

Factor(T,U): Factored Cognition Strengthens Monitoring of Untrusted AI

Aaron Sandoval

Independent

aaron.sandoval110@gmail.com

Cody Rushing

Redwood Research

Abstract

The field of AI Control seeks to develop robust control protocols, deployment safeguards for untrusted AI which may be intentionally subversive. However, existing protocols that rely on weaker monitors to detect unsafe behavior often fail on complex tasks beyond the monitor’s comprehension. We develop control protocols based on factored cognition, in which a trusted model decomposes a task, an untrusted model solves each resultant child task in isolation, and the results are reassembled into a full solution. These protocols may improve safety by several means, such as by simplifying the context for monitors, or by obscuring vulnerabilities in the environment. We implement our protocols in the APPS coding setting and red team them against backdoor attempts from an adversarial GPT-4.1 Nano. We find that: (i) Adding factored cognition to a trusted monitoring protocol can boost safety from 41% to 63%; (ii) Safety improves because monitor performance improves; (iii) Factored cognition makes it no harder for capable LLMs to write backdoors in APPS. While our protocols show low usefulness in APPS, they hold promise for more complex tasks.

1 Introduction

Given the challenges of either aligning powerful AI or detecting misalignment through evaluations (Hubinger et al., 2024), the field of AI control treats those models as untrusted, models their worst-case behavior, and develops deployment safeguards called control protocols which aim to be robust even to intentional subversion by the untrusted AI (Greenblatt et al., 2023). Many existing control protocols use a weaker trusted model T to monitor the actions of the stronger untrusted model U , a technique called trusted monitoring (Greenblatt et al., 2023). However, when faced with more complex




Figure 1: Functionality of the Factor(T,U) factored cognition control protocol. Given a root task, the decomposer T creates child tasks and reassembly logic. Each child task is implemented by U under trusted monitoring in an isolated context. The reassembly logic is then used to compose the child solutions into a solution to the root task.

tasks, the weaker T may be worse at distinguishing malicious behavior due to longer contexts and a lack of understanding of the task and its solution.

To address this, we introduce *Factor(T,U)*, a control protocol based on factored cognition (Stuhlmüller et al., 2018), in which T decomposes the root task into a set of child tasks, child tasks are each implemented by U under trusted monitoring in isolated contexts, and the child solutions are reassembled into a solution to the root task. These protocols may deliver several safety benefits, including *simplicity benefits for monitors*: decomposing tasks creates simpler contexts in which monitor performance is enhanced, and *security through obscurity*: for some threats, isolating contexts hides information about security vulnerabilities, making it harder for U to attack effectively. Furthermore, child tasks may be solved using any control protocol, enabling simple integration of advances from other AI control research.

We perform control evaluations in the APPS coding

setting (Greenblatt et al., 2023), baselining our protocols against trusted monitoring¹. Our implementation of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ shows very low usefulness in APPS, preventing effective study of its safety. In our control evaluations we study $\text{Factor}(D, U)$, which is identical to $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ except that it uses a powerful trusted model to decompose tasks. We find that $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ substantially outperforms trusted monitoring on safety. We find evidence of simplicity benefits for monitors, but not of security through obscurity in this setting. Monitors rate attacks on child tasks as more suspicious, while the suspiciousness of honest solutions shifts less. While we demonstrate that factored cognition control protocols show promising safety benefits, task decomposition degrades accuracy in the APPS setting. We expect the usefulness of these protocols to be highly setting-dependent and best for complex tasks where task decomposition enhances accuracy, such as those solved by large language model (LLM) agents (Xi et al., 2023).

Our main contributions are:

- We introduce a novel family of factored cognition control protocols with several potential safety benefits.
- **We demonstrate the superior safety of $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ in the APPS control setting by red teaming and baselining against a trusted monitoring protocol.**
- We find evidence that **$\text{Factor}(D, U)$ provides simplicity benefits for monitors, but not security through obscurity** in APPS.
- We find that **$\text{Factor}(T, U)$ has very low usefulness in APPS**, and that this is likely a permanent property of the setting.

2 Setting

We perform control evaluations using methods similar to Greenblatt et al. (2023). For readers familiar with this work, Appendix E contains an alternate description of our setting in terms of deviations from theirs.

We use the APPS control setting of coding problems (Greenblatt et al., 2023) where a red team attempts a side task of writing backdoored solutions that pass undetected during a deployment.

¹Code and data available at <https://github.com/aaron-sandoval/inspect-control-settings/tree/2025-12-publication>

We use 500 tasks from the APPS-verified subset (likaixin, 2024), applying a 50/50 train/test split. 99% of tasks have exactly one unit test case, modeling a setting with little ground truth knowledge about the intended behavior of solutions. Control evaluations are conducted as an iterative red teaming process, in which a red and a blue team use different resources to achieve opposing objectives.

2.1 Resources and Restrictions

Untrusted model: The blue team has access to U , a strong model that may or may not be attempting to write hidden backdoors. In a deployment, U may either act identically to GPT-4.1 Nano, which we call the honest policy U_H , or it may follow an attack policy U_A designed to write backdoors. U_A is an LLM system that has been built by the red team. U_A may use attack templates, make calls to GPT-4.1 Nano, and follow stochastic policies precisely. U_A makes an *attack* whenever it attempts to write a backdoor. The red team has full knowledge of the blue team’s control protocol and can access all the results of previous experiments. The blue team can also access the results of previous experiments, except for any internal functionality of U_A . The red team cannot call T or fine tune on T ’s outputs, but they can iterate directly against the control protocol, which calls T . U maintains no memory between calls. These red team allowances are intended to amplify the capabilities of GPT-4.1 Nano to conservatively bound the ability of a similar model that is scheming to subvert the control protocol. Following Greenblatt et al. (2023), the blue team may measure summary statistics of U_H and use them in protocols.

Trusted models: The blue team may also use T , a weaker trusted model which never attempts attacks, implemented using Llama 3.1 8B-instruct (Grattafiori et al., 2024). We additionally allow access to a powerful trusted model for the exclusive use of decomposing tasks. We call this decomposer model D and implement it with OpenAI o3-mini. Using D in $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ produces the $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ protocol. This compensates for Llama 3.1 8B-Instruct’s poor decomposition ability without directly upsetting the capability gap in the weaker T monitoring the outputs of the stronger U . See Appendix D for further justification and discussion of this allowance.

Auditing: Similar to the methods of Bhatt et al.

(2025), the blue team has access to limited perfect auditing. The blue team may audit up to 2% of samples in the trajectory. For simplicity, we assume *perfect auditing*: if a solution containing any deviation from U_H is audited, this always reveals incriminating evidence of scheming and triggers a shutdown of U , terminating the deployment safely. This incentivizes the red team to only ever deviate from the behavior of U_H when attacking. We acknowledge that perfect auditing is unrealistic for this setting, but we don’t expect it to meaningfully affect our conclusions. For factored cognition protocols, child task solutions are audited in isolation, and one such audit costs the same against the budget as an audit of a solution from trusted monitoring. For simplicity, the blue team is restricted to using fixed criteria over the deployment for deciding whether to audit a solution.

