

Compile Once, Govern Every Repair: Deterministic Replay for Repeated GUI Work

Richard Abrich*
OpenAdapt.AI (MLDSAI Inc.)
ORCID: [0000-0002-9556-4491](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9556-4491)
richard@openadapt.ai

Draft of August 2026

Abstract

Reasoning through a known workflow on every run is wasteful and unsafe. It adds latency, inference cost, and run-to-run variation, and—because a rendered success banner is not a persisted write—it can report success after a partial, duplicate, stale, or rejected business effect. We present OpenAdapt, a demonstration compiler that converts one recorded GUI trace into a deterministic program. Healthy replay follows structured elements and local visual evidence with *no model calls*; when evidence changes, a resolution ladder re-resolves the target and records the change as a reviewable *repair*; and the runtime *refuses* to continue when configured identity, postcondition, effect, or policy checks cannot verify an action. The central safety mechanism is system-of-record effect verification: a consequential step declares a typed effect and checks it against the application’s own state, not the screen. Every run ends in exactly one *transaction outcome*, of which only one is a production success, and a run whose delivery or persistence is uncertain is never blindly retried. Measured through the live replayer’s governed actuation and verification path, with the observation backend and vision stack stubbed so the study isolates verification rather than perception, and judged by an independent system-of-record ground truth, screen-only verification silently accepted 54 of 90 injected-fault runs; an out-of-band effect check cut that to 9 of 90 and a complete system-of-record read path to 0 of 90, the residual nine being one collateral-write class outside the out-of-band oracle’s read coverage. The finding replicates on a second, non-healthcare lending domain with the same three-arm ladder: 24 of 36 silent wrong effects under screen-only verification, 3 of 36 under a single out-of-band oracle (the same collateral residual), and 0 of 36 under a complete read path. It also holds on two multi-application workflows that span email, spreadsheets, documents, a UI-only gateway, and two systems of record: across 30 governed runs, zero silent incorrect successes and zero healthy-path over-halts, against six under the same runs’ banner oracle. Bounded experiments span a public OpenEMR workflow, a CI-reproducible fixture, a 29-application public-web corpus, transactional fault injection, adversarial identity tests, and scoped qualifications of native Windows UIA, macOS, and real-network RDP mechanisms. On the two demonstrated tasks measured here, compiled replay completed every run with lower median latency and no model calls than a single-attempt, un-scaffolded computer-use agent on the same backend, while preserving independently checked effects and ambiguity refusal; these are bounded, unequal samples and not a reliability comparison. Every headline number in this paper is bound by a released machine-check to either a reviewed raw artifact or a bounded aggregate summary. Every system of record evaluated here is synthetic or a public demonstration instance, no external organization has yet deployed the system, and no result covers real Citrix ICA/HDX: the Citrix evidence reported here is a deterministic synthetic stand-in that reproduces ICA/HDX *conditions* without the real protocol. The release publishes the engine, the machine-check, permitted benchmark files, and the failure taxonomy; grown identity and reliability corpora, deployment-derived tuning, per-target recipes, and raw private evaluation rows are not part of the public release.

*Competing interests and funding: see the statement before the bibliography.

1 Introduction

Much operational computer work is *repeated*: the business intent is stable, the sequence is mostly known, errors are costly, and the same task may run hundreds of times. Reasoning through such a workflow on every run is both wasteful and unsafe. Wasteful, because a general model re-derives the same plan each time, paying latency, inference cost, and run-to-run variation. Unsafe, because the usual success signal is the *screen*: a model or a script sees a rendered “Saved” banner and stops—but a banner is not a persisted write. The same green pixels can follow a partial save, a duplicate submission, a stale overwrite, or a silently rejected transaction. The failure mode that matters in production is not the visible crash; it is the *silent wrong action* that reports success.

Graphical user interfaces remain the practical integration boundary for legacy, third-party, and remote applications, so this problem cannot be assumed away with an API. Selector-based automation is fast and deterministic when stable structure is available but brittle under interface drift, while visual scripting extends to pixel surfaces [27]. Recent computer-use agents instead observe the screen and choose each action with a general model [2, 22, 7], a useful formulation for previously unseen tasks and broad benchmarks [28, 10, 26]. Neither line closes the safety gap: RPA does not check the system of record, and an agent re-reasons every run yet still trusts the screen.

OpenAdapt treats a successful human demonstration as source material for a *program* rather than as context for a model on every run (Figure 1). Compilation extracts parameters, redundant target evidence, postconditions, and risk metadata. Replay follows the compiled program deterministically and makes zero model calls on the healthy path; models are optional repair tiers, not the controller. Where a step is consequential, an independent verifier checks the effect against the application’s own system of record, and the runtime refuses rather than guessing when it cannot verify. The distinction the paper foregrounds is not whether a task *completed* but whether identity and external effects were *verified*, and whether the system can *refuse* when evidence is insufficient. In an injected-fault study this distinction is decisive, and we measure it through the live replayer’s governed actuation and verification path and judge it by an independent system-of-record ground truth: screen-only verification silently accepted 54 of 90 fault runs, an out-of-band effect check cut that to 9 of 90, and a complete system-of-record read path to 0 of 90 (Section 6). The same gap replicates on a second, non-healthcare lending domain and on two multi-application workflows spanning email, spreadsheets, documents, and two systems of record.

This paper makes five contributions:

1. A demonstration compiler and backend-neutral workflow representation for deterministic repeated GUI execution.
2. A resolution ladder that prefers structured identity, then local visual evidence, and records bounded drift repairs as reviewable changes.
3. System-of-record effect verification that treats the screen as a weak oracle and the application’s own state as the strong oracle, closing the gap between a rendered success and a persisted effect.
4. Governance mechanisms that distinguish runnable from certified, verify identity and system effects where configured, and refuse rather than silently degrade. Three are load-bearing for the thesis and are described in Section 4: an explicit *transaction outcome* taxonomy backed by a privacy-safe effect journal and an at-most-once idempotency ledger, so an uncertain write is reconciled rather than retried; a *governed repair promotion lifecycle* in which a runtime repair is only ever a candidate until human review, contract-invariant enforcement, replay and fault campaigns, a digest-bound approval, and a bounded auto-rollback canary have all passed; and *explicit surface selection*, which refuses an implicit browser default in production and refuses to run a workflow qualified on one execution surface on another.
5. An evaluation protocol that reports task success *together with* silent incorrect success and over-halt, with a failure taxonomy and *machine-checked paper constants* that bind every headline number to a released raw artifact or bounded aggregate summary. The protocol is instantiated as EffectBench, a standalone versioned benchmark, and is exercised in a second non-healthcare domain and on two multi-application workflows so that the metric is not tied to one fixture. Raw grown corpora, deployment-derived

tuning, and target-specific recipes remain outside the public release. The machine-check establishes transcription fidelity—that the prose faithfully cites the released evidence—not the validity of the underlying measurement; a sound number and an unsound one are bound alike.

The evaluation deliberately separates a broad product architecture from the scope of each measured result. Browser workflows supply the comparative and breadth studies. Additional task-bound qualifications cover Windows UIA, native macOS, and real-network RDP with independent effect oracles and ambiguity or stale-target refusals. Two multi-application benchmarks add branching, exception paths, and cross-system effects. These results establish working substrate and workflow mechanisms for the named environments; they are not a population estimate for arbitrary enterprise applications. No external organization has deployed the system, so nothing here is field-reliability evidence. Citrix ICA/HDX is a pixel-only remote-display environment in the same class as the measured RDP backend, and we report a qualification of the shipping Citrix Workspace backend against a *deterministic synthetic stand-in* that reproduces ICA/HDX conditions in process. That stand-in is not Citrix: it exercises no HDX codec, no ICA compression, and no Workspace-client transport, and its released artifact records `is_real_ica_hdx: false`. The measured remote-display result in this paper is RDP over Aardwolf into a Parallels Windows guest, and RDP evidence does not transfer to Citrix either. The limitations section states this scope precisely and names the specific validation it would take.

2 Related Work

GUI automation and RPA. Robotic process automation systems execute rules over existing application interfaces and organizational workflows; their adoption and governance questions are surveyed by van der Aalst et al. [25]. Screenshot-driven automation predates current multimodal agents. Sikuli made visual patterns a first-class interface for search and scripting [27]. OpenAdapt shares the objective of operating interfaces that lack a practical API, but combines structured elements and visual evidence in an ordered ladder and makes a repair an auditable program change.

Programming by demonstration and synthesis. Programming by demonstration infers reusable behavior from user actions rather than requiring conventional source code [8]. Programming-by-example systems such as FlashFill demonstrate how compact examples can produce deterministic programs while exposing ambiguity in the inferred intent [12], and web-scraping-by-demonstration systems such as Rousillon compile direct manipulation into a reusable program [5]. A GUI trace similarly under-specifies intent: coordinates do not identify the semantic target, and one trajectory does not determine every branch or loop.

