

ADLC: A Lifecycle Model for Governing Agentic Software Development

Fangyuan Zhang¹, Lyuye Zhang¹, Lingling Fan¹, Sen Chen¹, Yang Liu^{2,*}

¹Nankai University ²Nanyang Technological University

fangyuanzhang@mail.nankai.edu.cn, zh0004ye@e.ntu.edu.sg

linglingfan@nankai.edu.cn, senchen@nankai.edu.cn

Abstract—Software development is shifting toward human-steered, agent-executed work. We propose ADLC, an Agentic Development Lifecycle framework that augments the SDLC for this mode of development. Analyzing this transition, we identify five structural changes and their corresponding designs. (1) Agent execution across stages motivates metacognitive execution control for assessing task understanding, strategy, and capability. (2) Execution across separate agent contexts motivates lifecycle knowledge sharing to preserve project understanding. (3) Broader access to cross-domain knowledge motivates domain knowledge shift-left through this shared knowledge. (4) Lower-cost generation and frequent feedback motivate parallel exploration and optimization. (5) Separation of decision execution from accountability motivates authority and responsibility arrangements that link permitted actions, scoped obligations, and remedies, including collateral or insurance for covered losses. These designs form a dynamic lifecycle in which shared knowledge informs early decisions, evidence guides self-regulation and candidate selection, and responsibility commitments shape design and govern delegated action. These commitments persist across handoffs, with reassessment when their supporting conditions change. Agents select, revisit, or parallelize stages according to the evolving project state. Operational feedback updates this shared state for subsequent increments. We specify the rules connecting these designs and discuss the framework’s use, open design questions, and directions for further development.

Index Terms—agentic software engineering, software development lifecycle, coding agents, process control, software governance

I. INTRODUCTION

We envision a near future in which agents perform most software development activities, while humans steer goals and delegated authority. Emerging agentic engineering frameworks point toward this human-steered, agent-executed mode of work [1]–[3].

Several closely related works address how agentic development is organized. Wang and Liu [4] connect shared engineering state and verification to the distribution of change-acceptance authority. Prifti et al. [5] provide an executable protocol language for enforcing human-agent process boundaries. OpenAI’s Symphony [6] orchestrates parallel agent tasks and describes a move toward objective-driven execution. Anthropic’s application-development harness [7] coordinates planning, generation, and evaluation through shared records




Fig. 1. Five structural changes and the five ADLC designs they motivate. Arrows show the principal correspondences.

and feedback. Intelligent AI Delegation [8] links task assignment to risk-adaptive authority and accountability, while agent risk frameworks specify insurance and compensation [9], [10]. Our focus is how scoped development commitments shape early design and subsequent exploration through shared knowledge. These commitments link permitted actions to obligations and remedies, and remain subject to review as the project changes.

The lifecycle design question is how changes in execution jointly reshape knowledge use, exploration, and responsibility. We organize five structural changes that motivate the ADLC designs in Figure 1:

- 1) **Human-centered to agent-executed work.** Agents carry work across stages, while humans set goals and the scope of delegation.
- 2) **Execution across separate agent contexts.** Work can span multiple agents and invocations, each with its own

*Corresponding author: Yang Liu (yangliu@ntu.edu.sg).

available context rather than a continuous view of the project’s decisions.

- 3) **Broader access to cross-domain knowledge.** A general-purpose agent can consult information from multiple domains within a task, extending the knowledge accessible to an individual executor.
- 4) **Lower-cost generation and frequent feedback.** Cheaper trials make repeated generation and parallel alternatives more accessible.
- 5) **Changing authority and accountability.** Agents make decisions whose consequences are borne by people or organizations, separating execution from responsibility.

We therefore propose ADLC, an Agentic Development Lifecycle framework that connects these changes to five lifecycle designs. Shared project state guides the choice of stages, verification depth, rework, and increment closure. Stages can be revisited, overlapped, or bypassed when their obligations are already satisfied, with the next activities selected from the current state. Shared domain knowledge and responsibility commitments inform early design criteria. These criteria guide strategy assessment and candidate selection, while changes to their supporting conditions require reassessment of affected decisions. Our contribution is a lifecycle design that specifies these relationships, including how responsibility constrains design and how design supports commitments. Coding agents execute activities within this framework, with stage-specific methods chosen by the project.