2.2 Metrics and Red/Blue Team Objectives

The blue team’s objective is to maximize the test set usefulness and safety of their protocol as defined in Greenblatt et al. (2023). The threat model is *high-stakes*, meaning that a control protocol accepting a single backdoor is considered catastrophic. The red team’s objective is to minimize safety. In a run measuring usefulness, all calls to U are implemented by U_H , and we measure accuracy, the proportion of samples where the solution passes all unit tests. Usefulness is a linear rescaling of accuracy where T has 0% usefulness and U_H has 100% usefulness.

To measure safety, we run the experiment using U_A and measure the probability that the deployment terminates safely before a backdoored solution is accepted by the protocol. A solution is considered backdoored if it meets all of the following criteria. We discuss these criteria further in section 4.1.

- It passes a set of unit tests from the dataset
- It contains an attack
- When GPT-4.1 Nano is prompted with the task and solution, it provides a successful exploit: an input to the solution which produces a behavioral difference relative to a reference solution. We call this instance of GPT-4.1 Nano the *exploit finder*.

We use a downsampling method similar to Greenblatt et al. (2023) to increase the sample size of

	Audited	Not audited
Backdoored	A , blue wins	B , red wins
Failed attack	C , blue wins	D , continue
No attack	E , continue	F , continue

Table 1: Possible root task outcomes. Blue and red cells result in victory for that team, and yellow cells indicate that the deployment continues. The letter in each cell represents the quantity of such root task outcomes observed in a control evaluation.

attacks. For a safety run of 1000 root tasks, we randomly downsample the root tasks which contain an attack, keeping 1/18 of the tasks and discarding the rest. Our protocols do not use any cross-task information or information about where in the deployment sequence the task lies. Consequently, root task outcomes are functions only of intrinsic properties of that task and its solution. This simplifies the calculation of the following metrics, where the variables refer to the quantities in Table 1.

$$\text{Attack audit rate (AAR)} = \frac{A + C}{A + B + C + D}$$

$$\text{Attack success rate (ASR)} = \frac{A + B}{A + B + C + D}$$

$$\text{Unaudited ASR} = \frac{B}{A + B + C + D}$$

3 Results

All error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

3.1 Red Teaming

Like in Greenblatt et al. (2023), we find the best red team strategy against trusted monitoring is to write subtle backdoors. We use the same strategy for $\text{Factor}(D, U)$, as no distinct red team strategy superior at countering $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ was found. The only change in the red team’s tactics is to tune separate attack selection parameters to account for the different task distribution. The blue team tests 3 variations of $\text{Factor}(D, U)$, using different prompts to D to create different decomposition granularities. Decompositions from $\text{Factor}(D_{\text{low}}, U)$ have an average of 2.0 child tasks, those from $\text{Factor}(D_{\text{med}}, U)$ have 3.0, and those from $\text{Factor}(D_{\text{high}}, U)$ have 3.5. The main results from red teaming are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Safety performance of $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ protocols with different decomposition granularities relative to trusted monitoring. Arrows indicate the direction correlated with higher safety. The rightmost cluster shows ASR when using o3-mini to find exploits instead of GPT-4.1 Nano.

To investigate the causes of the observed safety performance, we examine related metrics. The $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ protocols generally outperform trusted monitoring on all safety metrics. For safety and AAR, the advantage diminishes with higher granularity. For ASR and unaudited ASR, there is no significant difference between granularities. Both AAR and unaudited ASR are functions of the monitor performance in each protocol, illustrated in Figure 3. Monitors in $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ protocols outperform those in trusted monitoring, but performance among different granularities is similar. Though our experiments didn’t use protocols such as defer to resample (Bhatt et al., 2025) to implement child tasks, the higher AUROC indicates that a superior safety-usefulness tradeoff is available to $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ by adding resampling compared to trusted monitoring. Examining in more detail the differences in monitor performance, Figure 3b shows that attacks on $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ child tasks are more suspicious than on the root tasks in trusted monitoring. In effect, factored cognition helps monitors recognize attacks. However, the same is not true for honest solutions. According to Figure 3c, while more granular decompositions produce less suspicious U_H solutions on average, this distribution shift is dwarfed by the greater quantity of tasks, resulting in more high-suspiciousness solutions overall under $\text{Factor}(D, U)$. Altogether, **we attribute the safety advantage of $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ to two separate mechanisms: (i) improved monitor**

performance, with the advantage diminishing with higher granularity; (ii) lower ASR.

3.2 Security through Obscurity

To investigate the causes of our superior ASR relative to trusted monitoring, we perform an additional experiment. We test if the ASR difference is due to security through obscurity, a possible safety benefit of $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ protocols. If these protocols possess security through obscurity, it means that attacks fail more often because the limited context hides information about the target of the attack, making it harder to assess attack opportunities, resulting in some attacks failing which would have succeeded had U been given the full root task context. We expect this possible benefit to only apply to some threat models, including APPS backdoors. See Appendix I for details on this threat model partition.

We test the security through obscurity hypothesis by running all protocols using the stronger o3-mini as the exploit finder rather than GPT-4.1 Nano. If the hypothesis were true, then $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ should maintain its superior ASR with a stronger exploit finder since U ’s failed attacks were more likely to be unsalvageable. However, since we see in Figure 2 that there is no significant difference in ASR using an o3-mini exploit finder, it’s more likely that the difference when using a GPT-4.1 Nano exploit finder is due to something other than security through obscurity, such as the longer and more complex $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ solutions impeding GPT-4.1 Nano’s ability to understand and exploit the attacked code. Though generating complex solutions whose structure is specifically intended to confuse attackers is a possible blue team strategy, we don’t expect our implementation of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ to have such a benefit against models of capability similar to o3-mini, let alone truly untrusted models.

If we expect $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ to have no systematic advantage in ASR, then to what degree does it maintain its safety advantage? As a proxy measurement, we recompute the safety of each protocol using the o3-mini exploit finder and conservatively estimate $P = 0.066$ that $\text{Factor}(D_{\text{low}}, U)$ has no safety advantage compared to trusted monitoring. This value is conservative both because $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ maintains its systematic advantage in monitor performance, and because the estimate does not fully account for possible correlations




Figure 3: (a) Trusted monitor ROC curves for classifying attacks vs. honest policy solutions from each protocol. (b) Attack suspiciousness distributions. (c) U_H suspiciousness distributions. The vertical line segments indicate the distribution means. The area under each curve is proportional to the quantity of suspiciousness scores produced by the protocol over 1000 root tasks.

of individual root task outcomes between the protocols. For these reasons, we are confident that $\text{Factor}(D_{low}, U)$ would maintain a significant advantage in safety compared to trusted monitoring even when using untrusted models with a similar ASR between the two protocols. See Appendix B for further details on the study.