We name this line explicitly because OpenAdapt performs inductive program synthesis whether or not it calls itself that. A demonstration is evidence, not a specification, so the compiler faces the classical problem of a hypothesis *space* consistent with the examples—the setting version-space algebra formalized for demonstration [14] and that inductive-synthesis frameworks such as PROSE/FlashMeta generalized with witness functions [20]. OpenAdapt’s multi-trace induction is the same move: a value that varies across aligned traces becomes a typed parameter, a repeated sub-sequence whose repetition count varies becomes a loop, and a divergence under a detectable condition becomes a guarded branch. Where the space does not collapse to one program, it does not sample from it. Underdetermined induction on a consequential step is *quarantined*: an ambiguous loop around an irreversible action, or an unhandled zero-result branch, is emitted as an uncertainty and the workflow is left uncertified until the operator answers a concrete grounded question—the interactive-disambiguation posture of SUGILITE and DiLogics [16, 21] rather than the maximum-likelihood completion. Runtime target repair supplies the other half of the generate-and-check loop familiar from counterexample-guided inductive synthesis and syntax-guided synthesis [24, 1], and qualification campaigns supply the counterexamples: a repair candidate is replayed against a perturbation battery and a fault battery before it may be promoted (Section 4).

The closest comparable system is WebRobot [9], which synthesizes web RPA programs from an interactive demonstration by speculating rewrites and then validating them against the *retained* action and DOM traces rather than executing candidates against the live site, precisely because a candidate program may have unintended side effects. We arrived at the same constraint from the safety direction rather than the synthesis direction, and we treat this as convergent design, not inheritance: our induction validates against retained

Table 1: Where OpenAdapt sits, as a *design-intent* positioning rather than an empirical head-to-head. The columns are the properties OpenAdapt was designed around, so its clean row is by construction; the table summarizes which paradigm *addresses* each property, not a measured capability comparison. ✓ = designed-in, ~ = partial or tool-dependent, blank = not addressed by the paradigm.

Approach	No per-run model call	Deterministic healthy path	Repairs under drift	Verifies effect	Refuses on ambiguity
Selector RPA [25]	✓	✓			
Visual scripting [27]	✓	✓	~		
PBD / synthesis [8, 12]	✓	✓			~
Computer-use agents [2, 28]			✓		~
OpenAdapt	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

traces and quarantines what it cannot certify, and our runtime additionally refuses *at execution time* when the effect it intended cannot be verified. Long-horizon demonstration synthesis for robot tasks [19] and model-proposes/symbolic-decides architectures such as HYSYNTH [3] draw the same boundary we do between a model that may propose and a deterministic component that decides; in OpenAdapt that boundary is enforced by construction, since a model actor is rejected on every transition of the repair promotion lifecycle.

OpenAdapt departs from this line in two ways: it repairs targets at runtime under drift, and it verifies downstream effects rather than only reproducing input actions.

Computer-use agents and benchmarks. A rapidly growing line of computer-use agents observes the screen and chooses each action with a general multimodal model [2, 22, 7], evaluated on breadth-oriented benchmarks such as WebArena, WorkArena, and OSWorld [28, 10, 26]. These emphasize task completion under online reasoning on previously unseen tasks. Our question is complementary: after a workflow has been *demonstrated*, when can execution be compiled so that repeated healthy runs need no model decision? We retain task-level oracles but additionally measure silent incorrect success and over-halt, which distinguish unsafe success from conservative refusal—quantities these benchmarks do not report.

Runtime verification, oracles, and end-to-end effects. Runtime verification synthesizes monitors that evaluate execution traces against explicit safety properties [13], and the end-to-end argument places a correctness check at the layer that can establish the intended property rather than an intermediate subsystem [23]. Deciding whether an observed outcome is correct is the *test-oracle problem* [4], and a large software-testing literature builds partial oracles when a full specification is absent: metamorphic testing checks relations between related executions [6], and regression and differential oracles compare against a trusted prior or a reference implementation. Our silent-wrong-effect rate is in this family: it is a partial, state-based oracle that reads the system of record out of band rather than deriving a full specification of correctness.

Asserting against the backend rather than the interface is, importantly, not new: mature end-to-end test suites routinely check a database row or an API response after driving a UI, precisely because UI-level assertions are brittle and flaky [15, 17], and commercial RPA platforms expose database and API activities that a workflow author can use the same way. We claim no novelty for the idea of reading the backend. Our contributions are that this check is (i) made a *first-class runtime gate* rather than an optional test assertion—an unverifiable effect halts production execution—(ii) turned into a reported *metric* for automation reliability, and (iii) measured against an oracle that is operationally independent of both the write path and the automation’s own verifier. The faults OpenAdapt targets—duplicate submission, double delivery, stale overwrite—are the same exactly-once and idempotency hazards studied in transactional systems [11]. These principles motivate OpenAdapt’s separation between screen postconditions and system-of-record effects: a rendered success banner cannot independently establish that a transaction was persisted correctly. We claim nothing like a general formal-verification result; Section 4 states exactly what the guarantee is scoped to.




Figure 1: OpenAdapt compiles one demonstration into a deterministic program. Healthy replay makes no model calls. Each step passes governance gates; the runtime verifies and succeeds, records a bounded *repair* when a lower-fidelity rung re-resolves a changed target, or *refuses* when a configured check cannot be verified. A repair is an auditable patch, never a silent overwrite of the deployed bundle.

3 System Design

3.1 Record and compile

A recorder captures actions, frames, element observations, and structural state when available. Declared secret fields are replaced with runtime parameters. The compiler emits a bundle containing a workflow program, target crops, locators, landmarks, postconditions, parameter declarations, and a manifest. The linear trace is the simplest program; the intermediate representation also supports states, guarded transitions, branches, loops, and subflows. Given several demonstrations of the same task, a deterministic multi-trace induction pass promotes a value that varies at an aligned position to a typed parameter, a consecutive repeated sub-sequence whose repetition count varies to a loop over an inferred relation, and a divergence under a detectable condition to a guarded branch; it makes no model call. Its reach is deliberately narrow and we state the limit rather than the aspiration: only consecutive repeated bodies are recognized, so a navigate-away-and-return loop, a paginated loop, and a per-row-conditional body are not. Where induction cannot certify the shape—an ambiguous loop around an irreversible action, an undetermined branch condition, an unhandled zero-result case—it emits an uncertainty and quarantines the result rather than inventing one, and the compiled workflow stays uncertified until an operator answers a concrete, grounded question about the specific divergence.

Parameterization is where a compiler is most tempted to guess, because the difference between a constant and a parameter is the difference between replaying a demonstration and running a new case. OpenAdapt therefore infers parameter *candidates* deterministically—a value typed into a field carries the field’s own label, taken from the recorder’s structural capture or, failing that, from the nearest OCR line left of or above the field rectangle—and then refuses to apply them. Each candidate is written to a sidecar with the example value masked, and one batch operator pass confirms, renames, marks secret, or keeps each as a constant. The default on an unanswered prompt is *keep constant*: an unconfirmed inference changes nothing, and the bundle replays exactly as demonstrated. This is deliberate rather than conservative for its own sake—the parameter name is the identifier an effect contract binds to and that secrets are keyed by, so naming is confirmed by a human, never inferred behind the operator’s back. The inference makes no model call.

3.2 Resolution ladder

For an action target, replay tries evidence in descending order of fidelity: structured DOM or accessibility identity, local and global template matching, OCR, landmark geometry, and an optional grounding model. A backend presents a small common contract for observation and actuation. This provides a pixel floor without discarding structured evidence on browsers and native desktops.




Figure 2: The resolution ladder tries evidence in descending order of fidelity. Structured identity is preferred; local visual evidence gives a pixel floor for substrates without a DOM. Rungs 1–5 are deterministic and make no model calls. A grounding model is an optional last rung, disabled by default, and its rescue is subject to the same identity and effect checks.

Healthy execution stops at deterministic tiers and makes zero model calls. A lower rung resolving a changed but verified target creates a repair patch. The runtime can save a healed derivative bundle, but does not silently replace the deployed source bundle.

3.3 Postconditions and reports

Each step may carry visual or structural postconditions such as text presence, region stability, URL change, or window state. Replay writes a human-readable and machine-readable report with rung, confidence, identity verdict, postconditions, effects, model calls, elapsed time, repair, and halt reason. Postconditions are necessary but not sufficient: a success banner is evidence about the screen, not independent evidence about a database write.