II. CHANGES AND LIFECYCLE REQUIREMENTS

Recent industry reports describe changes in how software development is organized. OpenAI documents agent-executed development supported by repository-based knowledge and explicit engineering constraints [11]. Anthropic’s internal study reports engineers working beyond their usual expertise and pursuing exploration previously considered uneconomical [12]. Its subsequent analysis of coding sessions identifies a division between human planning and agent execution [13]. Its 2026 coding trends report anticipates broader access to specialist knowledge and emphasizes security from the start [14]. Drawing on these accounts, we organize the emerging changes into five dimensions in Figure 1.

First, agent-executed work allows an executor to carry an increment across stages, while people steer goals and delegation. Second, work can span agents and invocations with separate local contexts, as illustrated by long-running application harnesses [7]. Decisions and findings from one invocation must be made available to another when relevant. Third, a general-purpose agent can consult knowledge from multiple domains within a task. This broadens access to security, performance, human factors, and application-domain information. Turning this access into appropriate early design decisions requires selecting and interpreting applicable knowledge. Fourth, lower generation costs make repeated trials and parallel alternatives more accessible, increasing the importance of deciding what to verify and when to continue. Fifth, delegation separates decision execution across agents from the people or organizations

accepting obligations for its consequences. This makes the scope and continuity of those obligations a lifecycle concern, including during handoffs [8].

These changes jointly shape a dynamic lifecycle whose activities are selected according to current needs and feedback. Section III develops five connected ADLC designs that make shared knowledge available to early decisions, support agent self-monitoring and evidence-guided exploration, and bind delegated authority to responsibility arrangements.

III. ADLC: A CONNECTED LIFECYCLE MODEL

ADLC augments the SDLC for agent-executed development by connecting five designs through the evolving state of an increment. Shared project and domain knowledge defines what agents should build and the criteria used to assess it. Evidence supports judgments about whether those criteria are met, while authorization and responsibility conditions determine which actions may proceed. A development commitment specifies the properties an executor must maintain or obligations it must fulfill, the conditions under which they apply, and the party accountable for fulfilling them. Such commitments inform design and verification before they govern release. Each accepted change updates this common state and prompts reassessment of dependent decisions, from early design through operation. Figure 1 maps the five changes to these designs, whose interaction is organized by the lifecycle flow in Figure 2.

Requirements, design, implementation, verification, and operation denote activity types. Their execution order is selected dynamically from the current project state. Agents may enter a relevant stage, return to an earlier activity, or carry out compatible activities concurrently. An activity whose obligations are already satisfied can be bypassed, with the supporting evidence retained. Changed requirements or evidence can make it necessary again. Shared knowledge supplies context for each transition, D1 assesses what work is needed, D4 coordinates exploration, and D5 bounds permissible actions. Humans establish objectives, delegation limits, and approval rules. The execution framework coordinates agent activity and enforces these rules at action boundaries, including when agents disagree about the next step.

A. Five Connected Lifecycle Designs

The five designs follow the order in Figure 1:

- **D1. Metacognitive execution control.** Agents in ADLC assess their understanding, strategy, and capability relative to the current task, drawing on computational metacognition [15]. Each agent maintains an explicit account of assumptions, progress, uncertainty, and observed outcomes. It uses task feedback and independent checks to decide whether its current approach remains appropriate. The response may be to revise a candidate, change strategy, revisit requirements, obtain additional evidence, or seek assistance. This assessment concerns how the agent is solving the problem as well as the quality of its output. Failed checks, missing evidence,




Fig. 2. ADLC lifecycle overview. D2 supplies shared knowledge across stages and enables early domain integration in D3. D1 assesses strategy and capability relative to the task and informs exploration in D4. D5 links authorized actions to scoped obligations and remedies. The D1 human gate provides assistance, while D5 also enforces required approvals. The stage row illustrates one possible traversal. Execution can revisit, overlap, or bypass activities according to project state and applicable obligations. The upper panels detail the corresponding mechanisms. Operational feedback updates shared knowledge and informs subsequent work.

and mandatory approval rules can independently trigger intervention through the execution framework. Self-assessment informs activity selection, while D5 determines permissible action.

