

---

# SoK: TRUST-AUTHORIZATION MISMATCH IN LLM AGENT INTERACTIONS

---

**Guanquan Shi**  
shiguanquan@buaa.edu.cn

**Haohua Du\***  
duhaohua@buaa.edu.cn

**Zhiqiang Wang**  
sa21221041@mail.ustc.edu.cn

**Xiaoyu Liang**  
xiaoyuliang@buaa.edu.cn

**Weiwenpei Liu**  
liuweiwenpei@buaa.edu.cn

**Song Bian**  
sbian@buaa.edu.cn

**Zhenyu Guan**  
guanzhenyu@buaa.edu.cn

## ABSTRACT

Large Language Models (LLMs) are rapidly evolving into autonomous agents capable of interacting with the external world, significantly expanding their capabilities through standardized interaction protocols. However, this paradigm revives the classic cybersecurity challenges of agency and authorization in a novel and volatile context. As decision-making shifts from deterministic code logic to probabilistic inference driven by natural language, traditional security mechanisms designed for deterministic behavior fail. It is fundamentally challenging to establish trust for unpredictable AI agents and to enforce the Principle of Least Privilege (PoLP) when instructions are ambiguous. Despite the escalating threat landscape, the academic community’s understanding of this emerging domain remains fragmented, lacking a systematic framework to analyze its root causes. This paper provides a unifying formal lens for agent-interaction security.

We observed that most security threats in this domain stem from a fundamental mismatch between trust evaluation and authorization policies. We introduce a novel risk analysis model centered on this trust-authorization gap. Using this model as a unifying lens, we survey and classify the implementation paths of existing, often seemingly isolated, attacks and defenses. This new framework not only unifies the field but also allows us to identify critical research gaps. Finally, we leverage our analysis to suggest a systematic research direction toward building robust, trusted agents and dynamic authorization mechanisms.

**Keywords** AI agent · trustworthiness · security

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) [1] are transitioning from passive query responders to *agents* that plan, call tools, and act through standardized interaction protocols [2, 3]. This shift transfers operational authority from deterministic, human-authored code to probabilistic, language-driven decision makers. As illustrated in Fig.1, this architectural evolution exposes a tension between two traditions: “fortress” security grounded in authorization and control [4], and “brain”-centric trustworthiness grounded in alignment and behavior [5]. Neither paradigm alone suffices once agents are given capabilities that reach outside the model boundary [6].

This Systematization of Knowledge (SoK) aims to bridge systems security and AI alignment in the specific context of *LLM agent interactions*. Rather than offering another descriptive survey of attacks and defenses [7, 8, 9], we argue that a significant fraction of observed failures can be *explained and organized* by a single, testable lens: many incidents arise from a *mismatch between how trust is established and how authorization is granted*. We refer to this as a




Figure 1: The Comparison of the Traditional Security Model and AI Trustworthy Model.

*Trust–Authorization Mismatch.* Our goal is not to claim a singular “root cause,” but to evaluate the explanatory power and limits of this unifying perspective and to make it operational for design and verification.

At a high level, the mismatch appears in two recurring manifestations:

- **Agent as Attack Surface: Improper Trust.** Agents conflate or mis-handle sources and semantics on a single textual channel: instructions, tool outputs, and inter-agent messages can be manipulated to corrupt belief formation (e.g., prompt/indirect injection, tool/metadata poisoning).
- **Agent as Attack Vector: Improper Authorization.** Agents are often over-privileged for utility, operate under ambiguous intent, and execute actions under consolidated identities, which together create gaps between what is permitted and what was actually intended or auditable (e.g., PoLP contradictions, auditability collapse).

To move from metaphor to machinery, we *formalize* agent interaction with the **B-I-P (Belief-Intention-Permission) Security Model** (details in Sec. 3.1) and use it to define (i) a *Trust–Authorization Matrix* that locates system states by trust (epistemic/provenance) and authorization risk, and (ii) a *Mismatch Process* that models multi-stage failures from belief corruption to failure-inducing action. These constructs form the analytic substrate for our SoK and are introduced in Sec. 3 (as shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5).

**Scope and Threat Model (brief).** We study *runtime interaction security* for agentic systems—how agents perceive, decide, and act via protocols such as MCP [10]/A2A [11]—and exclude training-time data poisoning and model theft unless they directly mediate runtime decisions. We assume adversaries may control or influence user prompts, external content (web pages, APIs, remote agents), protocol metadata (tool descriptors/agent cards), or local resources the agent relies on. We focus on confidentiality, integrity, availability, and accountability impacts arising from the  $B \rightarrow I \rightarrow P \rightarrow A$  chain. (A fuller scope statement follows in Sec. 2)

**Why SoK (and not only a survey)?** Taxonomies of “prompt injection” or “tool poisoning” catalog *what* goes wrong but do not explain *why* these failures generalize across modalities, protocols, and ecosystems. By grounding the field in B–I–P and the Trust–Authorization lens, we (1) provide a common vocabulary that connects attacks and defenses to *where* the chain must be broken, (2) enable principled comparison of seemingly disparate proposals, and (3) highlight *testable invariants*, such as “low-trust beliefs must not drive high-risk permissions”).

### Our Contributions.

- *Unifying formal lens.* We develop the B–I–P model and the Trust–Authorization Matrix/Process, turning anecdotal failures into states and transitions amenable to reasoning and verification. We use this lens to re-map known attacks and defenses to explicit *breakpoints* along the mismatch chain (Sections 3 to 5; cf. Figures 4 to 5).
- *Systematized corpus and coding scheme.* We assemble a cross-community corpus spanning systems venues, AI venues, and grey literature; we code each artifact by victim component, stage coverage, and evaluation setting, enabling apples-to-apples comparison.

- *Defense landscape as chain-breaking design.* We reframe defenses by *which link* they sever (Stage 1–4), exposing assumptions, failure modes, and design obligations (e.g., belief-aware authorization and taint-to-policy enforcement) for deployable systems (Sec. 5).
- *Research agenda with verifiable control points.* We identify open problems where authorization remains belief-blind and propose directions such as belief-aware ABAC/TBAC, intent provenance across agents, and auditable security logs that link *B*, *I*, and *P* to post-hoc accountability (Sec. 6).

**Paper Organization.** Sec. 2 provides background, terminology, and our methodology/scope. Sec. 3 introduces the B–I–P model and the Trust–Authorization Matrix/Process. Sec. 4 systematizes attacks via this lens; Sec. 5 systematizes defenses as *chain-breaking* mechanisms; Sec. 6 outlines opportunities and open challenges; Sec. 7 concludes.

## 2 Overview

Table 1: Taxonomy of existing research on threats targeting LLMs and agents. ○ denotes those that do not involve the stages defined in Section 3.3, whereas ● represents those that affect the corresponding stages.

Victim Component	Ref.	Year	Venue	Analysis	Category	Model	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
User Query	[9]	2024	ACL	LLMs	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Llama-2-7B-Chat	●	○	●
	[7]	2025	arXiv	LLMs	Evaluation	GPT-4, Claude 3, Mistral 7B, Vicuna-13B	●	○	●
	[12]	2024	arXiv	LLMs	Evaluation	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Claude-2, Llama-2-Chat, Vicuna-13B	●	○	●
	[13]	2024	arXiv	LLMs	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Vicuna-13B, PaLM-2	●	○	●
	[14]	2023	arXiv	LLMs	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Claude-2, Llama-2-7B, Vicuna-13B	●	○	●
	[15]	2023	arXiv	LLMs	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Vicuna-13B, Llama-2-Chat	●	○	●
System Prompt	[16]	2024	KDD	Agents	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4	●	○	●
	[17]	2023	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Vicuna-13B	●	○	●
	[18]	2024	arXiv	LLMs	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Llama-2-Chat	●	○	●
	[19]	2024	AAAI	LLMs	Analysis	GPT-4	●	○	○
	[20]	2024	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Claude-2	●	○	●
Tool Returns	[21]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, Claude-3, Llama-3-70B	●	○	●
	[22]	2025	Invariantlabs	Agents	Incident	GPT-4	○	●	●
	[23]	2024	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Claude-2	○	●	●
	[24]	2024	arXiv	Agents	Benchmark	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Llama-2-Chat	○	●	●
	[25]	2024	NIPS	Agents	Evaluation	GPT-4, Claude-3, Gemini-Pro	○	●	●
	[26]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, Claude-3	○	●	●
	[27]	2025	USENIX	Agents	Detection	GPT-4, GPT-3.5, Llama-3-70B	○	●	●
	[28]	2025	ACM	LLMs	Survey	Not applicable	○	●	○
	[29]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, Claude-3, Llama-2-Chat	○	●	●
	[30]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, GPT-3.5, Llama-3-70B	○	●	●
Agent Returns	[31]	2024	arXiv	Agents	Simulation	GPT-4, GPT-3.5	○	●	○
	[32]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Analysis	GPT-4, Llama-2-13B	○	●	○
	[33]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Debugging	GPT-4, GPT-3.5, Llama-3-70B	○	●	○
	[34]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Analysis	Not specified	○	●	○
Local Resource	[35]	2025	JILSA	Agents	Guideline	Not specified	○	●	○
	[36]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Framework	Not specified	○	●	○
	[37]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Defense	Not specified	○	●	○
Tool Metadata	[38]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, Claude-3, Gemini-1.5	●	○	●
	[39]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, GPT-3.5, Llama-3-70B	●	○	●
	[40]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Benchmark	GPT-4, Claude-3, Mistral-7B	●	○	●
	[41]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, Llama-3-70B, Claude-3	●	○	●
	[42]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, Claude-3, Gemini-1.5	●	○	●
	[43]	2025	NAACL	Agents	Attack	GPT-4, GPT-3.5, Claude-3	●	○	●
Agent Interaction	[44]	2025	arXiv	Agents	Framework	GPT-4	●	○	○

This section details our methodology and background. Sec. 2.1 defines our scope “agent interaction security” and the reproducible, PRISMA-style pipeline for corpus construction and coding. Sec. 2.3 summarizes background on agent primitives, standardized interaction protocols, multi-agent systems, and the collision of traditional cybersecurity and trustworthy AI.

### 2.1 Methodology and Scope

**Scope.** We study *runtime interaction security* of LLM-based agents: how agents perceive, decide, and act via protocols (e.g., MCP/A2A), tools/APIs, and local resources. Training-time poisoning/model theft are out of scope unless they directly mediate runtime decisions. By default, we assume adversaries may control user prompts, external content, protocol metadata, or local resources.

**Strategy in brief.** To ensure breadth across systems-security and AI/ML venues and depth on agent-tool protocols, we adopt a two-pronged SoK strategy:

- *cross-community retrieval* over major libraries (IEEE Xplore, ACM DL, USENIX, ACL Anthology) plus arXiv/Scholar for grey literature;
- *B-I-P-aligned coding* that maps each artifact to the victim component, the mismatch stage (1 to 3), the evaluation setting, and the evidence level.