3.4 Backends and explicit surface selection

The browser backend is the reference implementation and supplies published end-to-end evidence against a real third-party application. Windows UI Automation adds structured candidate enumeration and native actions behind a typed, authenticated in-session contract. Native macOS binds capture and input to a unique application window. The RDP and Citrix Workspace backends expose the same runtime contract over a pixel-only network session. Section 4 reports scoped task and effect qualifications for the Windows, macOS, and RDP mechanisms, and a deterministic synthetic stand-in campaign for the Citrix Workspace backend. A real Citrix ICA/HDX environment is a separate deployment and inherits neither the RDP qualification nor the stand-in campaign.

The browser is one execution surface among six—`web`, `windows`, `macos`, `linux`, `rdp`, and `citrix`—and not a privileged default. Each surface fixes an execution *mode*: `rdp` and `citrix` are *external*, driving a local client window of a remote session through pixels, keyboard, and mouse with nothing installed inside that session; the others are *in-session*. The mode is fixed by capability negotiation at qualification and is never silently switched at run time. Two consequences are enforced at the command line rather than documented as advice. First, under the production execution profiles a record or run command that does not name a surface is *refused*, because an implicit browser default silently decides the substrate a workflow will be qualified on. Second, a compiled bundle carries the surface it was recorded on, and running it on a different surface is refused unless the operator passes an explicit override, which is then recorded in the run report as compatibility evidence. A cross-surface run is never silent.

4 Governed Execution

4.1 Identity before action

Target resolution answers where to act; identity verification asks whether the resolved target belongs to the intended entity. Structured text is authoritative where available. On pure-pixel substrates, OCR ambiguity can make distinct identifiers observationally identical. The safe response is abstention and halt, not a guessed click. Importantly, identity guarantees apply only to armed steps. Current real bundles can contain unarmed clicks, so coverage is reported per workflow and certification policy can impose a minimum.

4.2 Effect verification

A screen may paint success after a partial, duplicate, rejected, or stale write. Consequential steps can therefore declare typed effects and use an independent verifier against REST, FHIR, or document state. The verifier snapshots the system of record before and after an action and returns confirmed, refuted, or indeterminate. A declared effect without a configured verifier halts.

Crucially, the strong-oracle read is performed *out of band*: the verifier queries the system of record through its own interface (a SQL read on a read-only role, a REST or FHIR read, or a document or file read), independently of the substrate that carried the write. It does not parse the pixel stream or scrape the rendered page. The same effect contract therefore holds whether the write was driven through a browser DOM, native accessibility, or a pixel-only remote session: what changes is only the connector, not the check. Because the read is out of band, an unreachable, unreadable, or unauthenticated system of record maps to indeterminate and halts; the runtime never upgrades “I could not read the record” into a reported success.

Two consequences follow for pixel-only substrates such as RDP and Citrix. First, the effect check still applies as long as some out-of-band read path exists: the RDP qualification in Section 6, for instance, reads the persisted file through guest tools, a channel independent of the RDP display. Second, when a locked-down session exposes *no* such path, no database, no reachable API, and no readable file, the transactional strong oracle is simply unavailable. The only fallback is a same-application re-read of the record, which cannot catch a partial save, a duplicate, a stale overwrite, or a lost update, and the honest runtime treats that as a halt rather than a confirmation. On such substrates the safety guarantee rests instead on the identity gate and halt-on-ambiguity, not on effect verification. Effects are currently authored per deployment; the compiler does not infer them from a single demonstration. This is the classic *oracle problem* [4] made concrete: the screen is a weak oracle and the application’s own state is the strong oracle (Figure 3). Many of the faults it catches—duplicate submission, double delivery, stale overwrite—are exactly-once and idempotency hazards long studied in transactional systems [11]. Unlike a general formal-verification claim, the guarantees here remain scoped to armed steps, declared effects, configured verifiers, and named policies.

4.3 The verifier as a pluggable adapter, and its confidence tier

Because the oracle must be authored per deployment, the interface to it is a first-class extension point rather than a fixed set of connectors. A verifier adapter declares a substrate and a confidence tier and implements four operations: a read-only connection probe, a before-state capture, an after-state capture, and a verdict. Secrets arrive as environment or secret-manager *references*, never literals. Shipped adapters cover REST, GraphQL, FHIR, statement-checked read-only SQL, file and SFTP arrival, maildir email delivery, document arrival, and document hashing; a third party registers its own for a proprietary system of record either programmatically or by publishing a packaging entry point named for the effect kind it serves. A plugin that fails to import is a hard error rather than an unknown kind, and a plugin can never shadow a built-in kind.

Three properties of that interface are load-bearing. First, the adapter result is deliberately six-valued—confirmed, refuted, unavailable, stale, conflicting, indeterminate—and only *confirmed* lets a step proceed; the other five map to a halt, and four of them to an explicit reconciliation requirement, because “the record says no” and “I could not read the record” are different facts and must not be collapsed. Second, freshness can only weaken evidence: a confirmed verdict whose matched record carries a missing, unparseable, or out-of-window timestamp is demoted to indeterminate, and no freshness rule can rescue a failure into a pass. Third, each adapter declares its confidence tier, and a same-screen read-back is explicitly the lowest tier—a consistency check, never independent system-of-record proof—so a deployment cannot quietly satisfy an effect

requirement with the weak oracle the mechanism exists to replace. Evidence redaction, likewise, can only minimize what is retained; it cannot soften a failure into a success.

4.4 Transaction outcomes, effect journal, and idempotency

A run’s terminal state is not a boolean. OpenAdapt classifies every run into exactly one *transaction outcome* describing what is known about the business effect: VERIFIED, HALTED-BEFORE-EFFECT, RECONCILIATION-REQUIRED, FAILED-PLATFORM, CANCELED, REJECTED-POLICY, COMPLETED-UNVERIFIED, and ROLLED-BACK. Only VERIFIED is a production success and only VERIFIED is billable; a demonstration-profile completion is COMPLETED-UNVERIFIED and can never be mistaken for one. HALTED-BEFORE-EFFECT is reserved for the case where a verifier affirmatively established that no effect occurred—an unread record is not an absent record. RECONCILIATION-REQUIRED therefore dominates every other non-success bucket: any unresolved delivery uncertainty, any indeterminate effect verdict, and any refutation that did *not* establish absence lands there. This is what makes the classification operationally meaningful rather than cosmetic, because RECONCILIATION-REQUIRED forbids a blind retry of the consequential write.

Two records support it. The *effect journal* is a per-step ledger over the executed consequential steps, recording for each one the digests of the effect contracts it intended to apply, whether it was actuated and whether delivery was uncertain, whether the effect was observed present, absent, conflicting, or unknown, whether independent verification actually ran this run, and how many reconciliation actions were performed. It is deliberately privacy-safe by construction: hashes, closed enums, counts, and timestamps only, with no record values, parameters, or free text, so it can leave the trusted boundary that the underlying observations cannot. The *idempotency ledger* is an append-only at-most-once store keyed by a caller-supplied key. A run reserves its key *before any actuation*, so a crash after the write leaves a reservation behind; a later run under the same key is refused and recorded rather than re-actuated. A corrupt ledger fails loud instead of treating keys as unseen, and the suppressed replay never overwrites the original run’s outcome.

4.5 Governed repair promotion

Section 6 reports that the resolution ladder repairs drifted targets without a model. A repair that could silently become the deployed program would, however, convert a runtime convenience into an unreviewed change to a consequential automation. OpenAdapt therefore treats a repair as a *candidate* and nothing more. A healed or taught bundle is registered as a candidate record—binding values as digests, failure evidence as hashed references—and registration failure fails closed by absence: without the record the healed bundle cannot enter the lifecycle at all.

Promotion runs through an explicit state machine—candidate, reviewed, replay-passed, fault-passed, approved, staged, canary, active, with rejection and rollback as terminal states—in which no state may be skipped and no candidate advances as a side effect of being written to disk. Five gates guard it. (1) *Contract invariants*: the proposed bundle is diffed against the prior one across identity, effect, risk, environment, and policy, and any weakening—a lost identity evidence tier, a lowered quorum, a dropped effect declaration, a weakened effect tier, a downgraded risk classification, a changed target application or environment digest, a removed qualification—is refused unless the bundle carries an explicit new qualification revision. An incomparable contract is itself a refusal. (2) A *replay campaign* over a deterministic perturbation battery, which passes only if the binding both locates the target and verifies its identity in every case. (3) A *fault campaign* over ambiguity, wrong-entity, stale-target, unexpected-dialog, and verifier-failure injections, whose pass criterion is inverted: a case passes only when the binding *refuses*, and an unarmed binding cannot pass at all. (4) A *human approval* bound to the exact content digests of both bundles, re-verified against the bundles reloaded from disk, so a later byte change invalidates it. (5) A *bounded canary* over the first N runs that halts and reverts the active pointer automatically on the first unverified or silently incorrect run.