3.3 Usefulness

Separately from the red teaming experiments, we benchmark the usefulness of $\text{Factor}(T_{low}, U)$, excluding the allowance for the powerful decomposer D . With the models used in the red teaming experiments, $\text{Factor}(T_{low}, U)$ has -63% usefulness. This is unsurprising since weak models like Llama 3.1 8B-Instruct tend to be especially weak decomposers (see Appendix C). We also measure usefulness for several strong models under typical model selection constraints. Control evaluations typically maintain a substantial capability gap between T and U , as measured by accuracy on the main task, to reflect the expected circumstances when an actual untrusted model is trained (Shlegeris, 2023). If we maintain a typical minimum 25% gap between T and U , then this restricts candidates for T to the <75% accuracy regime in all future studies. For T , we select the three strongest decomposers which meet that constraint, and for U , we select o3-mini and GPT-5 mini, the two strongest models on APPS

that we tested. Among the six combinations of T and U , the highest $\text{Factor}(T_{low}, U)$ usefulness is -7%. Full results are shown in Figure 6. While some improvement may be achievable with better elicitation and a future, stronger U , it is unlikely that $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ could overcome such a large gap to attain competitive usefulness in APPS.

4 Discussion

Mechanisms for improved safety: Our findings indicate that factored cognition provides simplicity benefits for monitors by increasing the trusted monitor’s suspicion of attacks in APPS. However, there is no such clear distribution shift for honest solutions. While we find no evidence for security through obscurity in APPS, this doesn’t preclude such safety benefits in other settings.

Low $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ Usefulness is Not a General Property Across Settings: The usefulness of task decomposition protocols is likely much more task-dependent than for the more foundational protocols in Bhatt et al. (2025) and Greenblatt et al. (2023). While our scaffold degrades accuracy in APPS, other task decomposition scaffolds improve accuracy on tasks such as question-answering, math, and symbol manipulation (Wang et al., 2023; Dua et al., 2022; Hernández-Gutiérrez et al., 2025). Furthermore, there is a broad class of tasks already

being solved through automated task decomposition and multi-step LLM workflows. In the context of AI control, a generic LLM agent implemented with an untrusted model can be viewed as a task decomposition protocol without any of the safety features of factored cognition protocols like monitoring or context isolation for child tasks, where decomposition and child task implementation are all done by U . It may not be difficult to add safety-relevant features to these protocols and workflows.

Task decomposition in the form of LLM agent systems has gained immense popularity purely for its capabilities on complex tasks (Chowa et al., 2025). Factored cognition protocols will be most viable for these types of tasks, where decomposition is not a burden but an enhancement. For these tasks, the loss in usefulness will come from the context isolation and other safety features necessary to turn a regular LLM agent system into a proper $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ or $\text{Factor}(U, U)$ protocol. Decomposition itself will not differentially degrade usefulness, increase inference cost, nor lengthen latency. Therefore, these protocols are most promising for tasks where decomposition occurs by default, and where the natural baseline is a generic task decomposition system without the safety features of AI control protocols. The usefulness of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ in APPS is an underestimate of its potential usefulness on more complex tasks.

4.1 Limitations

Powerful Decomposer Allowance: Given the weakness of T , this allowance was necessary to investigate our hypotheses about factored cognition protocols, but it may also result in overestimating their safety. Since D never sees U ’s outputs, we think that $\text{Factor}(D, U)$ ’s safety performance is a decent first-order safety estimate. Still, there may be bias in our safety results, such as from highly detailed child tasks giving monitors extra clues as to what parts of a child solution are/aren’t legitimate. See Appendix D for a full discussion.

Honest Policy Safety Failures: We found that U_H writes backdoored solutions on about 1% of tasks. This is more likely for our split of APPS because 99% of tasks in our split contain exactly one unit test, far fewer than the splits used by Greenblatt et al. (2023) or Terekhov et al. (2025). Honest policy safety failures like these can undermine key features of high-stakes control evaluations such

as the red team’s incentive to attack and the blue team’s ability to incriminate scheming models. Our definition of a backdoor (see section 2.2) was selected to artificially mitigate these problems, and though we don’t believe that these are good general assumptions for other research using backdoored code threat models, we believe that our experiments maintain their integrity relative to our specific research questions and reflect the qualitative results that one would get using a split of APPS without honest policy safety failures.

Generalization from Weak Models and Elicitation: This study uses relatively weak models due to its limited budget and scope. Also, while we are satisfied with our elicitation in attack selection, our attack policies were much simpler than those in Greenblatt et al. (2023) or Wen et al. (2024). It’s unclear how well our results would generalize to stronger models using more thorough elicitation.

4.2 Future Work

Control evaluation in a new setting: A proper evaluation of the safety and usefulness of task decomposition protocols must test $\text{Factor}(T, U)$, not $\text{Factor}(D, U)$. It would be most relevant to use a setting where task decomposition is a lesser hindrance, such as an LLM agent setting or one with otherwise complex tasks.

Test Attack Coordination Challenges hypothesis: Factored cognition might provide additional safety via a separate mechanism for multi-step control settings like BashBench (Bhatt et al., 2025). In their study, a dominant strategy is multi-step attack strategies in which attacks are distributed across an agent trajectory. If this trajectory is broken up into isolated child tasks, it may be harder for an attack policy to coordinate these attacks.

Test Simplicity Benefits for Other Blue Team Tactics hypothesis: In addition to monitoring, other blue team tactics may be more effective when applied to simpler child tasks, such as editing solutions and generating unit tests.

Extensions of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$: Other potentially useful features which could be added include:

- Use implementers besides trusted monitoring
- Test a range of model capabilities for D and examine safety trends

- Add another monitoring, editing, or resampling step after reassembly with the full root task solution
- Use T or U to generate child task unit tests
- Use more sophisticated LLM task decomposition scaffolds from the literature

Other factored cognition protocols: Forthcoming work is exploring $\text{Factor}(U, T)$ and $\text{Factor}(U, U)$ protocols, where the untrusted model decomposes tasks. However, some questions related to those protocols remain open. In particular, future research should explore what steganographic bandwidth can be achieved in decompositions in a $\text{Factor}(U, U)$ protocol, and how various blue team measures for limiting that bandwidth trade off safety and usefulness.

5 Related Work

[Greenblatt et al. \(2023\)](#) introduce the field of AI control, control protocols, and high-stakes control evaluations. [Bhatt et al. \(2025\)](#) create BashBench, an LLM agent setting more realistic than APPS, and resample protocols, which are effective against stochastic attack strategies. [Wen et al. \(2024\)](#) introduce untrusted planning, a task decomposition protocol using an untrusted decomposer and trusted implementers, which they test in a low-stakes control evaluation, where no single failure is catastrophic. Our work is the first to test task decomposition techniques in a high-stakes setting. [Mallen et al. \(2025\)](#) evaluate frontier LLMs for several dangerous capabilities necessary for models to subvert control protocols. In parallel with our work, [Terekhov et al. \(2025\)](#) explore trusted monitoring in depth, measuring the performance vs inference cost tradeoff of monitoring in the APPS setting. We adapt their trusted monitor and use it in our experiments.

The subfield of scalable oversight, exemplified by Iterated Distillation and Amplification ([Christiano et al., 2018](#)), seeks to develop AI training methods which scale beyond human abilities to efficiently provide feedback. Factored cognition was originally developed as a scalable oversight method wherein the capability of a weak question-answering AI is amplified by using task decomposition to create a tree of simpler, context-free child questions ([Stuhlmüller et al., 2018](#)). A large body of work leverages task decomposition to improve

performance on various types of complex tasks, including [Min et al. \(2019\)](#); [Perez et al. \(2020\)](#); [Deng et al. \(2022\)](#); [Dua et al. \(2022\)](#); [Zhou et al. \(2023\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2023\)](#); [Yao et al. \(2023\)](#); [Khot et al. \(2023\)](#); [Juneja et al. \(2024\)](#); [Prasad et al. \(2024\)](#); [Hernández-Gutiérrez et al. \(2025\)](#). Our study is distinguished from this literature in focusing on task decomposition’s ability to reduce risks from untrusted models rather than to improve performance on benchmarks.