- D2. Lifecycle knowledge sharing.** Shared project memory preserves facts, constraints, and decision rationales across agents and stages, with links to their sources, versions, and applicability conditions. Naur’s account of programming as theory building [16] motivates preserving the rationale behind decisions. ADLC uses explicit records to support its reconstruction across agent contexts. Versioned, agent-accessible knowledge also underlies OpenAI’s repository-based engineering practice [11]. Agents retrieve applicable records before acting and contribute new findings and revised decisions for subsequent work. Proposed updates remain distinct from accepted records, with conflicts referred to the project’s designated decision authority before affected constraints are changed.
- D3. Domain knowledge shift-left.** ADLC aims to bring all relevant domain knowledge into requirements analysis

and initial design. D2 enables this shift by making knowledge contributed across roles and stages jointly accessible to agents working on early requirements and design. These agents translate relevant security, performance, human factors, and application-domain knowledge into design constraints and assessment criteria before implementation, recording the knowledge and applicability assumptions behind each criterion. Responsibility commitments from D5 can introduce requirements for observable outcomes, bounded effects, or recovery. Security provides an established example through the secure-by-design principle reflected in NIST’s SSDF [17]. The broader aim is to make knowledge beyond software engineering available from the outset, so that early design decisions account for the project’s needs across domains. Later findings can revise those constraints through D2.

- D4. Parallel exploration and optimization.** ADLC allocates agents to develop alternative designs and implementations in parallel, verify candidates against shared criteria, and select among qualifying solutions. Lower-cost trials create opportunities for broader exploration,

as reported in Anthropic’s study [12]. Within resource and risk budgets, evidence and D1 self-assessment guide which candidates to extend, revise, or stop and how deeply to explore, following risk-driven process reasoning [18]. Candidate assessment also checks whether the design can fulfill the applicable D5 commitments. Continuous quality assurance applies to both single-candidate work and parallel search. Evidence is bound to each candidate’s artifact and criteria versions, and changes or failed checks trigger reassessment. Verification results and operational feedback guide subsequent exploration. Concurrent activities use compatible constraints, and new findings can redirect work to a different stage or reopen a previously completed activity.

- **D5. Authority and responsibility.** ADLC binds delegated actions to scoped development commitments. Authorization specifies permitted decisions, affected assets, and operational limits. Responsibility specifies the obligations undertaken, their applicability, failure and attribution conditions, and an accountable operator or organization. Remedies specify correction, recovery, or compensation for those failures, with explicit limits and duration. Financial remedies identify covered losses, exclusions, and committed collateral or insurance, drawing on agent risk frameworks [9], [10]. The three scopes are linked explicitly. Permission to modify an artifact does not imply responsibility for every subsequent system failure, and financial coverage may address only part of the consequences for which a party is responsible. Uncovered consequences retain an identified risk owner and acceptance conditions.

These commitments enter requirements and design through D3 and constrain candidate selection in D4. Within preauthorized limits, execution can proceed while the required evidence, safeguards, and applicable backing remain valid. The execution framework suspends affected actions when their supporting conditions lapse and requires reassessment before they resume. Financial backing does not waive technical requirements or mandatory approvals. Scope expansion requires renewed terms, and backing allocations must account for concurrent and outstanding commitments to avoid promising the same capacity more than once. Changing an executor does not discharge existing obligations. They persist for their specified duration, including after delivery. A transfer requires a recorded accepting party and compliance with the commitment’s transfer conditions. This arrangement is intended to support autonomous work within commitments that users and operators can inspect and rely on.

Together, the designs connect knowledge, execution, and responsibility through three rules. First, applicable shared knowledge and development commitments inform design criteria, which guide strategy assessment and candidate comparison. Second, the execution framework permits an action only within its authorized scope and with the evidence, safeguards, and re-

sponsibility conditions required for that action. Third, changes to relevant knowledge, criteria, or commitment terms trigger reassessment of affected decisions before further dependent action. D1 can redirect work, while D5 limits the available actions. Thus responsibility influences early design, and the resulting design determines which commitments can be supported. After delivery, operational feedback updates shared knowledge and informs requirements, design, and verification in subsequent increments. This feedback connects the five designs across successive development cycles. Delivery closes an increment while preserving knowledge and responsibility commitments that remain relevant to later work.