Actors are typed, and the typing is the point: a model may be recorded as the *source* of a candidate but may not perform any lifecycle transition whatsoever—every transition rejects a model actor outright—and automation may run the mechanical campaign and canary steps but may never review or approve. Only a human actor can move a candidate through review and approval. Rollback is a single command, restoring a digest-verified copy of the prior bundle that was staged alongside the proposed one for exactly this purpose.




Figure 3: Effect verification separates the weak screen oracle from the strong system-of-record oracle. A rendered success is evidence about pixels, not about a persisted write; only an independent before/after snapshot of the application’s state can refute a silent wrong action. In the end-to-end fault study this reduced silent acceptance from 54 of 90 runs to 9 of 90 under a single out-of-band record oracle, and to 0 of 90 only once the read path covered every mutable surface the action could touch.

This is why the runtime can heal aggressively without the healed program becoming the deployed program: the two are separated by a gate a model cannot open.

4.6 Policy and refusal

The linter exposes unarmed clicks, vacuous postconditions, and risk-classifier gaps. Certification evaluates a named policy before deployment. A strict run gate can require certification, identity and effect coverage, encryption, and manifest integrity. Passing a policy means only that its assertions hold; it is not a general safety proof.

4.7 Sanitized artifact derivatives

Compilation is not de-identification. When an artifact crosses a boundary, the launch protocol inventories the source, transforms a copy with type-specific handlers, rescans the derivative, records unresolved findings and tool versions, and binds local review to the derivative hash. Unknown or unresolved content is refused. Sanitized authoring evidence is distinct from runtime observations: opening a live patient record can reintroduce protected information, which must remain inside the declared trusted execution boundary.

5 Evaluation Methodology

We separate comparative task performance, breadth, transactional safety, and identity availability. A single aggregate success rate would hide materially different errors.

Comparative conditions. Both repeated-workflow comparisons were generated on 2026-07-08 on the recorded platform `macOS-15.7.3-arm64-arm-64bit`. The compiled and agent arms drove the same vision-only Playwright backend: screenshots in and pixel clicks, typed text, key presses, and scrolling out, with no DOM selectors at runtime. The agent condition used `claude-sonnet-5` with the `computer_20251124` tool and `computer-use-2025-11-24` beta header. Agent costs are calculated from recorded token usage and the list-price schedule stored in each raw result; the compiled condition recorded no model calls. The agent is a single-attempt observe-act loop given the task goal and the same settled screenshots the replayer uses, without a system prompt, planning or reflection scaffolding, or whole-task retry, and bounded by per-run action and cost caps. It is a same-backend reference rather than a maximally scaffolded agent. The measured latency and cost differences characterize only these exact configurations; they do not predict what additional planning, reflection, or retry scaffolding would cost or recover, and they are not a reliability comparison.

Outcome taxonomy. Success means the external task oracle is satisfied. A safe halt stops without the intended effect. Over-halt is a safe halt when the intended correct action was in fact available. Silent incorrect success means the runtime reports success while the external oracle disagrees. False abort means the intended effect occurred but the runtime reports failure.

Scripted coverage counts, not sampled rates. The fault-injection and end-to-end studies use localhost, make no model calls, and inject a fixed fault at the persistence boundary. In the released matrices, the repeated outcomes were invariant within each arm-scenario cell. Those repeats confirm reproducibility in this implementation and environment; they are not independent samples from a target population. We therefore report run counts as a *coverage matrix* over a small, hand-authored fault taxonomy, not as an estimate of a production incidence rate. Inferential confidence intervals would require a sampling design and a target distribution that this study does not have. Two consequences are load-bearing for how these numbers should be read. First, the screen-versus-effect headline is determined by the authored differentiating classes, and the out-of-band-versus-complete-read-path gap rests on exactly one class, rather than on a sampled workload distribution. Second, the taxonomy is an adversarial transactional-fault lineage [11] chosen to differentiate oracles; it is not weighted to any measured EMR or lending incident distribution, so a figure such as the screen arm’s 60% is fault coverage under this taxonomy, never an expected production frequency.

OpenEMR comparison. The task logs into the shared public OpenEMR demonstration site, searches a patient, opens Patient Messages, adds a parameterized note, and saves. The compiled arm has 20 runs and the computer-use-agent arm 10. Both use the same task-level success check. The shared public instance is mutable and the study is not fully reproducible in CI; it is field evidence, not a production study.

MockMed comparison. The bundled browser fixture performs a triage workflow. The compiled arm has 100 runs and the agent arm 20. This is the CI-reproducible anchor, but the application is purpose-built and is not evidence about hostile enterprise UIs.

Public-web reliability corpus. Twenty-nine public, unauthenticated applications are recorded, compiled, and replayed once on an unchanged UI using an external goal oracle. This study is descriptive: one run per application does not meet the repeated-trial standard for a capability claim, and the selection excludes SSO-walled and desktop targets.

Transactional fault model (perception included, screen arm only). Seven persistence faults and controls are injected at a real HTTP persistence boundary behind the MockMed UI, with 10 repeats per class. Database state, not the UI report, is the oracle. This study is the one that exercises the full perception path—a real browser, real screenshots, and real OCR through the resolution ladder—but it measures only the screen-only arm; it carries no effect-verified arm and contributes no effect-verified number to this paper. It is complementary to, and separate from, the end-to-end study below.

End-to-end effect verification (governed path, perception stubbed). The headline safety result is measured through the actual governed replay path, not an in-process stub. Ten persistence scenarios, seven fault classes plus an accepted-write control and two delivery controls, are each run nine times per arm. Every write is issued by the replayer’s actuator as an HTTP POST to an on-disk SQLite system of record. We state the boundary of “end to end” precisely, because it is the obvious thing to overclaim: what is real here is the governed decision path—the replayer, its actuation tier, its effect verifier, the policy gates, and the transaction-outcome classification—while the observation backend and vision stack are null stubs, so this study measures *verification and refusal*, not GUI perception. Perception is covered by the browser-and-OCR fault-model study above, whose arm is screen-only. No single released study covers both at once, and we do not report one as though it did. Each trial contains three operationally distinct paths: the actuator writes over HTTP; the system-under-test effect verifier reads through a separate REST endpoint and connection; and the benchmark ground truth opens the SQLite file read-only over every table, fingerprints canonical typed schema and row content, and classifies the before/after state without seeing the write’s success flag. The verifier and judge necessarily observe the same persisted system of record, but they share neither a

read channel nor classifier implementation, so the system-under-test verifier cannot define its own score. This is operational independence, not independence of the business specification. We evaluate three arms: screen-only banner verification, an out-of-band effect oracle whose read path covers the record surface, and a complete effect oracle whose read path covers every mutable surface the action can touch. This supersedes an earlier in-process study in which the effect verifier and the ground truth read the same object, which made its zero circular by construction. Zero model calls, localhost only.

Second domain: lending. To test generalization beyond healthcare, the same effect-verification protocol is replicated on MockLoan, a loan-disbursement authorization workflow with its own SQLite ledger. Twelve tasks span the seven EffectBench divergence categories, a lending-local cross-surface collateral variant of the extra-write category, and clean and idempotent controls. Each runs three times per arm. The product arms read their declared surface through REST; the benchmark judge instead opens the persisted SQLite file through a separate read-only connection before and after each write, discovers business tables from SQLite’s catalog, and uses benchmark-local canonical typed row and table-content classification rather than the runtime effect classifier. One task funds a decoy loan; post-action, identity-sensitive readback locates the trial-unique persisted row by memo and product, then verifies its loan identifier against the intended loan. Zero model calls.

Multi-application workflows. The studies above are single-application, linear, worklist-driven form fills of roughly five to fifteen recorded steps, which is a fair criticism of the suite’s complexity. Two benchmarks were added to close that gap. *AP invoice* is an accounts-payable intake spanning a maildir inbox, a PDF document, an ERP three-way match, a payments API, an exception queue, and an outbound mail gateway: two applications, five modalities, 32 executed action steps over a five-row worklist, with branching on match route and discount eligibility. *O2C reconciliation* is an order-to-cash billing reconciliation spanning an exported CSV worklist, a comparison pass, ledger adjustments through a UI-only gateway with no adjustment API, reconcile marks over REST, and a results spreadsheet written back and re-read from disk across two separate SQLite systems of record: 26 executed action steps over a ten-row worklist. Each benchmark runs five scenarios—one healthy and four exception paths—three times in each of two arms. The *naive* arm runs the demonstration profile and trusts the application’s own banner; the *governed* arm runs the production profile under a named policy that requires system effects for every write and prohibits unconfirmed effect bindings. A benchmark-local ground truth reads both databases directly and audits per-table deltas. Both fixtures are synthetic and localhost-only, every consequential action is actuated through the replayer’s API tier, and no model is called; as with the end-to-end study, these measure governed workflow semantics and cross-system effects, not GUI perception and not document understanding.