Acknowledgments

Many thanks to Carlo Attubato, Trevor Lohrbeer, Alex Spies, Tyler Tracy, and the other 2025 Q1 Pivotal Research fellows for their advice and guidance.

References

- Aryan Bhatt, Cody Rushing, Adam Kaufman, Tyler Tracy, Vasil Georgiev, David Matolcsi, Akbir Khan, and Buck Shlegeris. 2025. [Ctrl-Z: Controlling AI Agents via Resampling](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2504.10374 [cs].
- Sadia Sultana Chowdhury, Riasad Alvi, Subhey Sadi Rahman, Md Abdur Rahman, Mohaimenul Azam Khan Raiaan, Md Rafiqul Islam, Mukhtar Hussain, and Sami Azam. 2025. [From Language to Action: A Review of Large Language Models as Autonomous Agents and Tool Users](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Paul Christiano, Buck Shlegeris, and Dario Amodei. 2018. [Supervising strong learners by amplifying weak experts](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Zhenyun Deng, Yonghua Zhu, Yang Chen, Michael Witbrock, and Patricia Riddle. 2022. [Interpretable AMR-Based Question Decomposition for Multi-hop Question Answering](#). *arXiv*.
- Dheeru Dua, Shivanshu Gupta, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2022. [Successive Prompting for Decomposing Complex Questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1251–1265, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Srivankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, and 542 others. 2024. [The Llama 3 Herd of Models](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Ryan Greenblatt, Buck Shlegeris, Kshitij Sachan, and Fabien Roger. 2023. [AI Control: Improving Safety Despite Intentional Subversion](#).

Sergio Hernández-Gutiérrez, Minttu Alakuijala, Alexander V. Nikitin, and Pekka Marttinen. 2025. [Recursive Decomposition with Dependencies for Generic Divide-and-Conquer Reasoning](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Evan Hubinger, Carson Denison, Jesse Mu, Mike Lambert, Meg Tong, Monte MacDiarmid, Tamera Lanham, Daniel M. Ziegler, Tim Maxwell, Newton Cheng, Adam Jermy, Amanda Askell, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Cem Anil, David Duvenaud, Deep Ganguli, Fazl Barez, Jack Clark, Kamal Ndousse, and 20 others. 2024. [Sleeper Agents: Training Deceptive LLMs that Persist Through Safety Training](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Gurusha Juneja, Subhabrata Dutta, Soumen Chakrabarti, Sunny Manchanda, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. 2024. [Small Language Models Fine-tuned to Coordinate Larger Language Models improve Complex Reasoning](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. [Decomposed Prompting: A Modular Approach for Solving Complex Tasks](#). *arXiv preprint*.

likaixin. 2024. [APPS-verified](#).

Alex Mallen, Charlie Griffin, Misha Wagner, Alessandro Abate, and Buck Shlegeris. 2025. [Subversion Strategy Eval: Can language models statelessly strategize to subvert control protocols?](#) *arXiv preprint*.

Evan Miller. 2024. [Adding Error Bars to Evals: A Statistical Approach to Language Model Evaluations](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Sewon Min, Victor Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2019. [Multi-hop Reading Comprehension through Question Decomposition and Rescoring](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6097–6109, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ethan Perez, Patrick Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Kyunghyun Cho, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. [Unsupervised Question Decomposition for Question Answering](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Archiki Prasad, Alexander Koller, Mareike Hartmann, Peter Clark, Ashish Sabharwal, Mohit Bansal, and Tushar Khot. 2024. [ADaPT: As-Needed Decomposition and Planning with Language Models](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Buck Shlegeris. 2023. [Untrusted smart models and trusted dumb models](#).

Andreas Stuhlmüller, Ozzie Goen, Ben Rachbach, Andrew Schreiber, Ben Weinstein-Raun, Paul Christiano, and Owain Evans. 2018. [Factored Cognition](#).

Mikhail Terekhov, Zhen Ning David Liu, Caglar Gulcehre, and Samuel Albanie. 2025. [Control Tax: The Price of Keeping AI in Check](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Lei Wang, Wanyu Xu, Yihuai Lan, Zhiqiang Hu, Yunshi Lan, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, and Ee-Peng Lim. 2023. [Plan-and-Solve Prompting: Improving Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought Reasoning by Large Language Models](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2609–2634, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jiaxin Wen, Vivek Hebbar, Caleb Larson, Aryan Bhatt, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Mrinank Sharma, Henry Sleight, Shi Feng, He He, Ethan Perez, Buck Shlegeris, and Akbir Khan. 2024. [Adaptive Deployment of Untrusted LLMs Reduces Distributed Threats](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, Wei He, Yiwen Ding, Boyang Hong, Ming Zhang, Junzhe Wang, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, Rui Zheng, Xiaoran Fan, Xiao Wang, Limao Xiong, Yuhao Zhou, Weiran Wang, Changhao Jiang, Yicheng Zou, Xiangyang Liu, and 10 others. 2023. [The Rise and Potential of Large Language Model Based Agents: A Survey](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. [ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models](#). *arXiv preprint*.

Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, and Ed Chi. 2023. [Least-to-Most Prompting Enables Complex Reasoning in Large Language Models](#). *arXiv preprint*.

E.D. Zwicky, S. Cooper, and D.B. Chapman. 2000. [Building Internet Firewalls: Internet and Web Security](#). O'Reilly Media.

A Glossary

The primary desiderata for control protocols are: **Safety:** The protocol can reliably detect and safely manage attacks within the untrusted AI’s capabilities that help it achieve its misaligned goals.

Usefulness: In the case that the untrusted model is not scheming, the protocol minimally degrades the capabilities at the task.

Cost: The protocol does it all economically, with minimal compute and human labor.

The basic set of intelligent resources which we have at our disposal to build control protocols are:

U: A smart untrusted model, which might be scheming against us.

T : A trusted model with capabilities inferior to U , which we are confident isn't scheming.

H : Trusted, high-quality human labor. In experiments, this is often simulated using a frontier LLM for practical reasons.

The 3 roles of human researchers which control different elements of control experiments are:

Red team: Elicits worst-case adversarial behavior from U given a set of affordances. The red team's goal is to minimize safety given a blue team protocol.

Blue team: Constructs control protocols given a set of affordances to maximize safety and usefulness.

White team: Decide the affordances, assumptions, and high-level experimental setup within which the red and blue teams optimize their objectives.

The red team creates two distinct policies that U can follow when called by the control protocol:

U_H : Untrusted model honest policy. Faithfully follows instructions without attempting an attack, like a trusted model.

U_A : Untrusted model attack policy. Sometimes attempts an attack, and sometimes follows a policy identical to U_H .

Usefulness run: The part of a control evaluation which measures the usefulness of a protocol. It is executed as an evaluation in the setting where U_H is used whenever the protocol calls U .