This yields a corpus adequate to evaluate claims under the Trust–Authorization lens introduced in Sec. 3. Full search strings, inclusion/exclusion criteria, de-duplication rules, and the PRISMA-style flowchart are presented in Appendix A. The machine-readable corpus and labeling codebook are provided as anonymized artifacts.

**Completeness and reproducibility.** We report the retrieval window, venues, and counts in Appendix A. We retrieved 279 records in total, among which automated and manual similarity-based analysis identified approximately 68 items as topically overlapping, yielding 211 unique items after de-duplication. From these, we included 104 papers in the final corpus.

To ensure transparency and support the reproducibility of our systematization, we have made our complete dataset and artifacts publicly available at an anonymous repository. This dataset includes (1) a comprehensive CSV file containing the raw bibliographic information and extracted metadata for all literature reviewed in this work, and (2) the access links to the literature. This material is provided to facilitate the review process and enable future research. The artifacts can be accessed at: <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Paper-76DE/>

**Threats to validity.** *Venue bias* (GL first-appearance) is mitigated via GL tagging and sensitivity analyses; *temporal drift* via timestamped retrieval and archived URLs; *selection bias* via forward/backward snowballing. Full details and statistics are in Appendix A.

## 2.2 Overview of Agent

We adopt a minimal agent vocabulary consistent with our later formalization: an *agent* maintains internal state, perceives its environment through inputs and tool/agent returns, forms *intentions* to act, and issues actions that are either *permitted* or denied by the host system [45]. In intent-driven workflows, users express goals in natural language; the agent decomposes goals into subtasks, invokes external capabilities (tools/APIs/agents) [46], and integrates results into a coherent response. This operational loop—from *belief* (about the world) to *intention* (plans) to *permission* (what the system allows) to *action*—is the substrate for our mismatch analysis in Sec. 3.




Figure 2: MCP protocol and A2A protocol workflow.

**Interaction Protocols (MCP/A2A) and Boundaries.** Standardized protocols provide the communication fabric for agent ecosystems. An interaction typically proceeds in three stages (cf. Fig.2):

1. **Capability discovery.** Agents advertise or retrieve metadata describing callable functions and constraints (e.g., MCP tool descriptors; A2A agent cards). This establishes *provenance* and delineates *authorization boundaries*.




Figure 3: MAS Coordination Strategies.

2. **Invocation and execution.** The initiator supplies parameters and context; calls may nest or cascade to downstream tools/agents. Transports (JSON-RPC, HTTP, etc.) preserve call–return semantics.
3. **Result propagation.** Targets return structured outputs (Results/Messages/Artifacts) synchronously or asynchronously; these outputs update the agent’s belief state and may trigger further planning.

**Trust/permission boundaries and instrumentation points.** To make protocols actionable for security engineering, we annotate the sequence with: (i) *source labeling* and *integrity tags* at ingress (where sanitizers and anomaly detectors operate), (ii) *belief attribution* at the planner (for quarantine/taint propagation), (iii) *policy guards* at permission checks (static/dynamic authorization, belief-aware ABAC/TBAC), and (iv) *secure logging* at each transition (for auditability and post-hoc reconstruction). These are the concrete *chain-breaking* control points revisited in Sec. 5.

**Multi-Agent Systems (MAS).** Multi-agent systems [47] coordinate peers or hierarchies to achieve complex objectives (Fig. 3). Joint modes share state and coordinate as equals; hierarchical modes decompose tasks to sub-agents and aggregate results. MAS improves coverage and specialization but amplifies *propagation risk*: faulty or adversarial returns can cascade across agents, increasing the need for provenance, isolation, and belief-aware authorization.

### 2.3 Overview of Models in Cybersecurity and AI

**Traditional Cybersecurity Model.** Traditional security draws on the CIA triad, TCB minimization, and the Principle of Least Privilege (PoLP) [48]. Historically, *authorization* was often treated as a proxy for *trust*: once authenticated and authorized, entities were expected to behave predictably inside the perimeter. Agentic settings violate this assumption: adaptive reasoning and tool-driven actions mean that what an entity is *allowed* to do may diverge from what it *should* do, creating a gap our SoK makes explicit.

**Trustworthy AI Model.** Trustworthy AI emphasizes alignment, safety, and robustness (e.g., reducing hallucinations and harmful behavior) [49]. These efforts largely address *behavioral trust* within a single model. When aligned models become agents that call tools and delegate, the tension with system-level authorization becomes salient: behavior may be “aligned” yet still produce unsafe *actions* under ambiguous goals and over-broad permissions. This motivates our unifying lens in Sec. 3, where beliefs, intentions, and permissions are explicitly reasoned about.

## 3 B-I-P Model and the Trust-Authorization

This section moves from intuition to a formal and *operational* foundation. We first define a belief–intention–permission (B–I–P) security model in a multi-modal setting and *make beliefs and intentions observable* via explicit metadata and logging constraints (Sec. 3.1). We then revise the *Trust–Authorization Matrix* like Fig. 4 to separate epistemic soundness from provenance assurance and to connect coordinates to policy decisions (Sec. 3.2). Finally, we formalize the *Mismatch Process* as in Fig. 5 with chain-breaking invariants that will ground the defense systematization in Sec. 5.

### 3.1 B-I-P Security Model

**State and dynamics.** We model an agentic system as an instrumented labeled transition system:

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle S, E, \Rightarrow, P, V \rangle,$$

where  $S$  denotes the set of system states;

$E$  is events  $\{\text{recv}(p), \text{plan}(\xi), \text{permit}(\alpha), \text{exec}(\alpha), \text{log}(\mu)\}$ ;  $\Rightarrow \subseteq S \times E \times S$  is the transition relation capturing state

evolution under event execution;

$P : S \times Act \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$  specifies the permission policy that determines whether an action is authorized in a given state;  $V$  is a valuation function interpreting relevant state properties.

A *run* is a finite trace  $s_0 \Rightarrow e_1 s_1 \cdots \Rightarrow e_n s_n$ . This trace semantics makes beliefs and intentions auditable, matching the Trust–Authorization Matrix and Mismatch Process (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5).

**Attribution domains for observability.** To avoid purely intensional operators, we attach observable metadata:

- **Belief labels.** Each belief carries a label  $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\text{src}} \times \Lambda_{\text{int}} \times \Lambda_{\text{age}} \times \Lambda_{\text{path}}$ .
- **Intent tuples.** An intention is represented as  $\xi = \langle \alpha, \text{args}, \text{tgt}, \text{just} \rangle$  with *machine-parsable* justification  $\text{just.uses} = \{(\varphi_k, \lambda_k)\}$ , where  $\varphi$  is a proposition.

**Logical language.** We use modal operators enriched with observables:

1. Belief:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, s &\models B_i(\varphi \mid \lambda) \\ \text{iff } \forall s'. (s, s') \in B_i &\Rightarrow (\mathcal{M}, s' \models \varphi \wedge \lambda \text{ attached}); \end{aligned}$$

2. Intention:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, s &\models I_i(\xi) \\ \text{“agent } A_i \text{ intends } \xi = \langle \alpha, \text{args}, \text{tgt}, \text{just} \rangle \text{”}; \end{aligned}$$

3. Permission:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, s &\models \text{Perm}(\alpha) \\ \text{iff } P(s, \alpha) &= \text{True}; \end{aligned}$$

4. Action:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, s &\models [\alpha]\varphi \\ \text{iff } \forall s'. (s, s') \in R_\alpha &\Rightarrow \mathcal{M}, s' \models \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

**Instrumentation constraints (auditable B and I).** We require two observability obligations (enforced by the runtime and used by the policy):

- **Belief attribution (O1).** Every ingress event  $\text{recv}(p)$  emits a label; labels propagate through  $\text{plan}(\cdot)$  and remain queryable.
- **Intent provenance (O2).** Every  $\text{plan}(\xi)$  includes a non-empty  $\text{just.uses}$ ; missing/unverifiable entries are treated as **LOW** trust by default.

These constraints make the model *operational*: Stage 3 policies in Sec. 3.3 can read labels and justifications to decide  $\text{Permission}(s, \alpha)$ .

### 3.2 The Trust-Authorization Matrix

As illustrated in Fig. 4, the *Permissible Zone* enforces the Containment by design; the *HITL Zone* applies obligation O2; the *Failure State* corresponds to Y-Low/X-High, which our process formalizes as a *reachable* misconfiguration if O1 is absent.

**X-axis: Authorization risk.** Let  $\rho(\alpha) \in \{\text{Low}, \text{High}\}$  classify action risk by consequence (e.g., file delete, network exfiltration). Then the Matrix quadrants denote *states*  $\langle \text{Trust}, \rho \rangle$ .

**Y-axis: Trust as a composite of soundness and provenance.** Define two partial scores:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{epi}}(\varphi) &\in [0, 1] \quad (\text{epistemic/evidence strength}), \\ \tau_{\text{prov}}(\lambda) &\in \{\text{attested}, \text{verified}, \text{unverified}, \text{unknown}\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Trust aggregator and risk.** To classify authorization risk, let  $\rho : Act \rightarrow \{\text{Low}, \text{High}\}$ .

Define partial scores  $\tau_{\text{epi}}(\varphi) \in [0, 1]$  and  $\tau_{\text{prov}}(\lambda) \in \{\text{attested}, \text{verified}, \text{unverified}, \text{unknown}\}$ , and a *monotone* aggregator,

$$\text{Trust}(\varphi, \lambda) = F(\tau_{\text{epi}}(\varphi), \tau_{\text{prov}}(\lambda)) \in \{\text{High}, \text{Low}\}.$$




Figure 4: The Trust-Authorization Matrix. The Y-axis is a composite of *Evidence Strength* and *Source Assurance*; the ‘HITL Zone’ is constrained by Obligation O2.

A concrete instantiation used in our evaluation is

$$F(\tau, \pi) = \begin{cases} \text{High} & \text{if } \tau \geq \theta \wedge \pi \in \{\text{attested, verified}\} \\ \text{Low} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . This makes Fig. 4’s Y-axis *computable* from O1 and O2, thereby avoiding conflating truth-like knowledge with source identity.

### 3.3 The Mismatch Process

We refine the four-step chain in Fig. 5 into a deduction that carries labels and justifications:

**Definition 3.1** (Chained Mismatch with Observables). There exist a state  $s$ , a payload  $p_{\text{mal}}$ , a belief  $\varphi_{\text{mal}}$ , and a high-risk action  $\alpha_{\text{danger}}$  such that,

1. Belief corruption (Stage 1):

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models [\text{recv}(p_{\text{mal}})] B_i(\varphi_{\text{mal}} \mid \lambda_{\text{low}}),$$

2. Intent formation (Stage 2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, s &\models B_i(\varphi_{\text{mal}} \mid \lambda_{\text{low}}) \\ &\Rightarrow I_i(\langle \alpha_{\text{danger}}, \text{args}, \text{tgt}, \text{just} \rangle), \\ &\text{with } \text{just.uses} \ni (\varphi_{\text{mal}}, \lambda_{\text{low}}), \end{aligned}$$

3. Permission-intent intersection (Stage 3):

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models I_i(\cdot) \wedge \text{Perm}(\alpha_{\text{danger}}),$$

4. Failure (Result):

$$\mathcal{M}, s \models [\alpha_{\text{danger}}] \text{Failure}.$$

$\lambda_{\text{low}}$  denotes any label that maps to Trust=Low via  $F$ .