Citrix ICA/HDX: a deterministic stand-in, not Citrix. No real Citrix ICA/HDX result is reported in this paper. What is reported is a qualification of the shipping Citrix Workspace backend—unmodified—against a deterministic synthetic stand-in in which only the backend’s window-client seam is replaced by an in-process source of synthetic frames that the real backend decodes, hashes, and DPI-maps. Sixteen ICA/HDX-class conditions (session launch and readiness, lock and unlock, reconnect and roaming, minimize, occlusion, move and resize, single and multi-monitor geometry, DPI and scaling, compression and codec artifacts, latency and delayed frames, keyboard layout and IME, clipboard restriction, focus theft, unexpected dialogs, uncertain submission, and out-of-band persisted-state readback) are exercised over 29 trials, with an out-of-band in-process oracle and never the on-screen banner. This exercises no HDX codec, no ICA compression, and no Workspace-client transport; the released artifact records `is_real_ica_hdx: false` and `ica_hdx_accepted: false`, and its status manifest reports real-protocol environment evidence as `pending`. We treat it as evidence about the backend’s gating logic under adverse remote-display conditions, and as nothing else.

Released benchmark. The metric and fault taxonomy are packaged as EffectBench, a standalone, versioned, and independently runnable benchmark (specification version 1.0.0), so that the silent-wrong-effect rate can be measured against any GUI or API automation, not only ours. We state its current scope honestly, because the reusable surface a third party can run is narrower than the specification.

What is public. The MIT synthetic sample is one fixture, the MockMed anchor, and it covers five of the seven divergence categories (C1–C5) plus controls, on the **web** substrate alone. C6 (homonym) and C7 (no-op/wrong-target) are specified but exercised only by the container-gated real-system-of-record packs and the private hardened corpus, as are the desktop and remote-display substrates. The differentiating cases are therefore defined in the open and measured behind a gate. A submission may target any subset it can reach and must report which pack and split it ran.

What the public pack hands away. The reference pack ships the synthetic system of record together with its reference oracle. In a real deployment, authoring a cheap, correct, independent oracle for a legacy system of record is the whole cost, and this paper does not claim to remove it: effects are authored per deployment and the compiler does not infer them (Section 4). A benchmark that supplies the oracle therefore measures whether a system uses one, not whether it could obtain one. We mark the built-in oracle reference-only rather than expose it to the system under test as a general capability, and a pluggable interface lets a third party bring its own system of record and its own independent oracle. That is the honest boundary of what the public pack tests.

What is not yet demonstrated. The two baselines scored so far are our own screen-only and effect-verified arms, so fair cross-system ranking is a design property rather than a shown one. The public fixture is also small, fixed, and open, which is exactly the shape a submission can special-case; the private hardened corpus is the intended mitigation, but a non-gameability argument that rests on a corpus the reader cannot inspect is asserted rather than demonstrated. Both gaps close only when an independent system of record and an independently scored third-party submission enter the public pack.

Identity ladder. Adversarial same-name/same-date-of-birth homonyms differ by confusable glyphs such as O/0 and l/1. The actual replayer stack is evaluated with structured and pure-pixel configurations. False accept and over-halt are both reported because a system can obtain zero wrong clicks by refusing every correct one.

Desktop and remote-substrate qualification. These mechanism studies are task-bound rather than comparative. Windows UIA is evaluated on one in-tree WinForms Patient Notes workflow in a Windows 11 ARM VM. Each counted trial starts from a clean snapshot, writes a trial-unique note, and uses an independent SQLite query as the effect oracle; stale and ambiguous candidate controls must leave every row unchanged. Native macOS is evaluated on one macOS 15.7.3 arm64 host using TextEdit, exact file-byte readback, and a two-window ambiguity control. The preserved batch report classifies graceful- close cleanup warnings as failure; a separate hash-bound offline adjudication accepts only the three action effects and ambiguity refusal after verifying the exact harness processes and temporary root were absent. RDP is evaluated over Aardwolf 0.2.14 into one 1280x800 Parallels Windows 11 snapshot: input through the Windows Run dialog creates a trial-unique file whose exact contents are read back through guest tools independently of the RDP channel. Each promoted task has three counted trials, records model calls, silent incorrect success and over-halt, and retains environment-cleanup evidence.

6 Results

Headline: an independent effect check catches silent wrong actions that the screen misses, and only as far as it can read. The paper’s central claim is a safety one, and we measure it through the live replayer’s governed actuation and verification path, with the observation backend and vision stack stubbed (Section 5). Ten persistence scenarios, seven fault classes plus an accepted-write control and two delivery controls, are each driven nine times per arm through the real governed path: the replayer’s actuator writes over HTTP, the system-under-test verifier reads through REST, and the benchmark judge reads SQLite directly with separate classifier code. Judged by the *screen*, the same signal an agent or a script trusts, replay silently accepted a wrong persisted effect on 54 of 90 fault runs (60%). An out-of-band effect verifier that reads the record back over a different endpoint than the write drove silent acceptance down to 9 of 90 (10%). Extending that verifier to a complete system-of-record read path, one that covers every mutable surface the action can touch, drove it to 0 of 90 (Figure 4). The residual 9 of 90 is the honest mechanism finding: they are a single fault class, a collateral write to a billing surface the out-of-band oracle’s read

Table 2: End-to-end fault study, per scenario, nine runs per cell. “Slip” means the arm reported success while the independent ground truth found a wrong persisted effect; “halt” means the arm refused. The screen arm slips on six classes, the single out-of-band oracle on one, and the complete read path on none. Rows marked “halt” in all three arms carry no oracle signal.

Scenario	Ground-truth effect	Screen	Out-of-band	Complete read
Clean write (control)	correct	pass	pass	pass
No persistence	absent	slip	halt	halt
Partial save	partial	slip	halt	halt
Duplicate submission	duplicate	slip	halt	halt
Wrong record	wrong record	slip	halt	halt
Stale overwrite	collateral loss	slip	halt	halt
Collateral write	collateral write	slip	slip	halt
Optimistic then reject	absent	halt	halt	halt
Session loss	absent	halt	halt	halt
Timeout after commit	correct	halt	halt	halt

path never covered, so the guarantee is exactly as strong as the oracle’s read coverage. False aborts are a constant 9 of 90 in all three arms, a conservative halt on a commit whose outcome is unknown to the client, so they do not distinguish the oracles. This end-to-end measurement supersedes an earlier in-process fault study whose effect and ground-truth checks read the same object, which made its zero circular by construction; the numbers here come from the real replayer with operationally separate write, read-back, and ground-truth paths. These paths do not make the shared business specification independent; Section 7 bounds that closed-world assumption.

Per scenario, the gap is driven by six differentiating classes and closed by one read-path extension. Table 2 decomposes the same 90 runs per arm. Six of the ten scenarios differentiate the screen from an out-of-band record oracle; exactly one, the collateral write, differentiates the single-surface oracle from a complete read path. Three scenarios—optimistic rendering followed by rejection, session loss, and a timeout after a successful commit—halt in every arm, so they carry no oracle signal at all; the last of these is the constant false abort. Read the table as a coverage matrix over hand-authored classes, not as a distribution: the headline is a property of which classes were authored.

With real perception, the screen misses five of seven fault types. The study above stubs the vision stack. A separate transactional study at the same persistence boundary keeps perception real—a live browser, real screenshots, and OCR through the resolution ladder—and injects the same class of faults. There, screen-only verification silently mishandled five of seven injected fault classes: partial save, duplicate submission, optimistic UI followed by rejection, stale overwrite, and double delivery. There were 10 consistent repeats per class. That study carries no effect-verified arm, so it establishes the screen-oracle failure under real perception and nothing about the fix; the fix is measured only in the stubbed-perception study above. We report the pair rather than a single number because no released study covers both perception and effect verification at once. The improvement itself has two non-optional preconditions in either case: the effect must be authored and the verifier deployed.