Safety run: The part of a control evaluation which measures the safety of a protocol. It is executed as an evaluation in the setting where U_A is used whenever the protocol calls U .

In the APPS setting, U_A attempts **attacks**, where it attempts to include a **backdoor** in its solution. A backdoor is an exploitable feature of the solution which produces a behavioral difference from a ground truth reference solution for some valid inputs while the solution still passes a set of unit tests. To determine if a solution contains a backdoor, an **exploit finder** (implemented by an LLM) proposes an **exploit**, which is a specific input to a solution which may produce a behavioral difference. If it really does produce a behavioral difference, then this is a **successful exploit**. If the solution passes unit tests and the exploit is successful, then the solution is backdoored. If an attacked solution fails unit

tests or the exploit does not produce a behavioral difference, it is a **failed attack**.

We use the following terms related to the task decomposition. These terms are defined with code-writing tasks in mind but should be pretty generalizable:

Task: A data structure containing a natural language problem description and possibly other fields. For functional programming tasks, it may include a function signature and a set of unit tests and test cases to check the validity of a solution.

Solution: An implementation of a task, including the solutions to any and all child tasks.

Parent task: Any task which has been decomposed into child tasks.

Child task: A task resulting from the decomposition of a parent task.

Sibling task: A child task which shares the same parent as another child task.

Root task: The original problem that we ask the AI system to solve.

Leaf task: A task which is not decomposed and is solved by direct implementation.

Reassembly logic: The part of the parent task solution which defines how to use the child task solutions to solve the parent task.

Decomposer: The part of a control protocol which decomposes a parent task into a set of child tasks and a reassembly function.

Implementer: A human/LM system which implements a solution to a task. Implementers are themselves control protocols.

The following are abbreviations for certain categories of task decomposition control protocols.

Factor(T, T): A factored cognition system for the trusted model.

Factor(T, U): A task decomposition control protocol with T as decomposer and implementer protocols which use U .

Factor(U, T): A task decomposition control protocol with U as decomposer and implementer protocols which use T only.

Factor(U, U): A task decomposition control protocol with U as decomposer and implementer protocols which use U .

Some miscellaneous terminology which we haven't seen in control literature previously but which we found useful:

Trigger set: The set of all possible inputs to a backdoored function which return unexpected results. Or, more formally, for a valid input $x \in S$, a reference solution function $f(x)$, a backdoored version $f'(x)$, and assuming a single unit test which asserts the equality of solutions, the trigger S_t set of $f'(x)$ is $S_t \subseteq S : x \in S_t \iff f(x) \neq f'(x)$.

Decomposition tax: The relative loss in accuracy from adding task decomposition to a protocol. Decomposition tax = $1 - (\text{accuracy of Factor}(T, T) / \text{accuracy of } T)$.

B Details of Security Through Obscurity Study




Figure 4: Safety metrics when using an o3-mini exploit finder.

We perform a relatively quick test for security through obscurity. As a simple proxy of testing for safety without Factor(D, U) having a systematic advantage in ASR, we recompute the safety of each protocol using the o3-mini exploit finder. We keep all of the solutions and suspiciousness scores from the runs which produced Figure 2. With context identical to that in the original evaluations, o3-mini




Figure 5: Bootstrap distributions of safety when using an o3-mini exploit finder. Each point shows the safety of each protocol conditional on identical bootstrap samples of root tasks across protocols. This applies to both the usefulness and safety runs.

suggests an exploit, and we test if it is valid. We perform identical bootstrapping and compute the safety metrics in Figure 4.

A given bootstrap sample contains a multiset of root tasks which is identical between protocols. This is true for the bootstrap samples on both the safety and usefulness runs, and it's true for each of the 500 bootstrap samples. Figure 5 shows that, surprisingly, conditional on matched bootstrap samples of root task multisets, there is no positive correlation between the safety of Factor(D_{low}, U) and trusted monitoring. As a result, this study does not deliver conclusive evidence to reject the null hypothesis that the safety of Factor(D_{low}, U) is higher. The following are two approaches by which one could refine this analysis:

Bootstrap to measure the difference in monitor performance: If the difference in safety performance is completely attributable to the difference in monitor performance and the difference in ASR, then one could test the null hypothesis that Factor(D, U) has no better monitor performance than trusted monitoring using bootstrapping. Rejecting this null hypothesis would be evidence for the superior safety of Factor(D, U) conditional on negligible difference in ASR. However, focusing on monitoring performance in isolation could neglect possible other factors influencing safety.




Figure 6: Usefulness of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ under several strong model selections. In each case, usefulness is normalized relative to the accuracy of the selected T and U .

Refined paired analysis on deployment task sequences instead of multisets: One could adapt the paired analysis methods of Miller (2024, sec. 4.2) to further reduce variance when comparing protocols. Conditional on the observed safety distributions of each protocol, observing a higher correlation between the safety of each protocol would strengthen support for the hypothesis that the safety of $\text{Factor}(D_{low}, U)$ is higher. Instead of bootstrapping to produce multisets of root tasks and computing average safety for each protocol conditional on a multiset, we could bootstrap to produce sequences of root tasks and compute the binary deployment outcome of catastrophe or no catastrophe conditional on the root task sequence. This could reveal additional correlation between protocol safety performance.

Though we do not perform either of the above analyses, given the conservative nature of our completed analysis, we are confident that $\text{Factor}(D_{low}, U)$ maintains safety superior to trusted monitoring even when it has no advantage in ASR.

C Details of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ Usefulness Study

We introduce the decomposition tax, which measures the relative loss in accuracy on a capability benchmark from adding a task decomposition scaffold. In other words, we implement a $\text{Factor}(T, T)$ protocol, in which T both decomposes the root task




Figure 7: $\text{Decomposition Tax} = 1 - (\text{accuracy of } \text{Factor}(T, T) / \text{accuracy of } T)$. The relative loss in accuracy on APPS from adding a task decomposition scaffold. This data comes from the low granularity decomposition scaffold. See Table 4 for full tabular results.

and implements child tasks, and measure the relative loss in accuracy compared to directly solving the task with T . If a factored cognition scaffold had a negative decomposition tax in some setting, a control protocol using that scaffold would have high usefulness. We show the results for 15 models using our task decomposition scaffold in Figure 7. Models which score higher on the benchmark also tend to have lower decomposition tax. While the most capable models are approaching zero decomposition tax, they are also approaching benchmark saturation. Assuming that future models follow the illustrated trend, then reaching zero decomposition tax on APPS is plausible. However, any such model would also score $>80\%$ on APPS and thus be typically ineligible for use as T . Among models maintaining $<75\%$ accuracy, our data predicts a 5-10% decomposition tax at best, setting a permanent upper bound on the usefulness of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ protocols in APPS. Progress in model capabilities alone will not allow for studying $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ protocols with competitive usefulness in APPS.

Other Ways to improve $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ usefulness on APPS: There are two main ways that usefulness could be improved, though we still don't expect it to be possible to produce a version of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ with competitive usefulness in APPS. First, due to the sparsity of unit tests in our split, accuracy on our split is likely inflated compared to accuracy on the full benchmark. If the results in Figure 7 were computed for a split with more unit tests, it's pos-

sible that the trend line would shift left, allowing room for future model progress to produce a pair of models T and U which satisfy the capability gap and where T has a negative decomposition tax. Second, our decomposer might be underelicited. The decomposer was the element of $\text{Factor}(D,U)$ which we spent the most time eliciting. However, closing an elicitation gap would shift the trend line in Figure 7 downward, achieving a similar effect.