**Belief-aware authorization as a trace property.** We state the Stage 3 check of Fig. 5 as a safety property over traces: “No run may contain an  $\text{exec}(\alpha)$  with  $\rho(\alpha) = \text{High}$  whose closest preceding  $\text{plan}(\xi)$  cites any  $(\varphi, \lambda)$  with  $\text{Trust}(\varphi, \lambda) = \text{Low}$ .”

**Soundness sketch.** Under I1-I3, Stage 3 cannot hold for  $\alpha_{\text{danger}}$  derived from low-trust beliefs, therefore the *Result* clause is unreachable (Theorem 1). It links Fig. 4’s “attack path” to a precise policy condition. Additionally, a case study on how to use such a theorem and the B-I-P model is presented in Appendix B.




Figure 5: The Trust-Authorization Mismatch Process. Each stage is annotated with auditable labels and intent justifications (Constraint 1 & 2). Stage 3 policy enforces Theorem 1 under assumptions A1–A4 (details in Appendix A.5).

**Theorem 1** (Non-interference for High-risk Exec w.r.t. Low-trust Sources<sup>1</sup>). Under O1/O2 and monotone  $F$ , no event  $\text{exec}(\alpha)$  with  $\rho(\alpha) = \text{High}$  can occur if the closest preceding  $\text{plan}(\xi)$  is low-trust-derived. Equivalently, all attempted trajectories into Fig. 4’s Failure quadrant (Y-Low/X-High) are cut at Stage 3; admissible high-risk executions lie in the HITL zone.

### 3.4 Analysis Framework

The B-I-P model now yields a *checklist* for systematizing attacks/defenses in Sec. 4 to 5:

1. **Where does Belief corruption occur?** (channel and  $\lambda$ ): direct instructions, tool returns, agent returns, protocol metadata, local resources.
2. **How is  $B \rightarrow I$  externalized?** (intent  $\xi$ ): does just cite low-trust beliefs?
3. **What enforces Stage 3?** (policy and mechanism): static PoLP (I3), belief-aware ABAC/TBAC (I1), IFC/taint propagation (I2), or HITL gating.
4. **What fails in auditability?** (valuation  $V$ ): are  $R_\alpha$ -traces distinguishable in logs to attribute cause?

This allows us to remap the literature as *chain-breaking designs* (Stage 1 to Stage 4), rather than technique silos, and it explains why defenses that ignore I1/I2 routinely fail under adaptive attacks. Fig. 6 presents the distribution of research studies across the various stages of the B-I-P model, based on our literature analysis.

### 3.5 Positioning B-I-P among Classical Security Models

B-I-P does not replace classical access control or information flow; it binds them to agentic evidence and provenance via: (1) belief labels  $\lambda$ , (2) intent justifications  $\text{just.uses}$ , and (3) a computable trust aggregator  $F$  that feeds authorization. B-I-P degenerates to classical models when belief evidence is ignored (Table. 2), and extends them by (i) computing Trust from epistemic/provenance observables, (ii) requiring provable causality from beliefs to intent to permission, and (iii) stating a trace-level safety property checkable from logs.

## 4 Agent as Attack Surface: The Belief Manipulation

In this section, we apply the framework introduced in Sec. 3 to systematically analyze the agent’s threat landscape. The operation of an agent can be logically decomposed into two phases corresponding to our model:

1. The Belief-Intention phase (B-I), where the agent’s “brain” forms an Intention (I) to act based on its current Belief (B). This belief state is a composite of the user’s query and all other contextual information.

<sup>1</sup>The Proof is shown in Appendix A.5.



Table 2: B-I-P in context: compatibility, increment, and layering with classical models.

B-I-P construct	Nearest classical notion	What is compatible	What is new in B-I-P
Belief label $\lambda = (\text{src}, \text{int}, \text{age}, \text{path})$	IFC/taint, data provenance	Label propagation; no-flow from low-integrity to high-critical ops	Adds epistemic score $\tau_{\text{epi}}$ and source assurance $\tau_{\text{prov}}$ ; $F$ maps them to Trust (Fig. 4 Y-axis)
Intention $I(\xi)$ with <code>just.uses</code>	TBAC/ABAC (task/attribute-based)	Context/task gating; PoLP	<i>Intent as a first-class, provable object</i> : causal links to beliefs drive authorization
Permission $P(s, \alpha)$	Capabilities, RBAC/ABAC	Static whitelists and role/task checks	<i>Belief-aware</i> checks; HITL zone for High $\times$ High (Fig. 4)
Matrix trajectory (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5)	Risk-adaptive access control (RAdAC)	Risk $\rho(\alpha)$ and context adaptation	Separates <i>risk</i> (X) from <i>trust of evidence</i> (Y) and connects them through justification graphs
Safety property (Thm. 1)	Biba-style integrity / non-interference	“No high-integrity effect from low-integrity input”	Stated at the <i>exec-trace</i> level with observable proofs (logs)




Figure 6: Distribution of surveyed papers across the B-I-P model stages. A-S1 denotes Attacks in Stage 1, and D-S1 denotes Defenses in Stage 1.

2. The Permission-Action (P-A) phase, where that Intention is evaluated against the system’s Permission (P) policy. If authorized, the intention is executed as a deterministic Action (A).

As established in our analysis, the Improper Trust problem is formally a vulnerability in the Belief (B) component. The agents’ belief state is continuously updated by interacting with the external environment. This operational context may become contaminated, mixing trusted data with untrusted elements, including potentially adversarial instructions  $p_{mal}$ . The intrinsic characteristics of the LLM, such as non-determinism and limited interpretability, exacerbate this risk. They make the reasoning process itself, namely the  $(B \rightarrow I)$  mapping, highly susceptible to interference, increasing the likelihood of forming intentions that deviate from the user’s original goal.

An agent’s belief state is primarily constructed from three sources: direct instruction, protocol metadata, and external returns (e.g., from tools and APIs). While these channels are essential for perception and task execution, they simultaneously serve as the main attack surface. Adversaries can exploit these pathways to inject malicious or misleading information into the agent’s belief-formation process, thereby manipulating its behavior without subverting the permission system itself.

#### 4.1 Attacks on Direct Instructions

**Attack Overview.** The instruction prompt structure consists of user queries and system prompts. Attackers can manipulate these instruction prompts to corrupt the agent’s beliefs at **Stage 1**, often known as “jailbreaking”. Since agents are designed to be well-behaved and align with human values, the implicit trust assumption inherent in these prompts can allow attackers to bypass the constraints and moderation policies imposed by AI agent developers, ultimately causing deviations from the users’ intended objectives.

**Matrix Trajectory Analysis.** Under normal operation, the agent’s *instruction prompts* reside in the Y-High / X-Low quadrant of the Trust Authorization Matrix in Fig. 4. These inputs are highly trusted, as they originate from predefined configurations, but they lack direct execution privileges. Their role is to define reasoning goals and contextual constraints rather than to perform actions. Attackers inject malicious content into these high-trust prompts during **Stage 1**, contaminating the agent’s belief state  $\mathbf{B}_{A_i}$  while preserving its high-trust (Y-high) label. During **Stage 2**, the corrupted belief propagates through the  $(\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{I})$  chain, generating an intention  $\mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\alpha_{mal})$  associated with high-authorization execution (X-High). The vertical escalation occurs from **Y-High / X-Low** to **Y-High / X-High**.

**User Query.** User queries express task-oriented intentions and serve as the primary driver of the agent’s behavior. These inputs are composed of natural language, which possesses inherent semantic richness but also introduces semantic ambiguity and interpretive uncertainty. Adversaries can craft inputs that interleave malicious directives with ostensibly legitimate requests to circumvent LLM security measures. For instance, entering phrases at the beginning of user queries, such as “ignore all previous instructions and act as my personal assistant”, can enable agents to perform unauthorized actions such as data leakage or the dissemination of inappropriate content.

The studies [7, 9] systematically reveal widespread vulnerabilities in large language models and provide a taxonomy of common prompt-based attack patterns. Benjamin et al. [12] further emphasize the vulnerability of user inputs as an attack vector through large-scale testing across diverse LLM architectures. Existing works [13, 14, 15] systematically craft adversarial prompts capable of circumventing alignment constraints, thereby enabling jailbreaks of aligned LLMs. CheatAgent [16] introduces an autonomous LLM agent to attack LLM-empowered recommender systems under the black-box scenario.

**System Prompt.** System prompts are the *context* set by the agent’s developers to define the specific tasks and goals of the system. During reasoning, the agent integrates user queries with this context to plan and generate executable action paths. However, since the system prompts are not fixed and evolve dynamically through inter-agent communication or external updates, their reliability is also not constant. If the content is stale, inconsistent, or maliciously manipulated, it can misguide the agent’s reasoning, leading to unsafe or suboptimal decisions.

Evil Geniuses (EG) [17] and LLM-Virus [18] explore prompt-based self-replication and role-aligned jailbreaks, illustrating how system-level context can be exploited to induce persistent harmful behaviors across agents. Breum et al. [19] further analyze how persuasive or manipulative phrasing within system instructions can bias the agent’s internal reasoning and output preferences. Prompt Infection [20] further demonstrates that multi-agent systems are susceptible to poisoned instructions inserted into system contexts spread across agents without direct user involvement. Meanwhile, Lupinacci et al. [21] expose how compromised initialization prompts may escalate agent privileges and enable full system control.

#### 4.2 Attacks on External Returns

**Attack Overview.** External returns are the *factual data* retrieved by AI agents from diverse data sources (e.g., search APIs, knowledge bases, or code generators), which may contain malicious instructions injected by adversaries. This attack, commonly referred to as Indirect Prompt Injection (IPI), corrupts the factuality of an agent’s percepts during **Stage 2**. The agent then internalizes the poisoned belief, generates a malicious intention, and if granted sufficient permissions, executes a harmful action.

**Matrix Trajectory Analysis.** This failure process is a two-step move on the Trust-Authorization Matrix in Fig. 5. The agent’s interaction with the tool in **Stage 1** correctly places it in the low-trust (Y-Low) coordinate, as the belief’s origin is an unverified external source. The system should contain the agent in the Y-Low / X-Low quadrant. However, the failure of  $(\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{I})$  in **Stage 2** causes the agent to generate an intention  $\mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\alpha_{danger})$  that corresponds to the high-authorization (X-High) coordinate. The Improper Authorization of **Stage 3** is the system’s failure to enforce this containment, fatally allowing a low-trust (Y-Low) agent to execute a high-authorization (X-High) action. The catastrophic mismatch is defined as the trajectory from **Y-Low / X-Low** to the **Y-Low / X-High** quadrant. A secure system must enforce an invariant that breaks the  $(\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{I})$  chain, or otherwise ensures that any intention generated from a  $\mathbf{B}_{Y-Low}$  state is restricted to  $\mathbf{P}_{X-Low}$  actions.