Generalization: the same silent-wrong ladder on a second, non-healthcare domain. The effect-verification result is not specific to clinical records, and it reproduces the healthcare three-arm ladder rather than an easier two-arm version. On MockLoan, a loan-disbursement authorization workflow with its own ledger and a second, collateral fee surface, screen-only verification silently accepted 24 of 36 wrong ledger effects (67%) while over-halting none. A single out-of-band oracle over one surface left 3 of 36, exactly the collateral-write residual the healthcare study exhibits: a spurious fee posts to a surface the disbursement oracle does not read. Extending to a complete read path drove it to 0 of 36, with 3 of 36 over-halts. That final arm also classified 18 of 36 runs as wrong actions: the verifier detected an incorrect effect after persistence and refused to certify it. Thus zero SWER means zero *silently accepted* wrong effects in this matrix, not




Figure 4: Same 90 injected-fault runs, three verification policies, measured through the live replayer’s governed actuation and verification path (with a null observation backend and vision stack) and judged by an independent ground truth. Screen-only verification silently accepted 54 wrong persisted effects; an out-of-band effect oracle that reads the record back cut that to 9 (one uncovered collateral-write class); a complete system-of-record read path drove it to 0. False aborts are a constant 9, a safe halt on an unknown-outcome commit. This is the failure mode general computer-use agents and selector RPA do not measure.

rollback, prevention, or zero incorrect writes. Broken out by class, screen-only verification again silently mishandled the same 2xx-but-wrong fault classes. In the decoy-loan task, post-action readback finds the trial-unique wrong-loan row and both effect arms report a detected wrong action rather than an over-halt. This is the same mechanism, and the same read-coverage residual, as the healthcare study, on a different system of record; both applications are synthetic and built by the same authors, so the replication shows the pattern transfers across two record shapes we designed, not that it transfers to a hostile production system.

Complexity: the same result holds on branching, multi-application workflows. A fair objection to everything above is that the workflows are short, linear, single-application form fills. Two multi-application benchmarks answer it directly (Section 5). Across both, 30 governed runs produced zero silent incorrect successes and zero healthy-path over-halts, while the same 30 runs under the naive banner oracle produced 6 silent incorrect successes. Every healthy governed run classified VERIFIED under the transaction taxonomy; no naive run did, because the naive arm never obtains independent effect evidence and therefore terminates COMPLETED-UNVERIFIED even when it is right. Zero model calls throughout.

Table 3 shows why the taxonomy matters more than a success rate. In the AP-invoice collateral-approval scenario the naive arm reports success three times over while an adjacent record is overwritten; the governed arm reports RECONCILIATION-REQUIRED and catches it on all three. In the payment-confirmation outage both arms fail to confirm, but only the governed arm says so, and in both arms the duplicate-attempt check confirms that a retry under the same idempotency key is refused rather than re-actuated. In the O2C phantom write-back the results spreadsheet returns HTTP 200 with a banner and persists nothing; re-reading the file catches it three times out of three. These are deterministic synthetic fixtures with hand-authored exception paths, three runs per cell, and API-tier actuation, so they are a coverage matrix over workflow shapes—not an incidence rate and not evidence about perception.

Compiled replay removes per-run reasoning on demonstrated tasks. Table 4 shows that, on these two already-demonstrated tasks, compiled replay completed 19 of 20 OpenEMR runs and every measured MockMed run with lower median latency and no model calls. The unequal, small samples do not establish superior reliability. The correct inference is narrower: repeated reasoning was unnecessary for the healthy executions measured here.

Repair under drift: the compiler heals what breaks the agent’s day. The comparison above uses nominal interface conditions. To exercise the “govern every repair” half of the thesis, we forced the MockMed interface to re-render with a dark palette, invalidating every recorded template crop. As a single observation per arm, compiled replay self-healed in 9.7s with 8 target repairs and zero model calls, while the same

Table 3: Multi-application workflows, three runs per scenario per arm (30 governed and 30 naive runs total). Cells give the transaction outcome, which was invariant across the three repeats. V = VERIFIED, CU = COMPLETED-UNVERIFIED, H = HALTED-BEFORE-EFFECT, R = RECONCILIATION-REQUIRED. Starred cells are the ones the naive banner oracle silently accepts.

Benchmark	Scenario	Fault	Naive	Governed
AP invoice	healthy	—	CU	V
AP invoice	missing PO	precondition absent	H	H
AP invoice	duplicate invoice	ambiguous duplicate	H	H
AP invoice	collateral approve	adjacent overwrite	CU*	R
AP invoice	payment outage	uncertain delivery	CU	R
O2C recon	healthy	—	CU	V
O2C recon	missing in ledger	precondition absent	H	H
O2C recon	ambiguous duplicate	ambiguous target	H	H
O2C recon	stale snapshot	optimistic concurrency	H	H
O2C recon	phantom write-back	200 without persist	CU*	H

Table 4: Bounded repeated-workflow comparison. Model API costs are estimates derived from recorded token usage and artifact-declared list prices; they exclude authoring and operations.

Task	Arm	Success	n	Median (s)	Model cost/run
OpenEMR	Compiled	19/20	20	39.2	\$0.00
OpenEMR	Agent	10/10	10	70.4	\$0.55
MockMed	Compiled	100/100	100	4.9	\$0.00
MockMed	Agent	20/20	20	37.5	\$0.27

computer-use agent under the same drift took 87.4s and \$0.63 across 24 model calls. One run is not a reliability claim, but it shows the mechanism working end to end: the resolution ladder re-resolved changed targets deterministically and logged each as a reviewable patch rather than re-reasoning the whole task.

Breadth: weak postconditions can still emit a green report. On the one-run public-web corpus, all 29 recordings compiled; 17 replays reached a verified success, 10 halted safely, and 2 reported success while the external oracle disagreed. Both silent wrong actions were vacuous successes under an environment blocker rather than a harmful persisted write, but they demonstrate that weak postconditions can still yield a green report. Because each app ran once and the corpus excludes authenticated enterprise and desktop applications, these counts are failure discovery, not a generalization rate estimate.

Identity: zero false accepts, honestly at the cost of availability. The integrated identity ladder recorded zero false accepts in every tested configuration. Structured browser identity also had zero over-halts on 14 correct homonym cases. Pure-pixel configurations halted on all correct confusable cases: zero false accepts at 100% over-halt. This is the intended safety/availability disclosure, not evidence that pixel-only identity is ready for dense clinical lists.

Substrate reach: one named task per substrate, not a support claim. The governed contract is not browser-specific, but the evidence for that is three named tasks, not three platforms. Table 5 qualifies three additional substrates on one named task and environment each, with an independent effect oracle and refusal controls. Nothing here licenses a claim about arbitrary applications on those platforms.

The Windows UIA counted matrix recorded 12 native structural-action receipts, three independently confirmed note effects, three stale-target refusals, three ambiguous-target refusals, zero silent incorrect successes, zero over-halts, and zero model calls. The native receipts establish delivery to a unique refreshed fingerprint; the SQLite oracle establishes the business effect.

On macOS, all three isolated TextEdit replace-and-save trials matched the exact expected file bytes, and the two-window control refused without changing either file. There were zero silent incorrect successes and

Table 5: Scoped substrate qualifications. Each row is one named task and environment, not an arbitrary-application support claim.

Substrate	Effect trials	Refusal controls	Independent oracle
Windows UIA	3/3	stale 3/3; ambiguous 3/3	SQLite row state
Native macOS	3/3	ambiguous 1/1	exact file bytes
Network RDP	3/3	readiness/timeout gate	guest-tools file readback

zero over-halts. We retain the original failed batch classification and use its separate adjudication only for these action-effect and refusal observations.

The network RDP batch completed three of three Windows Run-dialog unique-file tasks with exact guest-tools readback. Trial latencies were 51.845, 10.467, and 7.477 seconds, with zero failures, zero silent incorrect successes, zero over-halts, and zero model calls. Snapshot cleanup restored the pre-run inventory and suspended base state. Together these studies qualify the named substrate mechanisms; they do not transfer to other applications, environments, or Citrix.

Citrix: the backend passes a deterministic stand-in, which is not Citrix. We report one result about Citrix and it is deliberately a negative claim wrapped around a positive one. The shipping Citrix Workspace backend, unmodified, was exercised over 16 ICA/HDX-class conditions in 29 trials against a deterministic synthetic stand-in, with only its window-client seam replaced. All 29 trials met their expectation, with zero silent incorrect successes, zero silent writes, zero healthy-path over-halts, and zero model calls; the two banner-bearing trials are the informative ones, since one confirms a persisted effect only through the out-of-band oracle and the other refuses a green banner that no independent record supports. This is evidence that the backend’s fresh-frame, focus, DPI, identity, readiness, one-shot-actuation, and effect-verification gates behave correctly under adverse remote-display conditions. It is *not* evidence about Citrix. No HDX codec, ICA compression, or Workspace-client transport was exercised; the frames are synthetic and the oracle is in-process. The released artifact records `is_real_ica_hdx: false` and `ica_hdx_accepted: false`, and its status manifest reports real-protocol environment evidence as `pending`. Any statement that OpenAdapt “runs on Citrix” would be unsupported by this paper.

7 Limitations and Threats to Validity

The single largest limitation is stated first and without hedging: *no external organization has deployed this system*. Every result in this paper was produced by its authors, on synthetic fixtures or a shared public demonstration instance, in a controlled environment. There are zero external pilots, zero production workloads, and therefore zero field-reliability evidence of any kind. Nothing in this paper should be read as a claim about how the system behaves in someone else’s hands.