B. A Compact ADLC Representation

For an increment that reaches delivery, we summarize ADLC as

$$(r, K_0) \xrightarrow{\text{ADLC}_{H,A}} (O, e, \tau). \quad (1)$$

Here r specifies requirements and selection objectives, K_0 initial project and domain knowledge, and H and A the sets of participating humans and agents. The outputs are deliverable O , its verification evidence e , and execution record τ . Intermediate designs and code are working candidates. Resource limits, authorization, and responsibility terms constrain execution. The arrow specifies the interface, with stage ordering governed by the rules in Section III-A.

The record τ links decisions to the knowledge, evidence, and commitment terms applicable when they were made. Shared knowledge and outstanding obligations persist outside an individual increment and inform subsequent inputs and execution conditions. Delivery produces O and e while preserving these links for later operation and review.

IV. RELATED WORK

A. Agentic Development Lifecycles

Iterative revisiting of development activities is established in risk-driven lifecycle models such as the spiral model [18]. Recent agentic frameworks reconsider how those activities are organized and supervised. SE 3.0 [19] centers on conversational intent alignment and a technology stack for AI teammates, code synthesis, and execution. Structured Agentic Software Engineering (SASE) [1] organizes collaboration through versioned briefs, workflow and mentorship scripts, consultation requests, and merge-readiness evidence. Bhati’s A-SDLC [2] provides a six-layer architecture and maps agent roles and human review points to development phases. Agentsway [3] coordinates specialized agents under a human orchestrator and uses retrospective feedback to refine models. Agentic Agile-V [20] combines an Agile-V lifecycle with the SCOPE-V task loop and risk-adaptive acceptance gates. These frameworks structure collaboration through roles, records, and acceptance mechanisms. ADLC contributes a lifecycle design in which shared domain knowledge is translated into requirements and design criteria before implementation (D2, D3). These criteria guide agents’ self-assessment and parallel candidate exploration (D1, D4). Delegated authority is tied to scoped

obligations and remedies (D5), which also constrain early design. These relationships connect early design, autonomous execution, and responsibility throughout the lifecycle.

B. Knowledge and Evidence in Agentic Work

Shift-Up [21] uses executable requirements, architectural models, and decision records as persistent, machine-readable guardrails for agent-driven implementation. This provides a concrete precedent for D2's shared records. D3 emphasizes using such records to make relevant expertise across security, performance, human factors, and application domains available to early decisions, with later findings feeding back into those decisions. Davis et al. [22] develop a theory of governance conversion from a longitudinal case study, explaining how recurring agentic failures lead engineers to introduce durable controls. This complements ADLC's feedback loop by explaining how the knowledge and constraints guiding subsequent work can themselves evolve. Ron et al. [23] study diverse agent-generated implementations and report both benefits from multi-version voting and common-mode failures. Their focus is reliability through implementation diversity. D4 concerns exploration and selection across lifecycle activities, with candidate-specific evidence informing whether to continue, revise, or redirect work.

C. Process Control and Responsibility

Prifti et al. [5] specify AI-SDLC processes through a protocol language with operational semantics and enforcement invariants. Their revised study evaluates executed, self-correcting processes as well as prose instructions on repository tasks. This is a concrete approach to enforcing process obligations. ADLC instead specifies the lifecycle relationships that inform which activities to undertake. Its dynamic selection remains subject to applicable obligations, which an executable protocol could enforce.

Sakhinana and Runkana [24] combine graph-based workflow progression, bounded repair and replanning, and an authorization-enforcing harness for cloud engineering. Their evidence-gated transitions and recovery paths directly overlap with ADLC's state-driven execution. ADLC connects this control concern with cross-stage domain knowledge and financial backing for the consequences of delegated decisions.

Wang and Liu [4] organize agent-era software engineering around Trustworthy Change and Responsibility Topology. They connect shared engineering state, verification, and change acceptance while distinguishing execution capability from authority to accept residual risk. This closely aligns with ADLC's lifecycle-level focus. Their organizing question concerns the distribution of acceptance authority across human-agent organizations. ADLC centers on the interaction of five designs, particularly shared knowledge enabling early domain integration and collateral or insurance supporting delegated responsibility. The two perspectives motivate further study of how organizational acceptance and financially backed execution should interact.