**Tool Returns.** These are structured or unstructured responses returned by external APIs, computational modules, or function calls, serving as the primary evidence for subsequent reasoning during single-agent execution. The reliability of tool returns may be compromised through two distinct mechanisms. *i) The tool itself is untrustworthy and may produce adversarial outputs; ii) The tool is trustworthy, but the accessed resources are untrustworthy.*

A vulnerability in the official GitHub MCP server allowed attackers to inject malicious prompts into public issues, causing user agents to unintentionally leak sensitive data from private repositories [22]. Some studies [23, 24, 25, 26, 27] have demonstrated that malicious or manipulated data returned by external tools constitutes a major attack surface for LLM-based agents. Wang et al. [28] further investigate issues related to improper output handling and the potential contamination of tool returns. Meanwhile, Zhan et al. [29] reveal critical vulnerabilities and underscore the need for adaptive evaluation of current defenses under adaptive attack scenarios. StruPhantom [30] extends the attack to black-box settings, revealing that structurally crafted inputs can embed hidden prompts and compromise agents handling complex tool outputs.

**Agent Returns.** Agent Returns refer to the outcomes produced by invoked agents when performing their assigned subtasks during inter-agent coordination. These messages among agents enrich each agent’s contextual understanding and enable collective decision making. The untrustworthiness of agent returns primarily originates from two sources. *i) The reliability of the remote agents’ returns depends on the trustworthiness of the external tools they invoke; ii) Agents are inherently non-deterministic, and their reasoning may yield biased results even without interference.*

Faulty or misaligned agents can inject erroneous intermediate results into collaboration workflows, causing biased returns to propagate across the network and disrupt downstream reasoning [31, 32]. Complementarily, GraphTracer [33] the causal propagation of such faulty returns, illustrating how a single compromised agent output can trigger cascading inference errors throughout the multi-agent system. A recent empirical audit by Reid et al. [34] documents cascading reliability failures in LLM-based multi-agent systems, where a single incorrect agent decision led to a chain of subsequent mis-decisions across multiple agents.

**Local Resource.** These include contextual facts sensed or retrieved from local databases, caches, logs, configuration files, or other persistent states that the agent maintains during execution. They embody the agent’s perception of its operational environment and are frequently reused to support situational awareness, history tracking, and adaptive planning. However, local resources are not inherently trustworthy. When such environmental data becomes stale due to delayed synchronization, inconsistent because of concurrent updates, or tampered with by unauthorized processes, it can inject erroneous context into the agent’s reasoning space.

ADIL [35] highlights that an agent’s reliability largely depends on the freshness and internal consistency of its locally stored data. When caches or records become outdated or corrupted, reasoning drift and unsafe decisions may occur. Tsai et al. [36] point out that tampered contextual files such as logs or configuration parameters can misdirect agents toward unintended actions, while He et al. [37] further note that unauthorized runtime alterations undermine situational awareness and can gradually erode overall system stability.

### 4.3 Attacks on Tool & Protocol Infrastructure

**Attack Overview.** This category of attacks targets the *tool and protocol infrastructure* that defines the agent’s operational environment, including metadata such as capability manifests, tool lists, and agent cards distributed through interaction protocols (e.g., MCP and A2A). When auditing and provenance validation are absent, adversaries can inject or modify these metadata entries to embed malicious capability declarations or falsified endpoints, thereby corrupting the agent’s beliefs at **Stage 1**. This manipulation blurs the trust boundary between legitimate and unverified components, transforming originally trusted infrastructure into untrusted sources that still retain high execution privileges. Such inconsistencies between perceived trust and granted authorization manifest in real-world attacks such as *Tool Poisoning* and *Agent Spoofing*.

**Matrix Trajectory Analysis.** Under normal assumptions, these metadata components are treated as high-trust (Y-High) entities because they originate from pre-registered or system-declared sources and directly govern high-authorization (X-High) operations. However, this attack illustrates a structural contradiction within the Trust–Authorization Matrix in Fig. 4. Ideally, system tools and protocol metadata should fall in the Y-High / X-High quadrant, representing components that are both verified and privileged. Once the metadata or protocol registry is compromised, the component’s actual trust state degenerates to Y-Low while its authorization level remains X-High. This results in a cross-quadrant inconsistency, i.e., **Y-High / X-High to Y-Low / X-High** rather than a stepwise transition: the system erroneously allows an untrusted (Y-Low) infrastructure entity to operate with privileged authority (X-High).

**Tool Poisoning.** Tool Poisoning was identified by Invariant Labs [50] as a critical vulnerability involving the manipulation of tool sets or the injection of malicious instructions into tool descriptions. Such attacks subvert LLM reasoning

and decision-making processes, thereby impacting major providers (e.g., Anthropic [51], OpenAI [52]), workflow automation systems (e.g., Zapier [53]), and MCP clients (e.g., Cursor [54]). Meanwhile, this attack is also known as *Line Jumping* [55], in which an adversarial MCP server causes an AI agent to execute unintended actions before the targeted tool is explicitly invoked, effectively bypassing host-enforced connection isolation. According to the data presented in Table. 3, the rapid proliferation and growing popularity of MCP servers underscore the potential scale and systemic impact of such metadata-based threats.

Table 3: Comparison of MCP Marketplaces in their API/SDK support, deployment options, protocol coverage, and scale of discoverability (data collected in 2025) [56]

MCP Markets	# Servers	# Users
Smithery [57]	7582	376.7k
MCP Store [58]	34429	69.8k
MCP Market [59]	15559	36.3k
Glama [60]	10,179	94.3k
MCP.so [61]	16768	-
PulseMCP [62]	6285	22.1m

ToolHijacker [38] proposed a two-phase optimization strategy that systematically biases large language models to select attacker-crafted tools for a chosen target task consistently. MPMA [39] inserts manipulative words and phrases into the tool name and description to prioritize a customized MCP server over other competing MCP servers. MCPTox [40] conducted a systematic characterization of this attack and evaluated the influence of non-invoked malicious tools on tool invocation in realistic MCP environments. AUTOCMD [41] dynamically injects attack commands into tools for information theft in LLM tool-learning systems. TEW [42] manipulates the security-related validation parameters of tools, leading to severe security risks such as remote code execution. ToolCommander [43] injects malicious tools to collect user queries, then dynamically updates the injected tools based on the stolen information to enhance subsequent attacks.

**Agent Spoofing.** This attack arises when interacting with *remote agents* in multi-agent systems. Functionally, these remote agents act as external executors that the primary agent invokes to perform delegated subtasks on behalf of the user. However, compared to deterministic functional programs, agent execution is inherently non-deterministic and exhibits a larger attack surface. This characteristic also explains why research on remote-agent security remains considerably less mature than research on MCP servers.

Adversaries can publish forged Agent Cards (such as `/ .well-known/agent.json` files) under malicious or typosquatted domains to impersonate legitimate agents and their advertised capabilities [44]. If an A2A client mistakenly trusts such a counterfeit card, it may dispatch sensitive inter-agent tasks to a rogue server, resulting in task hijacking or unauthorized data exfiltration. Such incidents critically undermine the trust foundation of inter-agent communication within multi-agent ecosystems.

## 5 Systematization of Defenses: Breaking the Mismatch Chain

In Sec. 3, we formally established that agent security failures are not isolated incidents but are the result of a **Chained Mismatch** (Definition 3.1). In Sec. 4, we demonstrated how existing attacks, such as tool poisoning, map directly onto this four-stage logical process.

A successful defense, therefore, must be a mechanism that formally *breaks* at least one link in this chain. A defense that fails to prevent the completion of any of these stages is, by definition, an incomplete solution.

In this section, we provide a systematic review of the defense landscape. We depart from traditional taxonomies organized by technique, as these obscure the strategic purpose of a defense. Instead, we organize the landscape of existing and proposed defenses according to *which stage* of the B-I-P mismatch chain they are designed to sever. This allows us to analyze the fundamental assumptions, limitations, and critical gaps in the current collective response.

### 5.1 Stage 1 Defenses: Preventing Belief Corruption

The first line of defense consists of mechanisms that operate at the agent’s perceptual boundary. They assume the agent’s reasoning ( $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$ ) and permissions ( $\mathbf{P}$ ) are sound, but its **Belief** ( $\mathbf{B}$ ) state is vulnerable to the initial malicious input  $p_{mal}$ . The formal goal of these defenses is to prevent the initial premise of an attack from ever becoming true:

$$M, s \not\models [\text{Receive}(p_{mal})]\mathbf{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal})$$




Figure 7: Systematization of Defense.

**Path 1: Sanitizing (rule-/model-based).** The most direct approach is to act as a “gatekeeper,” sanitizing the malicious payload  $p_{mal}$  before it reaches the agent’s belief-update function. This strategy is reactive and analogous to traditional network firewalls or web application firewalls (WAFs).

*Defense on Direct Instruction.* To detect attacks on direct instruction that embed malicious directives within prompts, classifiers are commonly employed, serving as discriminative models that distinguish between benign and adversarial instructions based on linguistic and semantic features. They can be broadly divided into two categories: rule-based and model-based approaches. The rule-based category detects explicit malicious instruction patterns via handcrafted signatures [63] or pattern matching [64], whereas the model-based category [65, 66] employs embedding similarity and supervised learning to identify adversarial payloads more adaptively.

*Defense on Protocol Metadata.* This line of defense focuses on detecting malicious or tampered protocol metadata embedded in model-callable interfaces. It is designed to identify corrupted tool descriptions, injected instructions, or malicious invocation intents before task execution. One approach is static content scanning [67, 68], which detects adversarial patterns or abnormal textual features within the context. Another approach extends this defense to runtime auditing by monitoring invocation behaviors and identifying deviations from legitimate capability-tool bindings [69, 70]. Moreover, MINDGUARD [71] and Attention Tracker [72] leverage internal attention anomalies and dependency relations within LLMs to reveal behavioral inconsistencies and hidden prompt injections.

**Path 2: Neutralization (input rewriting / paraphrasing).** The second path assumes that detection is imperfect and instead adopts a strategy that constrains and regularizes input semantics. This approach reformulates or sanitizes inputs to remove, neutralize, or obfuscate potentially harmful instructions while preserving the semantic integrity of benign content. Such transformations operate at the lexical, syntactic, or semantic level, effectively defusing or disregarding adversarial prompts before they reach the model’s reasoning core. Approaches [73, 74] reformulate harmful inputs into safe equivalents, ensuring that the rewritten prompts are executed under restricted or non-harmful conditions. SafeDecoding [75] introduces a decoding-time defense that rephrases unsafe outputs. Zhao et al. [76] combine paraphrasing with semantic filtering to neutralize embedded attacks while preserving task fidelity.

However, the primary weakness of this approach is that it is inherently brittle, as adversaries can continually devise new “jailbreaks” and obfuscation techniques to bypass the sanitizer.

