



Edit the Harness. Not the Model

Carrying Harness² over to Aesel, a piece-writing agent, in one day

Seven rounds, two models, three adopted edits, and what a single run per arm cannot tell you.

@jeffrey

Aesthetic.Computer — October 18, 2026

ORCID: 0009-0007-4460-4913

<https://aesthetic.computer>

Abstract. Harness² [Xu et al., 2026] improves an agent without touching its weights: for each task it runs the current harness, has two editors propose changes from the run’s transcript, re-runs the task under each change, composes the edits whose runs did better, and keeps a library of what each edit did. We carried the method over to Aesel, Aesthetic.Computer’s harness for writing pieces, in one day. The prompt text moved into named markdown sections that compile byte-identically into every surface (verified across 1,536 terminal states and 290 bridge and native states). A headless runner plays every save in a browser and returns what breaks to the model before its write completes. A refinement loop drives both, with the Claude CLI as editor, composer, blind selector and reflector. Seven live rounds on three interaction tasks, two with the default hosted model and one with Claude Sonnet 5.5 writing the pieces, produced three adopted edits and three lessons for the library. The default model benefited; Sonnet 5.5 delivered every task in two or three rounds and rarely needed the help. Every finding rests on one run per arm, and we say so.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *harness* is everything around a model that lets it act: the system prompt, guardrails, tool guidance, memory, skills and the loop that carries tool results back. When an agent writes a bad piece, the usual remedies are a better model or a better prompt written by hand after reading a complaint. Harness² proposes a third: make the harness itself the thing being optimised, task by task, from the agent’s own transcripts, with no answer key.

Aesel is a natural fit. It already wraps several models — the Claude and Codex CLIs, and a hosted loop on Aesthetic.Computer’s own inference — and the same prompt reaches the terminal, the phone and web clients, the native app, and the Whistlegraph editor that MIME embeds [jeffrey, 2026b,c]. A better harness improves all of them at once; a better model improves one.

This report describes what it took to make that possible, what the first live rounds found, and where the evidence is thin. The work was done on October 18, 2026, partly by two agent sessions in parallel; the plan and its record live in the repository [jeffrey, 2026a].

2. HARNESS²

Harness² [Xu et al., 2026, Google Research, 2026] names eight editable components — system prompt, guardrails, memory, tool guidance, subagents, skills, scripts and plugins — and runs two levels of recursion

over them. At the task level, a *propose–probe–compose* step runs the base harness, asks one editor to change *how the agent works* (tool errors, wasted rounds, unverified finishes) and another to change *what a practitioner knows*, runs the task under each candidate, and composes the edits whose runs behaved better where they aimed. Keeping the base is a valid outcome. At the harnessing level, a reflector writes a verdict for every edit — *helped*, *hurt*, *no observed effect* or *confounded* — and at most one lesson whose cue can fire on a different task, into a library later tasks of the same domain read first.

Two disciplines in the method matter more than its scale. Evidence is served to the editors as files, not truncated into a prompt. And a lesson resting only on confounded rows is called a guess. The released code binds its proposer prompts and tree validation to two agent frameworks, OpenCode and Codex; a third surface raises an error. We therefore carried the method over rather than adapting the code, and adapted its prompts under their Apache-2.0 licence.

3. SYSTEM

3.1 The prompt as named sections

Aesel’s prompt was assembled in JavaScript from string literals spread over six modules. It now lives in `aesel/harness/` as three markdown files — `systemprompt.md`, `guardrails.md`, `tool_guidance.md` — one `##` name section

per paragraph, with `{{placeholders}}` for the values a session fills. A sync script compiles them into a module, because the same text reaches browser clients, the native app and a bytecode bundle that cannot read files beside the source; the test suite fails when the module is stale. The move was checked by rendering the prompt before and after across 1,536 terminal session states and 290 bridge and native states, byte for byte. Whistlegraph’s own prompts, which are private, were moved the same way into the vault.