Intelligent AI Delegation [8] connects capability assessment, task allocation, risk-adaptive permissions, and accountability across delegation chains. AgentBound [25] evaluates actions against delegation and behavioral policies and records the governing artifacts in verifiable receipts. These works provide direct precedents for adaptive authority and decision traceability. ADLC develops their connection to software design by making development commitments inform early criteria and candidate selection, with reassessment when the underlying knowledge, evidence, or terms change.

Insured Agents [9] proposes insurer-backed collateral, scoped policies, and evidence-based claims. The Agentic Risk Standard in Quantifying Trust [10] specifies settlement, collateral, underwriting, and compensation for agentic jobs, including motivation from coding-agent failures. ADLC draws on these financial mechanisms and focuses on how permitted actions, development obligations, and remedies relate throughout software development. Commitments constrain design and exploration before release, and remain traceable across agent handoffs and subsequent changes. These financial mechanisms provide the backing for the lifecycle commitments defined in Section III-A.

D. Official Engineering Accounts and Industry Reports

OpenAI's harness engineering account [11] describes an agent-built product supported by repository-based knowledge, executable constraints, and feedback loops. Its use of durable engineering records provides a practical counterpart to D2. OpenAI's Symphony account [6] describes continuous task dispatch, parallel agent workspaces, and a move toward assigning objectives rather than restricting agents to narrow transitions. This directly relates to ADLC's dynamic activity selection and D4's exploration. Its Asana case study [26] describes a test-system migration in which agents performed implementation while an engineer checked progress and reviewed every proposed change, illustrating continued human oversight within delegated work.

Anthropic's long-running application harness [7] separates planning, generation, and evaluation, shares criteria through files, and uses evaluation feedback to revise work. These mechanisms connect to D1's feedback-based adjustment, D2's shared records, and D4's quality assessment. Anthropic's internal work study [12] combines surveys, interviews, and usage analysis, reporting work beyond engineers' usual expertise and exploration previously considered uneconomical. It also reports continued supervision and concerns about retaining expertise, contextualizing the opportunities and constraints behind D3 and D4.

Anthropic's 2026 Agentic Coding Trends Report [14] anticipates coordinated agent teams, changes in human oversight, and broader access to specialist knowledge, with security integrated from the start. This supports the motivation for early domain integration in D3. These sources offer forecasts, implementation accounts, and organization-specific observations. ADLC uses these complementary perspectives to specify how

scoped responsibility commitments inform software design and delegated execution.

V. DISCUSSION

We discuss the limitations of ADLC, unresolved questions, and challenges that may arise from its designs and their interactions.

Using the connections. ADLC can guide workflow design by tracing how knowledge and commitments affect decisions across an increment. A team can examine whether domain knowledge changes early design criteria, whether those criteria and the associated obligations govern candidate selection, and whether revised assumptions reopen affected decisions. These questions assess the connections specified in Section III-A. Adding a memory store or an approval step establishes only part of them. Existing coding agents can serve as executors, while the surrounding workflow maintains the links and enforces action conditions. This provides a concrete basis for adopting ADLC incrementally and comparing implementations of its designs.

Shared knowledge and shared failure. The connection between D2, D3, and D4 can propagate errors alongside useful constraints. An incorrect domain assumption may enter shared memory, become an early design criterion, and then guide the verification of every candidate. Agreement among candidates would then reflect a shared premise rather than independent support for its correctness. Candidate diversity alone cannot resolve an omission in their common assessment criteria. An implementation therefore needs to distinguish checking an artifact against a criterion from assessing whether that criterion captures the applicable domain requirement. The latter calls for evidence beyond the candidate-generation process, such as authoritative domain sources or specialist review. Shared records should preserve unresolved disagreements and the assumptions behind accepted decisions. D3's early integration also needs to remain revisable as knowledge develops. Otherwise, moving knowledge earlier could increase the cost of correcting a mistaken premise across designs, tests, and commitments.