## 5.2 Stage 2 Defenses: Preventing Malicious Intention

This second line of defense assumes **Stage 1** has failed: the agent’s belief state is now corrupted ( $\mathbf{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal})$  is true). The goal is to break the *next* link in the chain: the logical step from a corrupt belief to a dangerous intention.

$$M, s \not\models \mathbf{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal}) \rightarrow \mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\alpha_{danger})$$

These mechanisms act as the agent’s internal policy advisor. They are not concerned with the truth of the belief, but with the acceptability of the resulting intention. This is the primary domain of the AI Alignment community.

These techniques are designed to modify the agent’s internal policy  $f_{A_i}$  to reject harmful intentions. Formally, they seek to satisfy the invariant  $\mathbf{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal}) \rightarrow \neg \mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\alpha_{danger})$ . For example, even if the agent is manipulated into believing that

“deleting the database is helpful” ( $\phi_{mal}$ ), its safety alignment is trained to intervene, preventing the formation of the intention  $\mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\text{DeleteDB})$ .

complements the agent’s primary memory with a dedicated repository of negative lessons. If a potential anomaly is detected through consensus validation, the flawed reasoning path is stored in the lesson repository. This allows the agent to learn from its own mistakes by referencing past failures, avoiding making similar incorrect decisions in the future.

**Path 1: Hardening the Belief Update ( $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}$ ).** This approach primarily aims to break the cycle of self-reinforcing errors. It complements the agent’s primary memory with a dedicated repository of negative lessons, serving as a cognitive “vaccine” against recurrent reasoning flaws [77]. When a potential anomaly is detected through consensus validation, the corresponding flawed reasoning path is stored in this repository. By referencing past failures, the agent can learn from its own mistakes and prevent the recurrence of similar erroneous decisions in the future. Vaccine, proposed by Huang et al. [78], is a robust LLM alignment solution that strengthens the resilience of aligned models when fine-tuned on partially harmful user data. Peigne et al. [79] further demonstrate through multi-agent simulations that active vaccine approaches achieve a more favorable trade-off between system robustness and agent cooperation.

In our formal model, this seeks to modify  $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}$  such that even when  $[\text{Receive}(p_{mal})]$  occurs, the agent’s internal policy  $f_{A_i}$  does not form the corresponding  $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal})$ . While promising, this approach struggles with generalization to unseen attacks and the high cost of robust re-training.

**Path 2: Isolating the Belief Source (B with Attribution).** This “quarantine” strategy concedes that  $p_{mal}$  will be received and that the agent *will* form a belief, but it seeks to tag that belief as untrustworthy and confine its influence within a controlled reasoning scope, preventing contaminated information from propagating to higher-privilege or critical decision layers. The isolation defenses emphasize privilege separation and execution isolation. PFI [80] emphasize the principle of least privilege by segmenting authorization units (AUs) that preprocess untrusted tool outputs, while IFC [81] designs an architecture that separates Planner, Executor, and Monitor components to control information flow. IsolateGPT [82] and MPLSandbox [83] enforce execution isolation among diverse LLM applications, preventing cross-application contamination and unintended effects on external environment.

**Path 3: Detecting the External Returns.** This defense path primarily targets the poisoned tool output  $p_{mal}$  rather than the initial input, ensuring the integrity and reliability of dynamic data flowing back into the agent’s reasoning process. It emphasizes the runtime assessment of data returned from external tools, collaborating agents, or local resources to determine whether such data has been corrupted, manipulated, or otherwise compromised. By introducing trust evaluation [84] and anomaly-detection mechanisms [85], agents can maintain situational awareness of data authenticity and reduce the propagation of adversarial information within the decision-making pipeline.

Formally, this defense refines the belief operator from  $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal})$  to a more granular, attributed belief:  $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal}|\text{Source} = \text{‘UntrustedAPI’})$ . This tagged belief is not blocked, but it is “quarantined.” This defense does not break the chain at **Stage 1**; rather, it provides critical information for a more robust defense at **Stage 3**.

### 5.3 Stage 3 Defenses: Breaking the Permission-Intent Intersection

This is the third, and arguably the most critical, line of defense at the *system level*. This stage assumes that the agent already holds a corrupted belief  $\mathcal{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal})$  and has formed a malicious intention  $\mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\alpha_{danger})$ . The goal is to ensure that there does not exist a mismatch between execution intention and permission. That is, the condition in **Stage 3** should never evaluate to true:

$$M, s \not\models \mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\alpha_{danger}) \wedge \mathbf{Perm}(\alpha_{danger})$$

This is the formal implementation of the Trust-Authorization Match. It is not concerned with the agent’s thoughts, only with its *permissions*.

**Path 1: Static Permission Control (PoLP).** This path is static implementation and enforces the Principle of Least Privilege (PoLP) by ensuring the dangerous permission is *never* granted. Progent [86] and LLMZ+ [87] adopt static whitelisting strategies, though their targets differ: the former defines privilege boundaries for agent operations, whereas the latter restricts prompt-level instructions. The studies [88, 89] integrate static access-control principles into agent ecosystems to enforce policy consistency and privilege separation. In addition, permission modeling can be adopted to quantify action risk and predefines static authorization constraints for agent behaviors [90].

In our model, this is the most powerful defense, as it sets the permission policy  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\forall s, \mathcal{P}(s, \alpha_{danger}) = \text{False}$ . The malicious intention is formed, but it harmlessly fails at the permission check. The primary drawback —and the

reason this is often insufficient —is that it severely limits the agent’s utility, as many agents are intended to have access to  $\alpha_{danger}$  (e.g., a software development agent needs file system access).

**Path 2: Dynamic and Context-Aware Authorization.** This is the most sophisticated and promising defense path, as it directly operationalizes the Trust-Authorization Mismatch. Instead of a static policy, it enforces a dynamic, context-aware permission policy  $\mathcal{P}(s, \alpha)$ . AAC [91] redefines access control as a dynamic and context-aware information-flow governance process. Fleming et al. [92] extend the task-based access control (TBAC) model by incorporating LLM-based evaluation of agent intent, uncertainty, and risk for real-time adaptive authorization. Collaborative Memory [93] introduces a multi-agent, multi-user framework that implements dynamic, asymmetric, and temporally evolving access-control mechanisms to enable context-aware resource sharing.

In this model, the system explicitly denies a high-risk permission *because* it can verify that the intention driving it originated from a low-trust belief.

**Path 3: Taint Tracking for Policy Enforcement.** Taint tracking is a formal mechanism to *implement* the dynamic policy described above. It provides a verifiable data-flow analysis to connect  $p_{mal}$  to  $\alpha_{danger}$ . Siddiqui et al. [94] demonstrate that dynamic information-flow tracking effectively mitigates taint-style vulnerabilities and propose a “permissive propagation” strategy that reduces false positives. AgentArmor [95] applies taint labeling and type-based analysis to the agent’s runtime trace, modeled as control- and data-flow graphs, to detect and mitigate prompt-injection attacks. FIDES [96] takes an information-flow control (IFC) perspective and uses data labeling to track confidentiality and integrity properties.

In this approach, the ‘Taint’ from the malicious input  $p_{mal}$  is formally propagated to the belief state  $\mathbf{B}_{A_i}(\phi_{mal})$  (**Stage 1**), which in turn taints the intention  $\mathbf{I}_{A_i}(\alpha_{danger})$  (**Stage 2**). The permission-check (**Stage 3**) is then reduced to a simple, formal rule: reject any request for a high-risk permission ( $\text{Perm}(\alpha_{danger})$ ) that carries a ‘Taint’.

## 5.4 Result: Failure Mitigation and Auditability

This final class of defenses assumes the entire mismatch chain (Stages 1 to 3) has succeeded and the failure action  $\alpha_{danger}$  has been executed. The goal here is twofold: 1) mitigate the consequences of  $[\alpha_{danger}] \text{FailureState}$ , and 2) provide a path to accountability, solving the *Auditability Collapse* described in our introduction.

These are the disaster recovery and forensic tools. This category includes work on automated backup and recovery, checkpointing, and, most critically, secure logging and interpretability (XAI). Yin et al. [97] survey digital forensics for large language models, identifying secure logging and interpretability as foundations for reliable recovery. Chernyshev et al. [98] develop invocation-level logging for forensic readiness and verifiable trace reconstruction. VeriLA [99] provides a framework for interpretable verification of agent failures, linking explainability with accountability. Barrak [100] examines traceability and responsibility attribution in multi-agent pipelines to support post-hoc auditing.

These defenses are not preventative, but they are essential for accountability. In our B-I-P model, they aim to enhance the Valuation function  $V$  so that malicious execution chains ( $R_{\alpha_{danger}}$ ) produce distinguishable and interpretable propositions  $V(s')$  in the audit log, allowing a human investigator to differentiate an attack from a benign but complex operation.

## 6 Opportunities and Fundamental Challenges

In Sections 3 to 5, we systematically reviewed attacks and defenses in Agent interaction security using the B-I-P model. This section aims to synthesize these findings, identify the central challenges and critical gaps in current research, and discuss future research directions.

### • Is adversarial defense in the belief stage valuable?

Our systematic review of recent work has found that much of the current research focuses on Stage 1, *i.e.*, preventing Belief Corruption. These defenses include prompt filtering, input sanitization, and adversarial training. However, such defenses are inherently competitive, placing the defender at a disadvantage:

- **Passive defense:** The defender is constantly reacting to new attack techniques, such as prompt injection or jailbreaking, that attackers discover.
- **Diminishing returns:** As attackers learn more through interactions, they become increasingly adept at bypassing the defenses.

Therefore, we argue that trying to create a perfectly secure belief environment in Stage 1 is extremely hard in the long run. It is as challenging as eradicating all malicious data on the internet. We must accept the harsh reality that the beliefs (B) of intelligent agents will always be corruptible. This leads us to shift our research focus from preventing the injection of malicious information into the agent’s brain (LLM) to the more critical question: How can we mitigate the far-reaching consequences when an agent inevitably believes it?

• **Is the process of generating malicious intent traceable and verifiable?**

After accepting the unreliability of beliefs (B), the second crucial link in the “mismatch chain” ( $B \rightarrow I$ , *i.e.*, intent generation) becomes the next key control point. However, the reasoning process from B to I is central to LLMs, and their non-determinism and uninterpretability are intrinsic properties. This non-deterministic nature may be acceptable to the AI alignment community, which is concerned with statistical harmlessness. Still, it fundamentally conflicts with the goals of the systems security community, which seeks verifiable security guarantees (e.g., formal policies ensuring that  $I_{Ai}(\alpha_{danger})$  never occurs).

Thus, we propose a second core conclusion: System security research cannot rely on AI safety communities to solve the alignment problem. Given that it is unlikely that LLMs will be fixed in the near term, security architectures must assume that intent (I) is untrustworthy, potentially malicious, and unverifiable. This forces us to shift our defense strategies, acknowledging that both B and I are unreliable. Consequently, security foundations must be built on the final stage of the chain.