The evidence does not establish long-term reliability, maintenance effort, total cost of ownership, multi-tenant scale, or safety in clinical production. OpenEMR uses a shared public demonstration site and a small sample. MockMed is a fixture, and the second-domain lending study is likewise a bounded mechanism study (twelve tasks, three trials each) on a purpose-built MockLoan ledger, not a production lending system. The two multi-application benchmarks add branching and cross-system effects but are equally synthetic, localhost-only, and hand-authored, with three runs per cell. The breadth corpus has one trial per application and selection bias toward public no-auth browser apps. No published study covers weeks of natural drift or a representative distribution of customer workflows.

Two evaluation paths are measured separately and neither covers the other. The end-to-end effect study, the lending study, and the two multi-application benchmarks all actuate through the replayer’s API tier with a null observation backend and a null vision stack, so they measure governed decision, verification, refusal, and transaction classification—not GUI perception, and not document understanding. The browser-and-OCR fault study and the public-web breadth corpus exercise perception, but the fault study carries only a screen-only arm. A study that exercises real perception *and* effect verification on the same runs does not yet exist, and no number in this paper should be read as though one did.

Identity is only checked on armed steps. Risk classification uses keywords and can miss an icon-only or indirect write. Visual postconditions do not verify a system-of-record effect. Effect declarations and verifiers require deployment work. Optional model rescue can false-rescue an ambiguous state, and measured grounding is weak on dense lists. Human review can catch contextual sanitation errors but is not proof of de-identification.

Several mechanisms described in Section 4 are presented as mechanisms and are not the subject of a reported measurement. The transaction-outcome taxonomy is exercised by the multi-application benchmarks, where it distinguishes VERIFIED, HALTED-BEFORE-EFFECT, and RECONCILIATION-REQUIRED on hand-authored exception paths, and the idempotency ledger is exercised by the duplicate-attempt checks in those runs; but the verifier plugin seam, the governed repair promotion lifecycle, and explicit surface selection are described from their implementations and their unit-level contracts, with no benchmark that quantifies, for example, how often a contract-invariant check correctly refuses a real drifted bundle or how much operator time promotion costs. Describing a governance mechanism is not evidence that it holds up under an adversarial operator or at fleet scale.

The substrate qualifications cover one Windows UIA workflow and VM snapshot, one macOS host and TextEdit task, and one RDP task and snapshot. They establish working observation, actuation, refusal, and effect-oracle mechanisms in those environments, not reliability across application families or deployment fleets. Remote display introduces compression, scaling, latency, coordinate, lock-screen, credential, input-acceptance, and identity-availability variables. No measured result covers real Citrix ICA/HDX, so RDP evidence does not transfer to a Citrix deployment. The Citrix campaign reported in Section 6 is a *deterministic synthetic stand-in*: the shipping backend is real and unmodified, but its window-client seam is replaced by in-process synthetic frames, so no HDX codec, ICA compression, or Workspace-client transport is exercised and the effect oracle is an in-process store. Its degradation conditions are image transforms, not a Thinwire bitstream. It is evidence about the backend’s gating logic under adverse remote-display conditions and about nothing else; the released artifact and its status manifest say so in machine-readable form. Citrix is a pixel-only remote-display environment in the same class as the measured RDP backend, and the resolution ladder and identity gate are substrate-independent by construction, but the paper reports no real-protocol ICA/HDX measurement. A concrete validation would record and compile a workflow inside a real Citrix Workspace session, replay it through the vision-only rungs of the ladder over the ICA/HDX channel, and confirm the identity gate refuses ambiguous targets and that an out-of-band effect oracle catches an injected transactional fault. That study is not reported here.

Effect verification also has a substrate-dependent reach that the RDP row can obscure. The strong oracle is only available when the system of record can be read out of band, through a database, API, or file interface independent of the substrate that carried the write. The RDP qualification reads the persisted file through guest tools, an out-of-band channel that a locked-down Citrix session may not expose. Where no such read path exists, the transactional strong oracle is unavailable; a same-application re-read cannot catch a partial, duplicate, stale, or lost-update write, and on such substrates safety rests on the identity gate and halt-on-ambiguity rather than on effect verification. Even where a read path exists, an out-of-band effect oracle is only as strong as its read coverage: in the end-to-end study a collateral write to a billing surface the oracle did not read slipped through (9 of 90) until the read path was extended to every mutable surface, so effect verification guarantees only what it reads.

The same read-coverage limit binds the independent *ground truth*, and this is why the complete-read-path 0 of 90 must be read as zero in a closed world, not an absolute zero. The judge audits every persisted table it discovers in the SQLite system of record, so it is open-world over that database; but an effect that lands outside the database entirely—an outbound HL7 or message-queue publish, a filesystem side channel, a downstream service call—is invisible to both the complete read path and the judge, because no in-database audit can see it. Independence of code and read path is moreover not independence of *specification*: the judge and the effect contract encode the same business intent, so a fault class no one thought to define is invisible to all three paths. For these reasons the realistic figure we foreground is the 9 of 90 residual under a single out-of-band oracle, the deployment an operator actually ships; the 0 of 90 is the best case under a complete in-database read path.

Cost values use recorded provider usage and then-current price metadata. They do not include recording, compilation, operator review, exception handling, infrastructure, support, or maintenance. Provider prices and models change.

Table 6: Evidence index. Paths are relative to the repository root; the machine-check reads each one. “ n ” is runs per arm or per cell as reported in the corresponding section.

Study	Artifact under benchmark/	Label	n	Oracle
End-to-end effect	effect_e2e/ results.json	Fixture	9/cell	direct read-only SQLite, every table
Fault model (perception)	fault_model/ results.json	Fixture	10/class	database state
Lending (2nd domain)	lending_fault_model/ swer_results.json	Fixture	3/task	separate read-only ledger
AP invoice	ap_invoice/ results.json	Fixture	3/cell	two-database delta audit
O2C reconciliation	o2c_recon/ results.json	Fixture	3/cell	two-database delta audit
OpenEMR comparison	openemr/ results.json	Field	20 / 10	task-level success check
MockMed comparison	results.json	CI-repro.	100 / 20	task-level success check
Public-web breadth	reliability/ summary.json	Descriptive	1/app	external goal oracle
Identity ladder	identity_ladder/ identity_ladder.json	Fixture	14-42	intended-entity ground truth
Windows UIA	windows_uia/ results.json	Field	3	independent SQLite query
Native macOS	macos_native/ *.adjudication.json	Field	3	exact file bytes
Network RDP	rdp/ *.sanitized.json	Field	3	guest-tools file readback
Citrix stand-in	citrix_ica_hdx/ results.json	Fixture	29 trials	in-process out-of-band store

Finally, the authors develop the evaluated system. Released raw artifacts where the source boundary permits them, bounded aggregate summaries, and scripts reduce but do not eliminate experimenter bias. Independent replication and pre-registered longitudinal workloads remain necessary.

8 Reproducibility and Artifacts

The source repository and reviewed public evaluation artifacts are published together [18] at <https://github.com/OpenAdaptAI/openadapt-flow>. The paper package includes a script that reads released benchmark JSON and fails if a headline constant drifts. Depending on the study, that released source is either a raw result or a bounded aggregate summary. Task definitions, benchmark prose, failure taxonomies, and selected run reports are versioned where their release boundary permits it. Grown identity and reliability corpora, deployment-derived tuning, target-specific recipes, and raw private rows are deliberately excluded. The machine-check therefore establishes consistency between the paper and released evidence; it neither claims that every underlying private row is public nor validates the design of the underlying measurement.

Evidence carries one of four labels:

- **CI-reproducible:** fixture and environment can run in automated CI, subject to browser and dependency availability.
- **Field:** real third-party target, but shared mutable state or credentials prevent full CI reproduction.
- **Fixture/fault injection:** deterministic mechanism study, not a population estimate.
- **Descriptive:** useful for discovering failures, but missing the repeated trials needed for comparative inference.

Table 6 is the index: every reported study, the released artifact the machine-check reads, its evidence label, its run count, and the oracle that decided each run. A claim that does not appear in this table is a mechanism description, not a measurement.

Reproducibility is uneven across these labels, and the unevenness is structural rather than incidental. The fault-injection, end-to-end effect, lending, and multi-application studies are localhost-only, deterministic, and make no model calls, so they re-run from a clean checkout and reproduce exactly. The comparative study does not: it depends on a hosted model identified by an exact name, tool version, and dated beta header,

none of which the authors control or can guarantee will remain available or unchanged, so its latency and cost figures are pinned to a date rather than reproducible on demand. The OpenEMR arm additionally runs against a shared, mutable, public demonstration instance and is not reproducible by design. The desktop and remote-substrate qualifications depend on specific virtual machines, snapshots, and hosts. We report these as field or descriptive evidence rather than presenting the whole suite as uniformly re-runnable.

