

LLM Workflow Audit

Phil Stevens
philipstevens.github.io

Define the production bar: failure modes, acceptance criteria, and an eval plan you can implement.

SCOPE	One LLM workflow end-to-end (prompting/routing, RAG/tools if present, output constraints, and operational controls).
PRIMARY OUTPUT	Contracts + gates + failure-mode coverage + eval plan + ops plan (ready to implement).

Best Fit

- You need clear ship/no-ship criteria and realistic acceptance thresholds.
- You have a workflow that works sometimes, but behavior is inconsistent or unmeasured.
- You want a concrete eval and hardening plan before investing in implementation.

Inputs Required

INPUT	MINIMUM	WHY IT MATTERS
Workflow walkthrough	Prompts/routing and where it runs (repo access or walkthrough)	Accurate diagnosis; practical fixes; correct trace/version requirements.
Representative examples	30–100 inputs (+ current outputs if available)	Realistic eval coverage; must-pass selection; edge cases.
Access to current implementation	Endpoint or repo to invoke/inspect the workflow	Enables reproducible runs and accurate failure-mode mapping.
Stakeholder constraints	Output consumer, required format, compliance/policy rules	Correct output contract, validation strategy, and refusal/escalation behavior.

Data handling: least-privilege access; redact sensitive fields in shared artifacts; keep examples minimal and relevant.

How the Work Runs

STEP	WHAT HAPPENS
1. Scope + risk tier	Define workflow boundaries, unacceptable failures, and allowed uncertainty (refuse / escalate / partial).
2. System teardown	Map prompting, routing, RAG/tool use, validators, and where failures can occur.
3. Failure modes	Enumerate failures, severities, detection methods, and mitigations tied to the workflow.
4. Eval design	Define test categories, must-pass set selection rules, and measurable gates.
5. Operability design	Define trace fields, versioning scheme, monitoring signals, rollout and rollback triggers.
6. Readout	Prioritize fixes, estimate effort, and hand off to Build & Harden.

Common failure patterns I look for

- Silent partial failures (plausible but incomplete outputs)
- Over-broad refusals masking missing grounding
- Eval metrics that don't correlate with user pain
- Latency/cost failures that only appear at p95+

Deliverables

ARTIFACT	PURPOSE
Workflow contract (input/output schemas, grounding mode, tool policy)	Defines what valid requests and responses look like
Failure-mode matrix	Maps failures by severity, detection method, and mitigation so nothing ships without a plan to catch it
Eval plan with gate thresholds	Specifies test categories, must-pass rules, and acceptance criteria so ship decisions are evidence-based
Ops plan (trace fields, monitoring signals, rollback triggers)	Defines what gets logged and when to act so incidents are diagnosable without guesswork
Ship/no-ship recommendation	Evidence-backed decision with rationale and next steps
Prioritized hardening roadmap	Sequenced fixes ready for Build & Harden

Definition of Done

- Workflow spec documents all agreed success criteria and known failure modes, with no ambiguous edge cases.
- Eval plan covers all identified critical failure modes with measurable acceptance thresholds.
- Prioritized hardening roadmap with sequenced fixes and clear ownership.
- Ship/no-ship recommendation is evidence-backed with documented rationale and actionable next steps.

Boundaries

- Implementing the harness, CI gates, or production rollout (covered in Build & Harden / Retainer).
- Large-scale labeling programs or broad multi-workflow platform work (can be separately scoped).

Next Step

Share one workflow and 30–100 representative examples to start. If examples are sensitive, start with synthetic or redacted cases and iterate.

Book an intro call:

calendly.com/philipstevens4/intro

Email: philipstevens4@gmail.com

Web: philipstevens.github.io

Not ready? Get the free [Production Readiness Checklist](#) to self-assess first.



Scan to book a call