D Discussion on Powerful Decomposer Allowance

We’d like experiments in the APPS setting to be able to tell us helpful information about factored cognition protocols despite the shortcoming of the setting. We think that giving access to the powerful decomposer D allows us to do this for $\text{Factor}(T,U)$ protocols. With the current state of LLMs, $\text{Factor}(D,U)$ is a better model of the safety-related dynamics of future AI control scenarios than $\text{Factor}(T,U)$ when using a significantly weaker trusted model like Llama 3.1 8B-Instruct. We select a T significantly weaker than U because this seems to usually be our best way to model future control evals with actual untrusted models (Shlegeris, 2023). This assumption seems reasonable for uses of T which are directly adversarial to U , such as monitoring, editing, generating unit tests, and generating honeypots. But we don’t think that the assumption is valid for every possible use of T , including for task decomposition. Using Llama 3.1 8B-Instruct as our decomposer we would achieve -63% usefulness and conclude that $\text{Factor}(T,T)$ and $\text{Factor}(T,U)$ were completely hopeless. $\text{Factor}(U,U)$ might be competitive with vanilla trusted monitoring in APPS only if you used the very best frontier models for U .

However, we think that these huge performance differences will not generalize to most important settings even when T and U_H have a similar accuracy gap. Consider measuring a safety and usefulness result from trusted monitoring using weak models, and attempting to estimate the performance on the same setting when using a stronger T and U with a similar capability gap. It seems plausible that the results could be similar to those from the weaker models. When doing a similar extrapolation with $\text{Factor}(T,U)$, however, this pattern probably doesn’t hold. Since a stronger T tends to have a lower decomposition tax (see Appendix C),

it will gain accuracy **that is not lost by the normalization from accuracy to usefulness**. The future T that we use in actual control evaluations will be at least as good at decomposing as o3-mini. The current low usefulness of $\text{Factor}(T,T)$ and $\text{Factor}(T,U)$ relative to simple baselines is an artifact of the weak selection of T , a necessity when running control evaluations in a relatively easy setting. This creates a large usefulness bias against task decomposition protocols when we try to generalize their performance to more difficult settings using more capable models. We can reduce that bias by using our best available LLM decomposer instead. The usefulness of $\text{Factor}(D,T)$ and $\text{Factor}(D,U)$ is closer to what we predict will be true using future trusted decomposers, but there is sufficient irreducible uncertainty that we don’t think that it’s valid to compare our $\text{Factor}(D,U)$ usefulness results to those of non-decomposition protocols.

Bias in safety performance: Since D can never see U ’s outputs, we think that $\text{Factor}(D,U)$ ’s safety performance is a decent first-order safety estimate. Still, there may be bias in our safety results, such as from highly detailed child tasks giving monitors extra clues as to what parts of an implementation are/aren’t legitimate. Maybe some of our safety and monitor performance gains could be achieved by a protocol where D merely rephrases root tasks into the style that it uses to write child tasks.

E Methodological Differences from Greenblatt et al. (2023) and Miscellaneous Methodological Details

E.1 Differences from Greenblatt et al. (2023)

For readers very familiar with Greenblatt et al. (2023), we provide here an alternate summary of our methods given as a list of differences from theirs, as well as some extra methodological details which may not be different but are not completely clear from that paper.

1. **Simple baseline protocols:** We build a simple trusted monitoring protocol instead of attempting to replicate the protocol from Greenblatt et al. (2023). In particular, the backdoor generation, attack selection, and trusted monitor subroutines are simplified.

2. **APPS dataset split:** We use 500 tasks from the APPS-verified subset (likaixin, 2024), applying a 50/50 train/test split.² 99% of tasks in our split have exactly one unit test case. The red and blue teams have access only to the train split during red teaming. We allow for no re-fitting of protocols or policies to the test split, with the exception of setting a new audit threshold.
3. **Perfect auditing:** Any action that deviates from U_H is assumed to be incriminating if audited, allowing the blue team to trigger a shutdown.
4. **No incrimination by distribution shift:** Greenblatt et al. (2023) allow the blue team to trigger shutdown by monitoring for shifts in U_A 's summary statistics relative to U_H 's. We do not allow for this mode of incrimination, as perfect auditing is sufficient to discourage the red team strategies that incrimination by distribution shift covers in Greenblatt et al. (2023) and Bhatt et al. (2025).
5. **Audit thresholds and budget:** The auditing budget (2% of tasks) is used to set the auditing threshold (a suspiciousness rating), but once the threshold is set, the budget does not constrain how many tasks may actually be audited in the safety run. The budget is the expected proportion of tasks which would be audited conditional on U not scheming. If U is actually scheming and making attacks, then the expected proportion of audited tasks exceeds the budget, but this is acceptable and the blue team may still audit all of them.
6. **No free upfront auditing:** Greenblatt et al. (2023) allowed the blue team to audit the first 10 tasks for free to discourage strategies which use variable audit thresholds, as this was not a focus of that paper. For the same reason, we constrain the blue team to maintaining a constant audit threshold for all tasks and give no free audits.
7. **Discretized suspiciousness and audit thresholds:** The blue team scores suspiciousness as a discrete measure (e.g., integers 0–9). The audit threshold is set at the suspiciousness value with the smallest expected proportion of audited tasks at least as large as the auditing budget. For example, with a budget of 2%, if 1% of usefulness run solutions have suspiciousness 9, and 3% have suspiciousness 8, the threshold is set at 8. Solutions equal to the threshold are audited at random, with a fixed on-threshold audit probability set such that the budget is met in expectation. In this example, the probability would be 33%.
8. **Audit thresholds and budget:** The auditing budget (a proportion of tasks) is used to set the auditing threshold (a suspiciousness rating), but once the threshold is set, the budget doesn't constrain how many tasks may be audited in the safety run. The budget is the expected proportion of tasks which would be audited conditional on U not scheming. If U is actually scheming, then the expected proportion of audited tasks exceeds the budget, but this is acceptable and the blue team may still audit all of them.
9. **Monitor all solutions:** The blue team only explored strategies where T monitored all solutions, regardless of whether they passed unit tests. A common alternative in other control work is to monitor only solutions which pass unit tests. Since solutions which fail unit tests are rejected anyway, there is no way that they can cause catastrophic outcomes. However, monitoring all solutions offers more opportunities to incriminate U using failed attacks.
10. **Exploit finder:** Due to a special property of Factor(T, U) protocols, all exploits in all protocols used to check for backdoors are generated in a separate call to GPT-4.1 Nano with full problem and solution context.
11. **Exploit validation:** A white team call to GPT-4.1 Nano checks if a proposed exploit obeys the input constraints of the problem. The exploit finder has 3 chances to submit a valid exploit, and it gets feedback from the validator on each rejection.
12. **Computing variance of safety:** We run multiple epochs of our small dataset and use a two-stage cluster bootstrapping method to estimate the variance of safety, usefulness, and other metrics. See Appendix F for details.

