson +6.0 [+0.2, +12.0] (Holm p 0.149), the primary's sign but much larger than +0.31; standard harness − the eight trace lessons +6.2 [−0.5, +13.2] (Holm p 0.153), the reverse of −0.52. By the registered rule the primary stands.

4 What this means

Access to mistakes helped on generated decisions. Access to the agent's mistakes improved decision accuracy within this procedure; the point estimate was below the registered worthwhile gain, although the interval includes larger gains. No improvement from learned lessons was demonstrated in full conversations or on held-out BFCL tasks. This agrees with other studies of small open models [6, 7, 25, 26]. Our addition is the controlled comparison: most of the decision-level gain came without reading failures.

Screens are not certifications. The two admitted τ^2 lessons remain untested in conversations, and on BFCL the admitted lesson's gate gain was not confirmed on held-out tasks. A selected winner should shrink on fresh data, and a gate on one split cannot tell a small true effect from selection on noise. Noise is large: across four identical trials of published τ^2 retail configurations, 33–55% of task verdicts flipped [27].

Some note effects may be non-specific. Because the neutral note scored higher than either set of lessons on held-out BFCL (descriptively), a learned note should be compared with a neutral note, not only with no note.

Benchmark scorers need audits. Most BFCL instances had clear defects, and the audit changed how strongly results can be read: the gate winner lost its credible gain on clean instances, and on clean held-out instances both learned-lesson arms sat about 6 points below the standard harness. Freezing it before outcomes kept it from steering results.

Limitations. We study one frozen 9B model, with thinking off, on two benchmarks. On τ^2 the writers' task descriptions stated the target rules, so the decision-level result measures whether a teacher can phrase a known rule so that the 9B follows it, not whether it can discover a rule. On BFCL the search writer saw documentation the trace writer did not. The decision cases are snapshots: the agent cannot explore or recover. Several deviations in the collaborator-run experiments are disclosed in full in the extended report. The registered teacher was replaced before any result; the τ^2 gate data were re-run in full after the first run's folder was lost; in that run, read calls were answered by the original database (visible in

0.27% of rows; removing them leaves the admitted lessons unchanged); BFCL used sampled decoding (temperature 0.7, not the official 0.001); and a scorer serialisation fix was applied after the run, with verdicts byte-identical wherever they could be compared.

What we do not claim.

- That the lessons have no effect on full conversations or held-out BFCL tasks: the intervals allow a few points either way.
- That the two admitted τ^2 lessons are certified, or that their gain comes from the traces.
- That these results extend beyond one agent, two benchmarks and one teacher family.

5 Conclusion

For a frozen Qwen3.5-9B agent, giving the teacher access to the agent's mistakes helped: its notes improved accuracy on generated decisions by +4.0 points over the matched search without episode contents. Both writers already had the target rules. But no improvement was demonstrated on full episodes, and without the matched search the decision-level gain would have looked 2.6 times larger. We expect the methods to outlast the answer: report a matched no-evidence search, compare notes with a neutral note, confirm gate winners on held-out data, and audit the scorer blind, before the comparison.

Data and code availability. Analysis code, this study's pre-registration records, the frozen defect lists and derived outcome tables are public at `https://github.com/hopit-ai/harness-mistakes-artifacts` (PolyForm Noncommercial licence); the experiment kits and other materials are available from the authors on request (arkid@hopit.ai). An extended version with all registered analyses is available from the authors.

References

[1] Qizheng Zhang, Changran Hu, Shubhangi Upasani, Boyuan Ma, Fenglu Hong, Vamsidhar Kamanuru, Jay Rainton, Chen Wu, Mengmeng Ji, Hanchen Li, Urmish Thakker, James Zou, and Kunle Olukotun. Agentic Context Engineering: Evolving Contexts for Self-Improving Language Models, 2025. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.04618`.

[2] Yifan Yang, Ziyang Gong, Weiquan Huang, Qihao Yang, Ziwei Zhou, Zisu Huang, Yan Li, Xuemei Gao, Qi Dai, Bei Liu, Kai Qiu, Yuqing Yang, Dongdong Chen, Xue Yang, and Chong Luo. SkillOpt: Executive Strategy for Self-Evolving Agent Skills, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.23904`.

[3] Lakshya A Agrawal, Shangyin Tan, Dilara Soylu, Noah Ziems, Rishi Khare, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Arnav Singhvi, Herumb Shandilya, Michael J Ryan, Meng Jiang, Christopher Potts, Koushik Sen, Alexandros G. Dimakis, Ion Stoica, Dan Klein, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. GEPA: Reflective Prompt Evolution Can Outperform Reinforcement Learning, 2025. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.19457`.

[4] Ruiyao Xu, Yanfei Chen, Zhongying CuiZhu, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, Yifei Ming, Han Yu, Rujun Han, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. Harness^2: Recursive Agent Harnessing for an Open World, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.14224`.

[5] Yike Wang, Huaisheng Zhu, Zhengyu Hu, Yige Yuan, Zhengyu Chen, Shakti Senthil, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Yulia Tsvetkov, Noah A. Smith, Pradeep Dasigi, and Teng Xiao. Rethinking the Evaluation of Harness Evolution for Agents, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.12227`.