• **Is permission management the only reliable control point?**

Our previous analysis indicates that due to the untrustworthiness and unverifiability of beliefs and intentions, we must leverage the control capabilities of permission management. However, our systematic review (Sec. 5.3) identifies a significant flaw in current authorization mechanisms: they are largely belief-blind. Specifically, permission decisions, such as dynamic access control, account for context changes but ignore the state and source of the beliefs (B) that lead to these contextual changes. This is the root cause of improper authorization (e.g., agent confusion). Based on this, we propose that future research should focus more on developing belief-aware access control mechanisms. These mechanisms should integrate current beliefs and context to design access control systems. Key research topics include:

- Designing a policy language that can succinctly express conditions like  $\text{Perm}(\alpha_{danger} | B_{Source} = \text{'Untrusted'}) = \text{False}$ , which would guide the design of such access control mechanisms.
- Creating an immutable belief-tracking system to reliably mark and trace the sources of beliefs and any potential contamination.
- Designing auditable security logs for agent interactions, which not only record the execution of policies (P) but also link them to the triggering beliefs (B) and intentions (I), providing insights for post-event analysis and defense iterations.

To summarize, instead of focusing solely on creating a better, more resilient brain (LLM) that is less susceptible to malicious information and intent, we should also focus on constructing a better cage (P). The future security guarantees for intelligent agents should not rely on unverifiable claims of “it will not do bad things,” but instead on verifiable guarantees that “it cannot do bad things.” As we work towards creating a trustworthy agent, we must also continuously strive to constrain an untrustworthy agent from causing harm.

## 7 Related Work

Deng et al. [101] provide a comprehensive examination of security challenges in AI agents and survey threats involving model misuse, tool invocation, and multi-step reasoning. Ehtesham et al. [2] analyze four emerging agent communication protocols, namely the Model Context Protocol, the Agent Communication Protocol, the Agent-to-Agent Protocol, and the Agent Network Protocol, and compare their deployment assumptions and interoperability properties. Li et al. [102] present a systematic review of LLM-based multi-agent systems with a focus on coordination mechanisms, agent architectures, and task decomposition strategies. Other surveys on LLM security [9, 7] emphasize prompt-based vulnerabilities or model-level risks. These surveys take a broader perspective than this SoK in their respective research scopes and thus do not cover a systematic analysis of the entire agent security system.

Many works investigate individual vulnerability classes within agent security. Prior research studies prompt injection [64, 7], jailbreak attacks [13, 14, 15], and tool-poisoning threats in protocol-driven environments [40, 71]. These works are orthogonal to this paper. Other studies explore interaction-layer manipulation, including multi-agent exploitation [16, 17], agent-to-agent contamination [103], and untrusted data channels in agent pipelines [23, 18]. Additional efforts construct taxonomies of interface-level risks and mitigations [24, 25, 104]. These complement this SoK, which proposes



a risk-analysis model for emerging threats on agents and classifies the implementation paths of both attacks and defenses.

## 8 Conclusion & Discussion

This work provides a systematization of over 200 papers and a unified formal perspective, revealing that security failures in LLM-based agents stem from a fundamental mismatch between trust and authorization. Through the B–I–P model and the Trust–Authorization Matrix, we show how corrupted beliefs can escalate into high-risk actions when permission systems lack provenance-aware controls. We argue that permission management is the most practical approach for verifiable constraints. These findings highlight the need for future research on belief-aware dynamic authorization, taint-driven policy enforcement, and auditable interaction provenance to enable agent systems that are controllable, verifiable, and secure in real-world deployments.

**Limitations.** We emphasize that several limitations arise from the novelty and volatility of this domain and thus reflect practical, field-wide realities.

- Corpus reproducibility & measurement volatility. The corpus includes grey literature, and ecosystem counts (e.g., Table. 3) are time-sensitive. These are objective constraints in a nascent ecosystem; they may affect measurement stability, but not the value of the unifying lens or the Stage-wise mapping.
- The B-I-P model we propose is currently intended merely to provide a perspective for systematizing current work, rather than to guide future research; it helps to define and clarify the scope of the work involved. However, it consequently relies on several strong assumptions; for example, Theorem 1 is a policy-level safety property contingent upon O1/O2 and a monotonic F.

Overall, these limitations bound claims without negating the contribution: a common vocabulary, a formal bridge between trust and authorization, and a reproducible mapping of attacks/defenses into chain-breaking control points. Given the field’s youth, we view them as expected, tractable, and compatible with the paper’s goal of systematizing current research and clarifying where enforcement and audit must occur.

## References

- [1] Junlin Xie, Zhihong Chen, Ruifei Zhang, Xiang Wan, and Guanbin Li. Large multimodal agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15116*, 2024.
- [2] Abul Ehtesham, Aditi Singh, Gaurav Kumar Gupta, and Saket Kumar. A survey of agent interoperability protocols: Model context protocol (mcp), agent communication protocol (acp), agent-to-agent protocol (a2a), and agent network protocol (anp). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02279*, 2025.
- [3] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*, 2022.
- [4] Sotiropoulos John, Rosario Ron F Del, Kokuykin Evgeniy, Oakley Helen, Habler Idan, Underkoffler Kayla, Huang Ken, Steffensen Peter, Aralimatti Rakshith, Bitton Ron, et al. *Owasp top 10 for llm apps & gen ai agentic security initiative*. PhD thesis, OWASP, 2025.
- [5] Ryan Greenblatt, Carson Denison, Benjamin Wright, Fabien Roger, Monte MacDiarmid, Sam Marks, Johannes Treutlein, Tim Belonax, Jack Chen, David Duvenaud, et al. Alignment faking in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14093*, 2024.
- [6] Rishi Bommasani, Percy Liang, and Tony Lee. Holistic evaluation of language models. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1525(1):140–146, 2023.
- [7] Chetan Pathade. Red teaming the mind of the machine: A systematic evaluation of prompt injection and jailbreak vulnerabilities in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.04806*, 2025.
- [8] Alexander Wei, Nika Haghtalab, and Jacob Steinhardt. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:80079–80110, 2023.
- [9] Yi Zeng, Hongpeng Lin, Jingwen Zhang, Diyi Yang, Ruoxi Jia, and Weiyan Shi. How johnny can persuade llms to jailbreak them: Rethinking persuasion to challenge ai safety by humanizing llms. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14322–14350, 2024.
- [10] PBC Anthropic. Introducing the model context protocol. URL: <https://www.anthropic.com/news/model-contextprotocol>, Accessed, 19:2025, 2024.
- [11] Rao Surapaneni, Miku Jha, Michael Vakoc, and Todd Segal. Announcing the agent2agent protocol (a2a). *Google for Developers Blog*, Apr, 2025.
- [12] Victoria Benjamin, Emily Braca, Israel Carter, Hafsa Kanchwala, Nava Khojasteh, Charly Landow, Yi Luo, Caroline Ma, Anna Magarelli, Rachel Mirin, et al. Systematically analyzing prompt injection vulnerabilities in diverse llm architectures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23308*, 2024.
- [13] Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J Pappas, and Eric Wong. Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.08419>, 1(2):3, 2024.
- [14] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*, 2023.
- [15] Xiaogeng Liu, Nan Xu, Muhao Chen, and Chaowei Xiao. Autodan: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04451*, 2023.
- [16] Liang-bo Ning, Shijie Wang, Wenqi Fan, Qing Li, Xin Xu, Hao Chen, and Feiran Huang. Cheatagent: Attacking llm-empowered recommender systems via llm agent. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 2284–2295, 2024.
- [17] Yu Tian, Xiao Yang, Jingyuan Zhang, Yinpeng Dong, and Hang Su. Evil geniuses: Delving into the safety of llm-based agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11855*, 2023.
- [18] Miao Yu, Junfeng Fang, Yingjie Zhou, Xing Fan, Kun Wang, Shirui Pan, and Qingsong Wen. Llm-virus: Evolutionary jailbreak attack on large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00055*, 2024.
- [19] Simon Martin Breum, Daniel Vædele Egdal, Victor Gram Mortensen, Anders Giovanni Møller, and Luca Maria Aiello. The persuasive power of large language models. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 152–163, 2024.
- [20] Donghyun Lee and Mo Tiwari. Prompt infection: Llm-to-llm prompt injection within multi-agent systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07283*, 2024.

- [21] Matteo Lupinacci, Francesco Aurelio Pironti, Francesco Blefari, Francesco Romeo, Luigi Arena, and Angelo Furfaro. The dark side of llms: Agent-based attacks for complete computer takeover. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06850*, 2025.
- [22] Marco Milanta and Luca Beurer-Kellner. Github mcp exploited: Accessing private repositories via mcp. <https://invariantlabs.ai/blog/mcp-github-vulnerability>, 2025. Accessed: 07-09-2025.
- [23] Xiaohan Fu, Shuheng Li, Zihan Wang, Yihao Liu, Rajesh K Gupta, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Earlene Fernandes. Imprompter: Tricking llm agents into improper tool use. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.14923*, 2024.
- [24] Qiusi Zhan, Zhixiang Liang, Zifan Ying, and Daniel Kang. Injecagent: Benchmarking indirect prompt injections in tool-integrated large language model agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02691*, 2024.
- [25] Edoardo DeBenedetti, Jie Zhang, Mislav Balunovic, Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Florian Tramèr. Agentdojo: A dynamic environment to evaluate prompt injection attacks and defenses for llm agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:82895–82920, 2024.
- [26] Hwan Chang, Yonghyun Jun, and Hwanhee Lee. Chatinject: Abusing chat templates for prompt injection in llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22830*, 2025.
- [27] Fengyu Liu, Yuan Zhang, Jiaqi Luo, Jiarun Dai, Tian Chen, Letian Yuan, Zhengmin Yu, Youkun Shi, Ke Li, Chengyuan Zhou, et al. Make agent defeat agent: Automatic detection of {Taint-Style} vulnerabilities in {LLM-based} agents. In *34th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 25)*, pages 3767–3786, 2025.
- [28] Shang Wang, Tianqing Zhu, Bo Liu, Ming Ding, Dayong Ye, Wanlei Zhou, and Philip Yu. Unique security and privacy threats of large language models: A comprehensive survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 58(4):1–36, 2025.
- [29] Qiusi Zhan, Richard Fang, Henil Shalin Panchal, and Daniel Kang. Adaptive attacks break defenses against indirect prompt injection attacks on llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.00061*, 2025.
- [30] Yang Feng and Xudong Pan. Struphantom: Evolutionary injection attacks on black-box tabular agents powered by large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.09841*, 2025.
- [31] Jen-tse Huang, Jiaxu Zhou, Tailin Jin, Xuhui Zhou, Zixi Chen, Wenxuan Wang, Youliang Yuan, Michael R Lyu, and Maarten Sap. On the resilience of llm-based multi-agent collaboration with faulty agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00989*, 2024.
- [32] Mert Cemri, Melissa Z Pan, Shuyi Yang, Lakshya A Agrawal, Bhavya Chopra, Rishabh Tiwari, Kurt Keutzer, Aditya Parameswaran, Dan Klein, Kannan Ramchandran, et al. Why do multi-agent llm systems fail? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13657*, 2025.
- [33] Heng Zhang, Yuling Shi, Xiaodong Gu, Haochen You, Zijian Zhang, Lubin Gan, Yilei Yuan, and Jin Huang. Graphtracer: Graph-guided failure tracing in llm agents for robust multi-turn deep search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10581*, 2025.
- [34] Alistair Reid, Simon O’Callaghan, Liam Carroll, and Tiberio Caetano. Risk analysis techniques for governed llm-based multi-agent systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05687*, 2025.
- [35] A. K. Soni and R. Kumar. Bridging the gap: Improving agentic ai with strong and safe data practices. *Journal of Intelligent Learning Systems and Applications*, 17:257–266, 2025.
- [36] Lillian Tsai and Eugene Bagdasarian. Context is key for agent security. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2501, 2025.
- [37] Christoph Bühler, Matteo Biagiola, Luca Di Grazia, and Guido Salvaneschi. Securing ai agent execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.21236*, 2025.
- [38] Jiawen Shi, Zenghui Yuan, Guiyao Tie, Pan Zhou, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, and Lichao Sun. Prompt injection attack to tool selection in llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19793*, 2025.
- [39] Zihan Wang, Hongwei Li, Rui Zhang, Yu Liu, Wenbo Jiang, Wenshu Fan, Qingchuan Zhao, and Guowen Xu. Mpmma: Preference manipulation attack against model context protocol. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.11154*, 2025.
- [40] Anonymous. MCPTox: A benchmark for tool poisoning on real-world MCP servers. In *The Fortieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2025.
- [41] Ziyu Jiang, Mingyang Li, Guowei Yang, Junjie Wang, Yuekai Huang, Zhiyuan Chang, and Qing Wang. Mimicking the familiar: Dynamic command generation for information theft attacks in llm tool-learning system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11358*, 2025.
- [42] Yu Liu, Yuchong Xie, Mingyu Luo, Zesen Liu, Zhixiang Zhang, Kaikai Zhang, Zongjie Li, Ping Chen, Shuai Wang, and Dongdong She. Exploit tool invocation prompt for tool behavior hijacking in llm-based agentic system. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2509, 2025.