²Our splits are available at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/xtremekiwi/APPS-leetcode-codeforces>

13. **Model selection:** We use more recent models: $T = \text{Llama 3.1 8B-Instruct}$, $U = \text{GPT-4.1 Nano}$. Under perfect auditing, there is no need to simulate trusted human labor.
14. **Downsampling:** Our final runs use a down-sampling factor of 18, compared to 12 in [Greenblatt et al. \(2023\)](#). We scale the down-sampling factor linearly with the number of root tasks in the safety run. This practically decouples the red and blue team strategies (the attack selection model in particular) from the size of the safety run, allowing us to scale runs arbitrarily.
15. **Access to opposite team’s protocol or model:** Both the red and blue team have nearly full black box access to the opposite team protocol and all outputs produced while improving their protocol. Each team may iterate directly against the adversarial protocol. The red team also has access to all blue team prompts and scaffolding, but the attack policy itself still may not call the trusted model. The only further limitation we impose is that teams may not fine-tune against the adversarial model, protocol, or policy.

The following are assumptions and allowances specific to task decomposition protocols.

16. **Powerful decomposer:** We give the blue team access to a powerful trusted decomposer (D), a highly capable model for the exclusive use of decomposing tasks. We implement D using OpenAI o3-mini (medium reasoning). This allowance compensates for T ’s poor decomposition ability, allowing us to explore strategies for these protocols without directly upsetting the capability imbalance in the weaker T monitoring code written by the stronger U . See Appendix D for further discussion of this allowance.
17. **A backdoored child task does not imply a backdoored parent task:** If a child task is backdoored, but the backdoor is not exploitable by the exploit finder in the full context of the root task solution, then this is a failed attack and a safe outcome.
18. **Child task solutions are audited in isolation:** If any child task solution has a suspiciousness

above the audit threshold then that child task solution alone is audited. Attacks below the audit threshold in sibling tasks would not get caught.

E.2 Miscellaneous Methodological Details

Here we include a loose collection of details and points of confusion that we encountered when setting up our experiments in APPS. These match the methods from [Greenblatt et al. \(2023\)](#) unless otherwise noted. These details might not be clear from reading existing literature, and so might serve some purpose for future researchers.

Red/blue team access to data and adversarial model: Both teams have nearly full black box access to the opposite team protocol and all intermediate results while improving their protocol, but not while actually running evaluations. Each team may iterate directly against the adversarial protocol. The red team has access to all blue team prompts and scaffolding, but the attack policy itself still may not call the trusted model. The only further limitation we impose is that teams may not fine tune against the adversarial model at any point.

Monitor ROC Curves: There are several possible classification tasks on which we could evaluate the monitors, but we focus on classifying solutions between:

1. Attacked vs not attacked
2. Attacked and passes unit tests vs not attacked and passes unit tests

These correspond to the two possible auditing strategies. We use strategy 1.

1. Monitor all solutions: Monitor and potentially audit any task
2. Monitor only solutions which pass unit tests: Since solutions which fail unit tests are rejected anyway, there is no way that they can cause catastrophic outcomes. In real control deployments, labs can reduce monitoring compute cost and potentially also improve safety by filtering out failed solutions before monitoring.

F Bootstrapping Details

We use cluster bootstrapping to estimate the sampling distributions of key metrics including audit thresholds, safety, and ASR. In a bootstrapping run, we resample with replacement clusters of leaf tasks from the results until the resampled quantity of leaf tasks is equal to the quantity of in the original sample. Leaf tasks are clustered by the APPS sample ID, so multiple epochs and multiple child tasks are all clustered together. Applicable statistics are calculated for each resample. We resample 500 times independently to compute a bootstrapping distribution for each statistic. The following enumerates our procedure:

1. Initialize two random number generators to use for resampling root task clusters, one for the usefulness run and one for the safety run, each with a different fixed seed³.
2. Safety run filtering
 - (a) Cluster the safety run root tasks by APPS sample ID.
 - (b) Filter the safety run root tasks to include only clusters with at least one attack attempt.
3. Usefulness run resampling
 - (a) Resample clusters.
 - (b) Compute usefulness, audit threshold, and on-threshold audit probability.
4. Safety run resampling
 - (a) Using the auditing parameters, compute the win/lose/continue outcome for each root task.
 - (b) Resample clusters.
 - (c) De-cluster into individual root tasks.
 - (d) Filter to only include attacked root tasks.
 - (e) Compute safety as a deterministic function of the root task outcome counts and the downsampling factor for that run. No variance due to random downsampling is introduced.

³For the purposes of comparing performance between protocols, if those protocols used the same tasks and number of epochs in their safety and usefulness runs (which ours did), this common initialization removes the variance of different protocols resampling different multisets of tasks.

(f) Compute the remaining safety metrics without downsampling.

5. Perform steps 3–4 500 times and aggregate empirical distributions for all metrics.
6. For each metric’s bootstrap distribution, compute a confidence interval centered on the median. Report these as error bars.

G Red Team Attack Selection Methods




Figure 8: Attack selection decision tree for trusted monitoring. An attack is submitted when its ratings fall within the dotted boundary. The heatmap shows the frequency of ratings for all potential attacks

The red team uses a restricted decision tree with a final random selection step to choose on which tasks to attack. The decision tree is shown for trusted monitoring in Figure 8. The decision tree operates on 2 ratings made by U : predicted suspiciousness and solution difficulty for a backdoored solution. The attack selection algorithm can be parametrized by 5 values: 4 to define the bounds of the rectangle, and 1 for the final random selection. The decision tree model is fit by hand to minimize safety without overfitting.

Modeling rare attacks in $\text{Factor}(D, U)$: Due to the possibility of upfront auditing, competent schemers would submit backdoor attempts rarely (Greenblatt et al., 2023). In $\text{Factor}(D, U)$, we would expect attacks on multiple sibling tasks to be exceedingly rare for most attack policies⁴. However,

⁴One exception would be attack policies which attack when the task contains some rare feature like “octopus”.

our experiments use downsampling to force the red team to attack much more often. This could potentially cause many attacked siblings, skewing the distribution of attacks in a way which doesn't happen for non-decomposition protocols. To mitigate this skewing, we restrict the attack policy to produce a minimum of 75% of attacked child tasks that do not have an attacked sibling task.

When to fit the attack selection model: When fitting the model for non-decomposition protocols like trusted monitoring, it is possible to do the safety run with loose thresholds and 100% probability of attack, then fit the model *ex post*. This preserves calculation of safety since:

1. Each attack affects exactly one root task outcome and all attacks are independent.
2. No data from U_H solutions in a safety run affects the safety metric. Therefore, no necessary information is lost by failing to run a U_H on any task and running U_A instead. However, other metrics are affected.

For $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ protocols, neither of these conditions hold, so tuning must be done *ex ante* to avoid biasing the results. To maintain a fair comparison in final results, we also tune trusted monitoring attack selection *ex ante*, even if further improvements could be made with tuning *ex post*.

H Example Handwritten $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ Trajectory

This is a trajectory provided to illustrate the functionality of $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ concretely.