[6] Weixiang Zhao, Yichen Zhang, Yanyan Zhao, Jinming Bai, Bin Liang, Ruifeng Xu, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. Self-Evolving Agents Can Repair Failures but Struggle to Generalize from Them, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.22984`.

[7] Liyang Fan, Yingcheng Shi, Yongbin Li, Chenghao Sun, Xin Chen, Xander Xu, Hu Wei, Shiwen Ni, Min Yang, and Jieping Ye. VibeMemBench: Evaluating Memory Systems for Coding Agents on Real Repository Coding Tasks, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.23570`.

[8] Hongqiang Lin, Chao Liu, Xiaofan Bai, Xuan Jin, Yuhong Li, Nenggan Zheng, and Xipeng Cao. Beyond Endpoint Performance: Process-Level Evaluation of Self-Evolving Agents, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.24663`.

[9] Harman Singh, Anton Bakhtin, Rulin Shao, Gabriel Synnaeve, Ilia Kulikov, Rob Fergus, Sanjeev Arora, Kurt Keutzer, Jason Weston, Anuj Mahajan, and Anirudh Goyal. Agent Plasticity: Measuring Self-Improvement Through Experience, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.08902`.

[10] Ashwath Vaithinathan Aravindan, Vatche Isahagian, Vinod Muthusamy, Jayaram Radhakrishnan, Evelyn Duesterwald, Gaodan Fang, et al. ALTK-Evolve: How learned memory tops the τ^2-bench leaderboard on customer service tasks without a frontier model. IBM Research blog, 20 Oct. `https://huggingface.co/blog/ibm-research/altk-evolve-bc`, 2026.

[11] Gaodan Fang. experiments: tau-retail mines test-split tasks by default, unlike AppWorld. Issue #426. `https://github.com/AgentToolkit/altk-evolve/issues/426`, 2026.

[12] Wangcheng Tao, Zhanglu Yan, Han Wu, and Weng-Fai Wong. Skill$^\infty$: Recursive Self-Improvement for Agent Skill Optimization, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.35434`.

[13] Xiaobo Wang, Zimu Wang, Siyu Ye, et al. Beneath the Surface: What We Overlook When We Talk About Agent Evolution, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2611.07624`.

[14] Shangziqi Zhao, Yitong Zhang, and Jia Li. Can Coding Agents Sustain Continual Evolution without Forgetting?, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2611.03219`.

[15] Bangrui Xu, Jie Yang, Sidi Chen, et al. SelfImprove-Bench: Evaluating Generalization in Self-Improving Agents, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2611.02797`.

[16] Kaiqu Liang, Jaime Fernández Fisac, Thomas L. Griffiths, and Andrew K. Lampinen. The Memory Trap: Language Agents Overgeneralize from Benign Interactions, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2611.07554`.

[17] Xinyi Xu, Xiaoyang Li, Yucheng Feng, et al. EvoGroup: A Self-Evolving Harness for Group Agents in Shared Contexts, 2026. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/2611.03868`.

[18] Wenbo Huang, Jianxin Bi, Shunyu Yang, et al. Learning the Task or Learning the Verifier? Rethinking Criteria Exposure in Embodied Self-Improvement, 2026. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2611.08318.
[19] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-V4.1-Flash: Pushing the Limits of KV Cache Compression, 2026. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.19969.
[20] Junyao Yang, Zongxia Li, Yucheng Shi, et al. Terminal-RSI: Recursive Self-Improving Terminal Agents via Recursive Self-Rewrite and Policy-Refine, 2026. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.22192.
[21] Victor Barres, Honghua Dong, Soham Ray, Xujie Si, and Karthik Narasimhan. τ^2-Bench: Evaluating Conversational Agents in a Dual-Control Environment. Repository: github.com/sierra-research/tau2-bench (v1.0.1 used), 2025. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.07982.
[22] Sierra Research. τ-bench 2.0.0 – Multilingual and Voice (release notes and CHANGELOG). https://github.com/sierra-research/tau2-bench/releases/tag/v2.0.0, 2026.
[23] Shishir G. Patil, Huanzhi Mao, Fanjia Yan, Charlie Cheng-Jie Ji, Vishnu Suresh, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. The Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard (BFCL): From Tool Use to Agentic Evaluation of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 267 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 48371–48392. PMLR, 2025. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/patil25a.html.
[24] Epoch AI. Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard (BFCL) v4 – Benchmark review. https://epoch.ai/benchmarks/berkeley-function-calling-leaderboard/review, 2026.
[25] Tianshi Xu, Huifeng Wen, and Meng Li. Adapting the Interface, Not the Model: Runtime Harness Adaptation for Deterministic LLM Agents, 2026. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.22166.
[26] Zhaochen Yu, Yingcheng Wu, Zhenfei Yin, Kaiyuan Chen, Zhe Zhao, Mengdi Wang, Shuicheng Yan, and Ling Yang. Recursive Experiential-Working Memory Evolution for Long-Horizon Agent Harnesses, 2026. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.24876.
[27] Universeyi. Run-to-run noise floor of the published baselines and leaderboard submissions, computed from the released trajectory files. Issue #540. https://github.com/sierra-research/tau2-bench/issues/540, 2026.