3.2 A runner with a verify loop

`ac run` executes one task under one harness and writes it down. A task is a list of requests, each a turn on the piece the last one left. A harness is a directory with one subdirectory per surface; any section it leaves out keeps the repository’s text. The *piece* runner is the hosted loop the terminal, phone and web share, with one substitution: `ac check` stands in for the person’s preview. Every save is played in a headless browser for four seconds with a tap and a space, and what that finds is written where the model’s `ac_preview` tool reads it — before the write’s tool result returns, so the model’s next round already knows. After each turn the final source is checked again, fresh. A turn *delivers* when it changed the piece and that check found no errors. The run directory keeps the transcript as actions and observations, every frame, every source revision, and the result.

3.3 The refinement loop

`refine` (Figure 1) runs one round per task through `ac run`, with the Claude CLI, isolated from the operator’s own settings, as every improver. Each stage receives a directory: the request, the base run’s trace with its frames, the deliverables, the domain’s library, and an editable copy of the harness. An edited harness must keep every section and every placeholder; a rejected one is returned once with the reason, then the stage keeps the base. The selector sees pieces only — source, last frame, reported errors — anonymised in a fixed order. Each round leaves `adopted/`, the changed sections as a harness of their own, and `changes.md`. Nothing it produces reaches the shipped prompt without a person.

4. EVALUATION

We ran the three interaction tasks — a pokeable jelly, finger-painted trails that fade, a playable snake — through three batches: a first round on jelly alone (R0), all three with the hosted default model, DeepSeek V4.1 Flash (R1), and all three with Claude Sonnet 5.5 writing the pieces (R2). Claude Sonnet 5 was the improver throughout. Table 1 gives every run.




Figure 1: One round of `refine`. Pink stages run the task through `ac run`; purple stages are Claude sessions reading evidence served as files. A candidate identical to an earlier harness reuses its run.

4.1 What the rounds found

Rules that changed the piece. In R1 jelly the base piece’s spring rim folded through itself under a poke; the dom editor added to `piece-visual` a rule bounding impulse against stiffness, clamping rim points away from the centre, and judging over several frames, and its piece dented and settled (Figure 2). In R1 snake the base game had already ended before the check’s first input — an empty board reading *score 0*; the adopted rule holds a self-moving game in a ready state until the player’s first key or touch. In R2 trails the inv editor added to `piece-reply` that the model must say when its check exercised a different interaction from the one it describes — a tap standing in for a drag, a frame taken after a fade — and that piece was chosen.

A rule that helped and was not adopted. In R0 the base run lost two rounds to `circle` and `screen` used in functions that had not destructured them. The dom edit to `api-workflow` — each lifecycle function receives its own copy of the API — gave a clean first save, and the reflector marked it *helped*. The selector still preferred the base piece, which wobbled on a plain tap. Selection judges pieces, not edits; the library is where such an edit survives, as a medium-confidence lesson.

A failure that was evidence. The inv candidate on jelly hit the output cap in R0 and again in R1. In both, the third response spent most of its 8,192 tokens thinking — 6,379 in R1 — before a save could fit. Both inv edits had added a check-before-saving *procedure*. We read this as the edit hurting on a reasoning model, not

Batch	Task	Base	inv	dom	Chosen	Claude
R0 Flash	jelly	✓ 69 s / 6 rounds	× output limit	✓ 77 s / 4	base	\$1.40
R1 Flash	jelly	✓ 77 s / 4	× output limit	✓ 85 s / 5	dom	\$1.33
R1 Flash	trails	✓ 75 s / 12	✓ 69 s / 11	✓ 76 s / 8	base	\$2.12
R1 Flash	snake	✓ 19 s / 4	✓ 23 s / 4	✓ 31 s / 5	dom	\$2.39
R2 Sonnet 5.5	jelly	✓ 39 s / 3	✓ 32 s / 3	✓ 33 s / 3	base	\$1.91
R2 Sonnet 5.5	trails	✓ 24 s / 2	✓ 25 s / 2	= base	inv	\$1.62
R2 Sonnet 5.5	snake	× out of allowance	—	—	—	\$0.73

Table 1: Every run, one per arm. A tick is a delivered turn, with wall time and model rounds; *output limit* means the model’s 8,192-token response cap ended the turn before a save. The composed candidate equalled one of the others in every round except R1 trails, where it also delivered (67 s / 10) and was not chosen. Claude is the improvers’ cost per task. R2 snake failed before reaching the model and is excluded from every claim below.