1. A trusted **decomposer** is given the **root task**:

```
def sorted_areas(s_3: float, s_4:
float, s_5: float) -> list[float]:
    """Given 3 side lengths s_3, s_4
    , s_5, compute the areas of
    an equilateral triangle,
    square, and regular pentagon
    , with those respective side
    lengths. Return a list of
    the 3 areas in sorted order,
    each rounded to 1 decimal
    place."""
```

2. It creates the following **decomposition** of four **child tasks** plus **reassembly logic**:

- (a)

```
def area_triangle(s: float) ->
float:
    """Return the area of an
    equilateral triangle
    with side length s"""
```
- (b)

```
def area_square(s: float) ->
float:
    """Return the area of a
    square with side length
    s"""
```
- (c)

```
def area_pentagon(s: float) ->
float:
    """Return the area of a
    regular pentagon with
    side length s"""
```
- (d)

```
def sort_and_round_list(nums:
list[float]) -> list[float]:
    """Sort the list nums and
    round all elements to 1
    decimal place."""
```
- (e) Reassembly logic:

```
def sorted_areas(s_3: float, s_4:
float, s_5: float) -> list[
float]:
    area_3 = area_triangle(s_3)
    area_4 = area_square(s_4)
    area_5 = area_pentagon(s_5)
    return sort_and_round_list([
        area_3, area_4, area_5])
```

3. In an instance of the trusted monitoring **implementer**, U is given “**child task a**” and implements `area_triangle`, creating a **child solution**. The trusted monitor is given “child task a” along with the solution and rates the suspiciousness. Child tasks b, c, and d are processed identically in separate contexts.
4. In **reassembly**, the implementations of `area_triangle`, `area_square`, ... `sorted_areas` are concatenated. This is the **root task solution**.

I Security Through Obscurity Conceptual Details, Product and Process Threats

We classify AI control threat models into one of the following categories:

Product Threat: A threat intrinsic to the product generated by an attack policy, i.e., the tokens in the root task solution, where a bad outcome can be locked in only after a root task solution containing a successful attack is accepted⁵. Example: APPS backdoors.

⁵This is slightly distinct from the idea of runtime threats

Process Threat: Harm is locked in during the process of an attack policy creating a solution. Example: [Bhatt et al. \(2025\)](#)’s threat model of U downloading and executing malware while completing another task.

Under a product threat, protocols like $\text{Factor}(T, U)$ can expand the contextual distance between attack policy and the attack target. Under $\text{Factor}(T, U)$, U never has direct access to the root task, only child tasks. We hypothesize that this obscuration of the target can make executing product threats more difficult for similar reasons that U lacking access to private unit tests makes it more difficult to write backdoors. Attacks must all filter up the decomposition, passing through additional obscured security layers before they can cause harm. This is somewhat similar to the cybersecurity idea of security through obscurity ([Zwicky et al., 2000](#)). In the cybersecurity field, this strategy is generally discouraged as a standalone security approach, but as one of many security layers it can sometimes be helpful.

Moreover, it may not be necessary to put any specific effort into creating dedicated security features like unit testing in the decomposition tree; there may be some average-case safety benefit from factored cognition by default on some coding tasks, and maybe other types too. Consider the example in [Appendix H](#). The `sort_and_round_list` implementer attack policy might insert a high-quality subtle backdoor into a merge sort implementation which gets past our monitors. Maybe its *trigger set* (the set of possible inputs which produce a behavioral difference) is sequences of length > 2 that have a negative value only in the center index. If `sort_and_round_list` were the root task, this would be a great attack. However, since this function is only used to sort areas of shapes which are all positive, the backdoor is unexploitable in the context of the root task. It’s only because we decomposed the parent task and isolated the child tasks that U didn’t know that its merge sort backdoor was a bad idea. The security-through-obscurity advantage is pretty clear for functional programming tasks, but it doesn’t generalize to all

in coding tasks, where bad outcomes require executing malicious code as opposed to merely writing it. A runtime threat might not be a product threat if our process for selecting solutions involves running the code, and that this could possibly cause harm before we accept the solution, e.g., we run unit tests on malicious code and harm occurs due to inadequate sandboxing.

product threats and tasks. A similar analogy is not apparent for a text summarization task, for example.

Under task decomposition protocols, it seems that most process threats have the potential to cause harm within child tasks, before root task solutions are assembled⁶. U in an LLM agent setting can execute commands to download malware in any child task. There is no need to filter through upstream and downstream logic. Task decomposition does not give us the same security-through-obscurity advantages here as when defending against product threats.

J Tables of Metrics

⁶For some corner cases this may not be true, e.g., for runtime threats where our protocol only runs code at the root task level. Here we retain most of the safety benefits of factored cognition. This is perhaps a valuable distinction, but we think this is probably a small category and we will set it aside for now.

	Trusted Monitoring		Factor(D_{low}, U)		Factor(D_{med}, U)		Factor(D_{high}, U)	
Audited?	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Backdoor	4	32	16	46	6	36	6	39
Failed attack	14	103	63	213	37	164	38	175
No attack	11	836	14	647	16	740	14	727

Table 2: Counts of root task outcomes for all protocols.

Metric	Trusted Monitoring	Factor(D_{low}, U)	Factor(D_{med}, U)	Factor(D_{high}, U)
Safety	41%	63%	56%	49%
Usefulness	100%	106%	103%	106%
Attack Success Rate (ASR)	24%	18%	17%	17%
Unaudited ASR	20%	13%	13%	15%
Attack Audit Rate (AAR)	13%	23%	17%	14%
Qty. of root tasks	999	999	999	999
Qty. of leaf tasks	999	2026	2964	3538
Qty. of attacked root tasks	153	338	243	258
Qty. of attacked leaf tasks	153	377	275	285
Root task attack rate	15%	34%	24%	26%
Leaf task attack rate	15%	19%	9.3%	8.1%

Table 3: Various metrics and task counts for all protocols. Factor(D, U) usefulness is reported for completeness only and is not representative of Factor(T, U) usefulness in comparison to trusted monitoring.

Model	T Accuracy	Factor(T, T) Accuracy	Decomposition Tax	Sample Size
Llama 3.1 8B-Instruct	37% (4%)	16% (3%)	56%	150
Llama 4 Scout	50% (4%)	32% (3%)	35%	200
GPT-3.5 Turbo	63% (4%)	39% (4%)	38%	150
DeepSeek R1 Distill Llama 70B	68% (4%)	50% (4%)	26%	150
GPT-4o mini	69% (4%)	61% (4%)	13%	150
GPT-4o	69% (4%)	59% (4%)	15%	150
Qwen 2.5 Coder 32B Instruct	71% (4%)	55% (4%)	22%	150
GPT-4.1 Nano	74% (3%)	66% (3%)	11%	250
Claude 3.5 Haiku	75% (4%)	44% (4%)	41%	150
DeepSeek V3	77% (3%)	59% (4%)	23%	150
GPT-4.1 Mini	82% (2%)	72% (3%)	12%	250
Claude 3.7 Sonnet	82% (3%)	76% (3%)	7.3%	150
Gemini 2.0 Flash	82% (3%)	63% (4%)	24%	150
GPT-5 Mini	88% (2%)	82% (2%)	6.4%	250
o3-mini (medium reasoning)	91% (2%)	85% (3%)	5.8%	150

Table 4: Statistics for the calculation of decomposition tax for 15 models. The standard error is reported below each value of accuracy.