Self-assessment and authority. D1's value depends on whether an agent recognizes when its understanding or strategy needs revision, including when its current output passes available checks. Self-assessments need to be checked against observed outcomes to establish when they can guide such choices. An agent may confidently persist with a mistaken interpretation, or repeatedly seek assistance despite having adequate evidence to proceed. Both cases matter when assessing the need for human intervention. D1 informs the choice of activity, while D5 and independent checks bound execution. Increased confidence cannot authorize a broader action, and a change of strategy cannot remove an applicable approval requirement. Human involvement consequently has two distinct roles, supplying missing judgment and exercising reserved authority. Better self-assessment may reduce the need for the former without changing the latter. This distinction also makes it possible to examine whether apparent gains in

autonomy arise from better decisions or simply from weaker oversight.

Commitments and acceptable delegation. D5 addresses the conditions under which a person or organization is willing to delegate work. Technical evidence supports confidence in the work, while scoped commitments identify who must respond to specified failures and which remedies are available. A stated compensation amount alone establishes neither the correctness of an action nor the acceptability of its consequences. The relevant question is whether permitted actions, undertaken obligations, and available remedies have an explicit and credible correspondence. Their scopes need not be identical. A responsible party may retain obligations beyond financial coverage, and the party accepting that residual exposure must be identified.

This correspondence has consequences for software design. A commitment to recovery requires a design in which the relevant effects can be detected and reversed or otherwise repaired. If a proposed action cannot be supported by the required safeguards and remedies, early design and candidate selection must account for that gap. Narrower authority or a design with more effective recovery may make a revised commitment feasible. Additional approval can address acceptance of residual exposure, but cannot replace required safeguards or remedy capacity. Some consequences may remain unacceptable under the available arrangements. The execution record can support attribution, but recording which agent acted does not by itself establish why a failure occurred or which obligation applies. Dispute resolution and the continued availability of remedies across concurrent work and later handoffs therefore remain implementation and organizational requirements. Whether these arrangements increase justified willingness to delegate depends on the credibility of the commitments as well as technical performance.

Control effort and adaptation. Maintaining shared records, reviewing domain assumptions, checking action conditions, and managing outstanding obligations all consume resources. Lower generation cost can make these activities a larger part of total development effort. Control intensity should reflect the affected assets, the reversibility of an action, and the duration of its consequences. A local, recoverable change may need less extensive review than an action with external effects or persistent obligations, while both remain subject to their applicable requirements. The same reasoning applies to D4's exploration depth and to dynamic stage selection. Reopening work is useful when changed knowledge or evidence affects a decision, but repeated switching without resolving the underlying issue adds coordination cost. Implementations need rules for prioritizing affected work, stopping unproductive exploration, and escalating unresolved conflicts. The framework's practical value depends on whether the rework and exposure avoided justify the effort of maintaining these connections. These tradeoffs, together with the reliability of self-assessment and shared knowledge, remain to be evaluated.