Figure 2: The last frame *ac check* recorded for six runs; a tick marks the chosen piece. Left: the R1 jelly base folds into lobes under a poke where the adopted candidate dents and holds. Middle: the R1 snake base reaches game over before any input; the adopted candidate waits. Right: Sonnet 5.5’s jelly base, chosen over both candidates, and its chosen trails piece, blank because the frame was taken after the trail faded — the case its adopted rule names.

noise: state the fact, not a routine to run.

A model that needed little help. Every Sonnet 5.5 run delivered in two or three rounds and 24–39 s, against 4–12 rounds and 19–100 s for Flash. Its editors proposed the same kinds of rule; with Sonnet writing, only the reporting rule changed which piece won.

5. WHAT THE METHOD NEEDED HERE

Two changes to the loop came from its own output. In R0 the *inv* editor wrote its rule into a section only terminal sessions in a repository receive, so its probe could not test it. Runs now record the system prompt they sent, match it against every section’s fixed text, and give editors the list; in R1 and R2 every edit landed in

a section the run received. And R2 snake ran out of the day’s inference allowance before reaching the model, yet the improvers were paid \$0.73 to read the failure; a base run that never reaches the model now stops the batch.

A third came from the session itself. The plan was being carried out by two agent sessions at once, and they implemented the same step twice before one noticed. The record in the repository is now the first thing a session reads.

6. LIMITATIONS AND ETHICS

One run per arm. Every comparison above is a single base run against a single candidate run, and Flash is noisy: R0 and R1 ran the same base harness on jelly and

took six and four rounds. A finding here is a reason to look, not a measured effect. An earlier hand-run pass on Whistlegraph targets, with pixel-scored re-renders, reached the same conclusion: a loop needs several runs per arm and, where possible, a scorer per task.

The verdict is narrow. *Delivered* means the final source ran for four seconds, under one tap and one space, without an error. It does not establish that a game is playable or a trail visible; the blank frame in Figure 2 is a delivered run. The selector and reflector are models judging models, and the same model family edits and judges.

Always-on cost. Two adopted rules are specific to a kind of piece — spring rims, self-moving games — but were written into *piece-visual*, which every piece request carries. They should not ship there as written.

Cost and consent. The seven rounds cost \$11.50 of Claude usage and the day’s Aesthetic.Computer inference allowance. No person’s work or data was used: tasks are synthetic requests and pieces were never published. Requests went to the inference vendors as in ordinary use; transcripts and frames are stored only on the machine that ran them.

7. CONCLUSION

Moving the prompt into named sections was the step everything else waited on, and it was the cheap one. With the harness editable and every embedding reading it, a round costs a few dollars and leaves a diff a person can read. The first rounds found real failure modes — a folding rim, a game lost before it began, an unchecked claim — and one rule that helped but lost the vote. They also found that the stronger model needed the harness least. Whether these rules hold is a question for repeated runs, which is the next thing to build.

References

- Google Research. `google-research/harness2`. Source repository, Apache License 2.0; read at commit `1cfe254` on October 18, 2026. URL <https://github.com/google-research/harness2>.
- @jeffrey. `Harness2 for Aesel and its Embeddings`. `aesel/docs/harness2.md` in the Aesthetic.Computer repository, commit `3ffb99a704`, 2026a. URL <https://aesthetic.computer>.
- @jeffrey. Shipping the Easel. Aesthetic.Computer papers, field report, September 11, 2026b. URL <https://papers.aesthetic.computer/shipping-the-easel-26-report.pdf>.
- @jeffrey. Paying for Strangers. Aesthetic.Computer papers, field report, 2026c. URL <https://papers.aesthetic.computer/paying-for-strangers-26-arxiv.pdf>.
- Ruiyao Xu, Yanfei Chen, Zhongying CuiZhu, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, Yifei Ming, Han Yu, Rujun Han, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. `Harness2: Recursive Agent Harnessing for an Open World`. arXiv preprint arXiv:2610.14224, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.14224>.



Source bundle

The attached ZIP contains the paper’s machine-readable text sources and a plain-text inventory. It supports accessibility, audit, quotation, and reproducible editing; the PDF remains the canonical reading edition. Private evidence, credentials, raw datasets, generated PDFs, and unlisted assets are excluded.