- [43] Rupeng Zhang, Haowei Wang, Junjie Wang, Mingyang Li, Yuekai Huang, Dandan Wang, and Qing Wang. From allies to adversaries: Manipulating llm tool-calling through adversarial injection. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2009–2028, 2025.
- [44] Idan Habler, Ken Huang, Vineeth Sai Narajala, and Prashant Kulkarni. Building a secure agentic ai application leveraging a2a protocol. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.16902*, 2025.
- [45] Jason Jabbour and Vijay Janapa Reddi. Generative ai agents in autonomous machines: A safety perspective. In *Proceedings of the 43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [46] Shishir G Patil, Tianjun Zhang, Xin Wang, and Joseph E Gonzalez. Gorilla: Large language model connected with massive apis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:126544–126565, 2024.
- [47] Jianrui Wang, Yitian Hong, Jiali Wang, Jiapeng Xu, Yang Tang, Qing-Long Han, and Jürgen Kurths. Cooperative and competitive multi-agent systems: From optimization to games. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 9(5):763–783, 2022.
- [48] Morrie Gasser. *Building a secure computer system*. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company New York, 1988.
- [49] Yang Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jean-Francois Ton, Xiaoying Zhang, Ruocheng Guo, Hao Cheng, Yegor Klochkov, Muhammad Faaiz Taufiq, and Hang Li. Trustworthy llms: a survey and guideline for evaluating large language models’ alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05374*, 2023.
- [50] Luca Beurer-Kellner and Marc Fischer. Mcp security notification: Tool poisoning attacks. <https://invariantlabs.ai/blog/mcp-security-notification-tool-poisoning-attacks>, 2025. Accessed: 07-09-2025.
- [51] Sugabsen Martins. Artificial intelligence-assisted classification of library resources: The case of claude ai. *Artificial Intelligence*, 2:27–2024, 2024.
- [52] OpenAI. Chatgpt by openai: Language model for conversations and tasks, 2023.
- [53] Zapier. Zapier: Automation for business & personal use, 2023.
- [54] Anysphere. Cursor: The ai code editor, 2023.
- [55] Trail of Bits. Jumping the line: How mcp servers can attack you before you ever use them. <https://blog.trailofbits.com/2025/04/21/jumping-the-line-how-mcp-servers-can-attack-you-before-you-ever-use-them/>, 2025. Accessed: 07-09-2025.
- [56] Hechuan Guo, Yongle Hao, Yue Zhang, Minghui Xu, Peizhuo Lyu, Jiezhi Chen, and Xiuzhen Cheng. A measurement study of model context protocol. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25292*, 2025.
- [57] Smithery. Smithery – find, build and ship mcp servers. <https://smithery.ai/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-04.
- [58] OpenMCP. Openmcp – making api → mcp servers easy. <https://openmcp.store/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-04.
- [59] MCP Market. Mcp market(china)– discover top mcp servers. <https://mcpmarket.cn/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-04.
- [60] Glama AI. Glama ai – all-in-one ai workspace: upload, analyze, visualize. <https://glama.ai/chat/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-04.
- [61] MCP.so. Mcp.so – find awesome mcp servers and clients. <https://mcp.so/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-04.
- [62] PulseMCP. Pulsemcp – everything mcp: servers, clients, use cases, tools. <https://www.pulsemcp.com/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-04.
- [63] Md Ahsan Ayub and Subhabrata Majumdar. Embedding-based classifiers can detect prompt injection attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.22284*, 2024.
- [64] Zhen Xiang, Linzhi Zheng, Yanjie Li, Junyuan Hong, Qinbin Li, Han Xie, Jiawei Zhang, Zidi Xiong, Chulin Xie, Carl Yang, et al. Guardagent: Safeguard llm agents by a guard agent via knowledge-enabled reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09187*, 2024.
- [65] Yizhu Wang, Sizhe Chen, Raghad Alkhudair, Basel Alomair, and David Wagner. Defending against prompt injection with datafilter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.19207*, 2025.
- [66] Yifan Zeng, Yiran Wu, Xiao Zhang, Huazheng Wang, and Qingyun Wu. Autodefense: Multi-agent llm defense against jailbreak attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04783*, 2024.

- [67] Ping He, Changjiang Li, Binbin Zhao, Tianyu Du, and Shouling Ji. Automatic red teaming llm-based agents with model context protocol tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.21011*, 2025.
- [68] protectai. Llm-guard. <https://github.com/protectai/llm-guard>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-04.
- [69] Kaijie Zhu, Xianjun Yang, Jindong Wang, Wenbo Guo, and William Yang Wang. Melon: Provable defense against indirect prompt injection attacks in ai agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05174*, 2025.
- [70] Huihao Jing, Haoran Li, Wenbin Hu, Qi Hu, Heli Xu, Tianshu Chu, Peizhao Hu, and Yangqiu Song. Mcip: Protecting mcp safety via model contextual integrity protocol. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14590*, 2025.
- [71] Zhiqiang Wang, Junyang Zhang, Guanquan Shi, HaoRan Cheng, Yunhao Yao, Kaiwen Guo, Haohua Du, and Xiang-Yang Li. Mindguard: Tracking, detecting, and attributing mcp tool poisoning attack via decision dependence graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20412*, 2025.
- [72] Kuo-Han Hung, Ching-Yun Ko, Ambrish Rawat, I Chung, Winston H Hsu, Pin-Yu Chen, et al. Attention tracker: Detecting prompt injection attacks in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.00348*, 2024.
- [73] Erik Jones, Anca Dragan, Aditi Raghunathan, and Jacob Steinhardt. Automatically auditing large language models via discrete optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15307–15329. PMLR, 2023.
- [74] Xiaotian Zou, Yongkang Chen, and Ke Li. Is the system message really important to jailbreaks in large language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14857*, 2024.
- [75] Zhangchen Xu, Fengqing Jiang, Luyao Niu, Jinyuan Jia, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Radha Poovendran. Safedecoding: Defending against jailbreak attacks via safety-aware decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08983*, 2024.
- [76] Wei Zhao, Zhe Li, Yige Li, Ye Zhang, and Jun Sun. Defending large language models against jailbreak attacks via layer-specific editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18166*, 2024.
- [77] Qianshan Wei, Tengchao Yang, Yaochen Wang, Xinfeng Li, Lijun Li, Zhenfei Yin, Yi Zhan, Thorsten Holz, Zhiqiang Lin, and XiaoFeng Wang. A-memguard: A proactive defense framework for llm-based agent memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.02373*, 2025.
- [78] Tiansheng Huang, Sihao Hu, and Ling Liu. Vaccine: Perturbation-aware alignment for large language models against harmful fine-tuning attack. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:74058–74088, 2024.
- [79] Pierre Peigné, Mikolaj Kniejski, Filip Sondej, Matthieu David, Jason Hoelscher-Obermaier, Christian Schroeder de Witt, and Esben Kran. Multi-agent security tax: Trading off security and collaboration capabilities in multi-agent systems. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 27573–27581, 2025.
- [80] Juhee Kim, Woohyuk Choi, and Byoungyoung Lee. Prompt flow integrity to prevent privilege escalation in llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.15547*, 2025.
- [81] Fangzhou Wu, Ethan Cecchetti, and Chaowei Xiao. System-level defense against indirect prompt injection attacks: An information flow control perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19091*, 2024.
- [82] Yuhao Wu, Franziska Roesner, Tadayoshi Kohno, Ning Zhang, and Umar Iqbal. Isolategpt: An execution isolation architecture for llm-based agentic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04960*, 2024.
- [83] Shihan Dou, Jiazhang Zhang, Jianxiang Zang, Yunbo Tao, Weikang Zhou, Haoxiang Jia, Shichun Liu, Yuming Yang, Shenxi Wu, Zhiheng Xi, et al. Multi-programming language sandbox for llms. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, pages 40–50, 2025.
- [84] Sana Ebrahimi, Mohsen Dehghankar, and Abolfazl Asudeh. An adversary-resistant multi-agent llm system via credibility scoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24239*, 2025.
- [85] Xu He, Di Wu, Yan Zhai, and Kun Sun. Sentinelagent: Graph-based anomaly detection in multi-agent systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24201*, 2025.
- [86] Tianneng Shi, Jingxuan He, Zhun Wang, Hongwei Li, Linyu Wu, Wenbo Guo, and Dawn Song. Progent: Programmable privilege control for llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11703*, 2025.
- [87] Tom Pawelek, Raj Patel, Charlotte Crowell, Noorbakhsh Amiri, Sudip Mittal, Shahram Rahimi, and Andy Perkins. Llmz+: Contextual prompt whitelist principles for agentic llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.18557*, 2025.
- [88] Haochen Gong, Chenxiao Li, Rui Chang, and Wenbo Shen. Secure and efficient access control for computer-use agents via context space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22256*, 2025.
- [89] Maximilian Stäbler, Tobias Müller, Frank Köster, and Christoph Langdon. Vault: Verified access control for llm-based knowledge graph querying. *ThinkMind Digital Library*, 2025.