Before submission, the release candidate must re-run promoted experiments, archive its exact commit and environment, record task-level oracles, and check that no application artifact contains sensitive or prohibited data. The repository’s `paper/ARTIFACT_CHECKLIST.md` is the submission gate, and records the exact commit, release tag, and published artifact digests that this version of the paper describes.

Data availability and ethics. Every released system-of-record fixture is synthetic: the MockMed and MockLoan fixtures, their injected-fault suites, and the benchmark task packs contain no real patient, borrower, or customer data. The public-web study observed public, unauthenticated applications, but only its bounded aggregate is released; its raw per-target rows and curated target recipes remain private. This paper release contains no customer-derived hardening corpus. Such grown corpora and raw private evaluation rows remain outside the public repository; when an approved sanitized derivative crosses a trust boundary, the pipeline applies type-specific transformations, rescans the result, and binds human approval to its exact hash as described in Section 4. Human review reduces but does not prove de-identification, so sanitization remains a defense-in-depth control rather than a guarantee. Repository-only third-party reference environments are also excluded from the permissively licensed wheel and source distribution; the release gate inspects the built archives rather than inferring their contents from the source tree.

9 Conclusion

Repeated GUI work does not require a general model to rediscover the same plan on every run. A demonstration compiler can retain the useful flexibility of multi-modal target resolution while recovering deterministic execution, inspectable programs, and bounded repair. The critical distinction is not whether a task completed, but whether identity and external effects were verified and whether the system can refuse when evidence is insufficient.

One consequence deserves stating plainly, because it points outward rather than inward. Inductive program synthesis is bottlenecked on the availability of a sound checker. Where a cheap, trustworthy oracle exists—input/output examples over pure functions, a type system, a reference implementation—generate-and-check is tractable and the field has made rapid progress; where the program’s correctness is defined by an effect on the world, no such checker has generally been available, which is much of why demonstration-driven automation has had to settle for reproducing observed inputs. The out-of-band effect verifier is exactly that missing checker for one important class of programs: consequential writes to a system of record through a graphical interface. It is sound in the direction that matters—it never upgrades “I could not read the record” into a pass—and it is independent of the path that carried the write. We therefore offer it not only as an engineering safeguard but as a synthesis contribution: it makes generate-and-check tractable in a domain where the checker, not the search, was the binding constraint.

The results establish the compiler/runtime thesis on bounded browser workflows, extend it to branching multi-application work across two systems of record, and show that the same governed semantics can drive named Windows UIA, native macOS, and network RDP tasks with independently checked effects and explicit refusal. They establish it nowhere outside the authors’ own environments. The next evidence target follows directly: longitudinal, repeated operation of one consequential customer workflow, in someone else’s deployment, with authoring time, intervention rate, silent incorrect success, over-halt, recovery time, and system-of-record outcomes measured across natural interface change. A second, independent direction follows from the paragraph above: with a sound effect checker in hand, the induction loop can afford to propose more aggressively than it does today, because a wrong proposal is caught rather than executed. We report no result on that here and make no claim about it.

Competing interests and funding

Competing interests: The author is the founder and CEO of MLDSAI Inc. (OpenAdapt.AI), which develops the evaluated system and offers commercial services based on the verification approach this paper describes. Funding: No external funding; experiments were self-funded (cloud compute partly under an AWS Activate credit; model API usage self-paid).

References

- [1] Rajeev Alur, Rastislav Bodík, Garvit Juniwal, Milo M. K. Martin, Mukund Raghothaman, Sanjit A. Seshia, Rishabh Singh, Armando Solar-Lezama, Emina Torlak, and Abhishek Udupa. Syntax-guided synthesis. In *2013 Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design (FMCAD)*, pages 1–8, 2013.
- [2] Anthropic. Developing a computer use model. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/developing-computer-use>, 2024. Accessed 2026.
- [3] Shraddha Barke, Emmanuel Anaya Gonzalez, Saketh Ram Kasibatla, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Nadia Polikarpova. HYSYNTH: Context-free LLM approximation for guiding program synthesis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37 (NeurIPS)*, 2024.
- [4] Earl T. Barr, Mark Harman, Phil McMinn, Muzammil Shahbaz, and Shin Yoo. The oracle problem in software testing: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 41(5):507–525, 2015.
- [5] Sarah E. Chasins, Maria Mueller, and Rastislav Bodík. Rousillon: Scraping distributed hierarchical web data. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 963–975. ACM, 2018.
- [6] Tsong Yueh Chen, Fei-Ching Kuo, Huai Liu, Pak-Lok Poon, Dave Towey, T. H. Tse, and Zhi Quan Zhou. Metamorphic testing: A review of challenges and opportunities. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 51(1):4:1–4:27, 2018.
- [7] Kanzhi Cheng, Qiushi Sun, Yougang Chu, Fangzhi Xu, Yantao Li, Jianbing Zhang, and Zhiyong Wu. SeeClick: Harnessing GUI grounding for advanced visual GUI agents. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024.
- [8] Allen Cypher, editor. *Watch What I Do: Programming by Demonstration*. MIT Press, 1993.
- [9] Rui Dong, Zhicheng Huang, Ian Iong Lam, Yan Chen, and Xinyu Wang. WebRobot: Web robotic process automation using interactive programming-by-demonstration. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*, pages 152–167, 2022.
- [10] Alexandre Drouin et al. Workarena: How capable are web agents at solving common knowledge work tasks? *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 2024.
- [11] Jim Gray. The transaction concept: Virtues and limitations. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases*, pages 144–154, 1981.
- [12] Sumit Gulwani. Automating string processing in spreadsheets using input-output examples. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 317–330. ACM, 2011.
- [13] Klaus Havelund and Grigore Roşu. Synthesizing monitors for safety properties. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, volume 2280 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 342–356. Springer, 2002.
- [14] Tessa Lau, Steven A. Wolfman, Pedro Domingos, and Daniel S. Weld. Programming by demonstration using version space algebra. *Machine Learning*, 53(1-2):111–156, 2003.

- [15] Maurizio Leotta, Diego Clerissi, Filippo Ricca, and Paolo Tonella. Capture-replay vs. programmable web testing: An empirical assessment during test case evolution. In *20th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering (WCRE)*, pages 272–281, 2013.
- [16] Toby Jia-Jun Li, Amos Azaria, and Brad A. Myers. SUGILITE: Creating multimodal smartphone automation by demonstration. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, pages 6038–6049, 2017.
- [17] Qingzhou Luo, Farah Hariri, Lamyaa Eloussi, and Darko Marinov. An empirical analysis of flaky tests. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE)*, pages 643–653, 2014.
- [18] OpenAdapt Contributors. openadapt-flow: Demonstration compiler and governed gui runtime. <https://github.com/OpenAdaptAI/openadapt-flow>, 2026. Software and evaluation artifacts; access date to be fixed at submission.
- [19] Noah Patton, Kia Rahmani, Meghana Missula, Joydeep Biswas, and Işıl Dillig. Programming-by-demonstration for long-horizon robot tasks. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 8(POPL):512–545, 2024.
- [20] Oleksandr Polozov and Sumit Gulwani. FlashMeta: A framework for inductive program synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications (OOPSLA)*, pages 107–126, 2015.
- [21] Kevin Pu, Jim Yang, Angel Yuan, Minyi Ma, Rui Dong, Xinyu Wang, Yan Chen, and Tovi Grossman. DiLogics: Creating web automation programs with diverse logics. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)*, pages 74:1–74:15, 2023.
- [22] Yujia Qin et al. UI-TARS: Pioneering automated GUI interaction with native agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12326*, 2025.
- [23] Jerome H. Saltzer, David P. Reed, and David D. Clark. End-to-end arguments in system design. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 2(4):277–288, 1984.
- [24] Armando Solar-Lezama, Liviu Tancau, Rastislav Bodík, Sanjit A. Seshia, and Vijay A. Saraswat. Combinatorial sketching for finite programs. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, pages 404–415, 2006.
- [25] Wil M. P. van der Aalst, Martin Bichler, and Armin Heinzl. Robotic process automation. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 60(4):269–272, 2018.
- [26] Tianbao Xie et al. OSWorld: Benchmarking multimodal agents for open-ended tasks in real computer environments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37, 2024.
- [27] Tom Yeh, Tsung-Hsiang Chang, and Robert C. Miller. Sikuli: Using gui screenshots for search and automation. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 183–192. ACM, 2009.
- [28] Shuyan Zhou et al. Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13854*, 2023.