VI. CONCLUSION

ADLC connects five changes in agent-executed development to five lifecycle designs. Their shared increment state links knowledge, quality, execution, and responsibility across dynamically selected stages. Domain knowledge and scoped commitments inform early choices, metacognitive assessment redirects execution, and action conditions are reassessed as the project changes. Authorization, responsibility, and remedies remain explicitly linked across handoffs and delivery. These relationships provide a basis for implementing and evaluating agent-executed lifecycles, with knowledge reliability, execution policies, and responsibility coverage as central directions for further work.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. E. Hassan, H. Li, D. Lin, B. Adams, T.-H. Chen, Y. Kashiwa, and D. Qiu, "Agentic software engineering: Foundational pillars and a research roadmap," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.06216*, 2025.
- [2] H. Bhati, "Agentic ai in the software development lifecycle: Architecture, empirical evidence, and the reshaping of software engineering," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.26275*, 2026.
- [3] E. Bandara, R. Gore, X. Liang, S. Rajapakse, I. Kularathna, P. Karunaratna, P. Foytik, S. Shetty, R. Mukkamala, A. Rahman, A. Hass, W. K. Ng, K. De Zoysa, A. Withanage, and N. Loganathan, "Agentsway – software development methodology for ai agents-based teams," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.23664*, 2025.
- [4] Z. Wang and M. Liu, "Software engineering in the agent era: From trustworthy change to human-agent software organizations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.04630*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.04630v1>
- [5] Y. Prifti, P. De Meo, and A. Proveti, "Specifying AI-SDLC processes: A protocol language for human-agent boundaries," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.20615*, 2026, version 3, revised August 16, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.20615v3>
- [6] A. Kotliarskyi, V. Zhu, and Z. Brock, "An open-source spec for Codex orchestration: Symphony," OpenAI, Apr. 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/index/open-source-codex-orchestration-symphony/>
- [7] P. Rajasekaran, "Harness design for long-running application development," Anthropic, Mar. 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.anthropic.com/engineering/harness-design-long-running-apps>
- [8] N. Tomašev, M. Franklin, and S. Osindero, "Intelligent AI delegation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.11865*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.11865v1>
- [9] B. A. Hu and B. Chen, "Insured agents: A decentralized trust insurance mechanism for agentic economy," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.08737*, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.08737v1>
- [10] W. Hua, T. Peng, C. Wang, J. Pei, I. Kaufman, B. Lim, and C. Fang, "Quantifying trust: Financial risk management for trustworthy AI agents," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.03976*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.03976v2>
- [11] R. Lopopolo, "Harness engineering: Leveraging Codex in an agent-first world," OpenAI, Feb. 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/index/harness-engineering/>
- [12] S. Huang, B. Seethor, E. Durmus, K. Handa, M. McCain, M. Stern, and D. Ganguli, "How AI is transforming work at Anthropic," Anthropic, Dec. 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.anthropic.com/research/how-ai-is-transforming-work-at-anthropic>
- [13] Z. Hitzig, M. Massenkoff, E. Lyubich, R. Heller, and P. McCrory, "Agentic coding and persistent returns to expertise," Anthropic, Jun. 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.anthropic.com/research/claude-code-expertise>
- [14] Anthropic, "2026 agentic coding trends report," Anthropic, Tech. Rep., 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://resources.anthropic.com/2026-agentic-coding-trends-report>
- [15] M. Cox, Z. Mohammad, S. Kondrakunta, V. R. Gogineni, D. Dannenhauer, and O. Larue, "Computational metacognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.12885*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.12885>
- [16] P. Naur, "Programming as theory building," *Microprocessing and Microprogramming*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 253–261, 1985.
- [17] M. Souppaya, K. Scarfone, and D. Dodson, "Secure software development framework (SSDF) version 1.1: Recommendations for mitigating the risk of software vulnerabilities," National Institute of Standards and Technology, Tech. Rep. SP 800-218, Feb. 2022.
- [18] B. W. Boehm, "A spiral model of software development and enhancement," *Computer*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 61–72, 1988.
- [19] A. E. Hassan, G. A. Oliva, D. Lin, B. Chen, and Z. M. Jiang, "Towards AI-native software engineering (SE 3.0): A vision and a challenge roadmap," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06107*, 2024, ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol., doi:10.1145/3807901.
- [20] C. Koch, "Agentic agile-v: From vibe coding to verified engineering in software and hardware development," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.20456*, 2026.
- [21] P. Lipsanen, L. Rannikko, F. Christophe, K. Kalliokoski, V. Stirbu, and T. Mikkonen, "Shift-up: A framework for software engineering guardrails in AI-native software development – initial findings," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.20436*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.20436v1>
- [22] J. C. Davis, P. C. Amusuo, T. Singla, B. Çakar, and K. A. Davis, "Cheap code, costly judgment: A case study on governable agentic software engineering," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.01087*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.01087v2>
- [23] J. Ron, B. Baudry, and M. Monperrus, "N-version programming with coding agents," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.20158*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.20158v1>
- [24] S. S. Sakhinana and V. Runkana, "Towards agentic cloud engineering: Graph and loop engineering with a zero-trust agent harness," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.00050*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.00050v1>
- [25] A. Kaul, Q. Lan, and P. Gupta, "Behavioral governance for autonomous AI agents: The AgentBound framework," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.30970*, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.30970v2>
- [26] OpenAI, "Asana cleared 5 years of engineering work in 2 weeks with Codex," Customer case study, Aug. 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/index/asana/>