- [90] Kaiyuan Zhang, Zian Su, Pin-Yu Chen, Elisa Bertino, Xiangyu Zhang, and Ninghui Li. Llm agents should employ security principles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24019*, 2025.
- [91] Xinfeng Li, Dong Huang, Jie Li, Hongyi Cai, Zhenhong Zhou, Wei Dong, XiaoFeng Wang, and Yang Liu. A vision for access control in llm-based agent systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.11108*, 2025.
- [92] Charles Fleming, Ashish Kundu, and Ramana Kompella. Uncertainty-aware, risk-adaptive access control for agentic systems using an llm-judged tbac model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.11414*, 2025.
- [93] Alireza Rezazadeh, Zichao Li, Ange Lou, Yuying Zhao, Wei Wei, and Yujia Bao. Collaborative memory: Multi-user memory sharing in llm agents with dynamic access control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.18279*, 2025.
- [94] Shoaib Ahmed Siddiqui, Radhika Gaonkar, Boris Köpf, David Krueger, Andrew Paverd, Ahmed Salem, Shruti Tople, Lukas Wutschitz, Menglin Xia, and Santiago Zanella-Béguelin. Permissive information-flow analysis for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03055*, 2024.
- [95] Peiran Wang, Yang Liu, Yunfei Lu, Yifeng Cai, Hongbo Chen, Qingyou Yang, Jie Zhang, Jue Hong, and Ye Wu. Agentarmor: Enforcing program analysis on agent runtime trace to defend against prompt injection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.01249*, 2025.
- [96] Manuel Costa, Boris Köpf, Aashish Kolluri, Andrew Paverd, Mark Russinovich, Ahmed Salem, Shruti Tople, Lukas Wutschitz, and Santiago Zanella-Béguelin. Securing ai agents with information-flow control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23643*, 2025.
- [97] Zhipeng Yin, Zichong Wang, Weifeng Xu, Jun Zhuang, Pallab Mozumder, Antoinette Smith, and Wenbin Zhang. Digital forensics in the age of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02963*, 2025.
- [98] Maxim Chernyshev, Zubair Baig, and Robin Ram Mohan Doss. Towards large language model (llm) forensics using llm-based invocation log analysis. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Workshop on Large AI Systems and Models with Privacy and Safety Analysis*, pages 89–96, 2023.
- [99] Yoo Yeon Sung, Hannah Kim, and Dan Zhang. Verila: A human-centered evaluation framework for interpretable verification of llm agent failures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.12651*, 2025.
- [100] Amine Barrak. Traceability and accountability in role-specialized multi-agent llm pipelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.07614*, 2025.
- [101] Zehang Deng, Yongjian Guo, Changzhou Han, Wanlun Ma, Junwu Xiong, Sheng Wen, and Yang Xiang. Ai agents under threat: A survey of key security challenges and future pathways. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 57(7):1–36, 2025.
- [102] Xinyi Li, Sai Wang, Siqi Zeng, Yu Wu, and Yi Yang. A survey on llm-based multi-agent systems: workflow, infrastructure, and challenges. *Vicinagearth*, 1(1):9, 2024.
- [103] Zhaorun Chen, Zhen Xiang, Chaowei Xiao, Dawn Song, and Bo Li. Agentpoison: Red-teaming llm agents via poisoning memory or knowledge bases. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:130185–130213, 2024.
- [104] Tianyu Cui, Yanling Wang, Chuanpu Fu, Yong Xiao, Sijia Li, Xinhao Deng, Yunpeng Liu, Qinglin Zhang, Ziyi Qiu, Peiyang Li, et al. Risk taxonomy, mitigation, and assessment benchmarks of large language model systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05778*, 2024.

## A Methodology

### A.1 Ethics considerations

This work does not involve human subjects at any stage. All processed data consists of academic discussion papers or statistical datasets, all of which can be retrieved from open sources. Therefore, this work raises no ethical concerns related to human subjects, such as informed consent or privacy risks.

### A.2 LLM usage considerations

In this work, LLMs were used solely to assist with the refinement of the manuscript, including grammatical polishing, clarity improvements, and stylistic adjustments. The models were not involved in designing the methodology, generating experimental insights, or producing any novel technical contributions. All conceptual frameworks, analyses, and results presented in this paper were developed independently by the authors. The use of LLMs, therefore, serves only as an editorial aid and does not influence or alter the scientific validity or originality of the research.

### A.3 Taxonomy Appendix

**Scope.** We focus on *runtime interaction security* of LLM-based agents: how agents *perceive, decide, and act* through protocols (e.g., MCP/A2A), tools/APIs, and local resources. Training-time data poisoning, model theft, and pretraining misalignment are *out of scope* unless they directly mediate runtime decisions. We expanded with class-specific queries (e.g., “prompt injection”, “tool poisoning”, “A2A spoofing”) and applied forward/backward snowballing from seed papers.

When processing titles, papers clearly unrelated to compartmentalization are discarded. Abstracts are inspected if the title does not enable an unambiguous decision, and are sufficient to make an unambiguous decision in the most cases. We analyze the content of papers to determine if the study works in Stage 1-3 defined in Section 3.3.

**Inclusion/Exclusion criteria.** We *include* artifacts that (i) concern LLM-based agents or agentic pipelines that *call tools, access resources, or coordinate with agents*; (ii) discuss security failures/defenses with *operational impact* (C/I/A/accountability); and (iii) provide sufficient detail to map to at least one Stage of our mismatch chain. We *exclude* artifacts that (i) only evaluate single-model harmlessness without external action, (ii) concern training-time attacks unrelated to runtime decisions, or (iii) lack verifiable technical substance (e.g., purely conceptual blog posts).

### A.4 Source Search Appendix

The keywords considered for the automated search of papers on Google Scholar are: LLMs, agent, MAS, and protocol (including derived terms, as well as related attack keywords such as jailbreaking, poisoning, and prompt injection, and defense keywords such as detection and isolation). This yields 279 retrieved records, after which we performed automated de-duplication over titles/DOIs/URLs and normalized preprint/venue versions. Two reviewers independently screened titles/abstracts, followed by full-text screening, resulting in 211 de-duplicated unique items. Many false positives originate from projects that use these terms in unrelated contexts—such as general-purpose chatbot applications, multi-agent coordination frameworks without security relevance, or protocol utilities that do not involve adversarial interaction. We further inspect associated authors and organizations to identify additional works that follow similar security-oriented design principles but were missed due to inconsistent terminology. Finally, we incorporated 104 papers from prior surveys and domain knowledge into the final included corpus to obtain a consolidated set of mainstream attack and defense techniques across LLMs, agents, MAS environments, and protocol-driven systems.

**Corpus construction.** We performed a systematic literature review across systems-security venues (e.g., IEEE S&P, USENIX Security, CCS, NDSS), AI/ML venues (e.g., NeurIPS, ICML, ICLR, ACL), and major digital libraries (IEEE Xplore, ACM DL, USENIX, ACL Anthology), complemented with arXiv categories (cs.CR, cs.AI, cs.LG) and Google Scholar to capture grey literature. The search window spans *Jan 1, 2023* to *Nov 1, 2025* (UTC).

**Search strings.** Grounded in our B–I–P lens, we used conjunctive queries targeting the intersection of agents, security, and tool-mediated actions, for example:

```
(LLM OR "AI" OR agent) AND (security OR attack OR defense OR authorization) AND
(tool OR API OR protocol OR interaction OR permission)
```

**Coding scheme and data extraction.** For each artifact we extract: venue/year; component under study (*victim component*: user query, system prompt, tool return, agent return, local resource, protocol metadata); coverage of

Table 4: Stage-by-Stage trace before/after enabling belief-aware authorization.

Stage	Event	Key B-I-P Annotations	Outcome
S1	recv( $p_{mal}$ )	$B(\varphi_{mal} \mid \lambda_{low}), F \rightarrow \text{Low}$	Before: $\checkmark$ After: $\checkmark$
S2	plan( $\xi$ )	$\xi : \langle \alpha_{danger}, \dots, \text{just.uses} \ni (\varphi_{mal}, \lambda_{low}) \rangle$	Before: $\checkmark$ After: $\checkmark$
S3	permit( $\alpha_{danger}$ )	$\rho(\alpha_{danger}) = \text{High}; \text{read just.uses}$	Before: <b>ALLOW</b> ; After: <b>DENY/HITL</b>
R	exec( $\alpha_{danger}$ )	–	Before: <b>Leak</b> ; After: <b>Unreachable</b>

mismatch Stages (Stage 1 to 3); evaluation setting (simulated, real-system, incident); *evidence level* (concept/demo/empirical/incident); *reproducibility assets* (code/data/config); and *attack/defense role*. We will release a machine-readable table and scripts to reproduce the corpus and figures.

**PRISMA-style flow and availability.** A PRISMA-style diagram summarizes  $279 \rightarrow 211 \rightarrow 102$  with reasons for exclusion (non-agentic, training-only, insufficient technical detail, duplicates).

**Threats to validity (brief).** (i) *Venue bias*: security incidents often appear first in grey literature; we mitigate via GL tagging and sensitivity analyses. (ii) *Temporal drift*: the ecosystem evolves quickly; we record retrieval timestamps and archive URLs. (iii) *Selection bias*: to reduce omission, we perform snowballing and query expansion; the artifact documents all queries.

## A.5 Proof of Theorem 1

**Definition A.1** (Low-trust-derived intent). An intention  $I(\xi)$  is *low-trust-derived* iff  $\exists(\varphi, \lambda) \in \text{just.uses}$  with  $\text{Trust}(\varphi, \lambda) = \text{Low}$ .

*Proof sketch.*

1. O1/O2 ensure each exec is preceded by a plan whose just.uses over-approximates consumed beliefs.
2. If any cited  $(\varphi, \lambda)$  maps to **Low** under  $F$ , the enforcement algorithm returns **DENY**, so permit( $\alpha$ ) cannot appear.
3. Monotonicity of  $F$  prevents raising trust by weakening evidence/provenance; OC-2 conservatively treats omissions as **Low**. Hence exec( $\alpha$ ) is unreachable.

□

### Minimal log schema (for auditability).

We log  $\{\text{ts}, \text{event} \in E, \text{alpha?}, \text{just.uses?}, \text{trust\_eval}[]\}$ , where  $\text{trust\_eval}[]$  records  $(\varphi, \lambda, \tau_{\text{epi}}, \tau_{\text{prov}}, \text{Trust})$  per cited belief. This suffices for post-hoc reconstruction of the backward slice from any exec to its beliefs and to check Theorem 1.

**Corollary 1. Matrix safety** Under Theorem 1, any trajectory that starts in  $\langle \text{Low-Trust}, \text{Low-Risk} \rangle$  and attempts to cross into the Failure quadrant  $\langle \text{Low-Trust}, \text{High-Risk} \rangle$  is cut at Stage-3. The only admissible High-risk executions inhabit the HITL Zone of Fig. 4 (i.e.,  $\text{Trust} = \text{High}$  with O2 satisfied).

**What the Theorem does not claim (scope & limits).** The result is a safety property about executions, not a correctness claim about belief formation. If  $\text{Trust} = \text{High}$  and  $\rho = \text{High}$ , O2 still requires HITL/extra attestation to admit execution (Fig. 4). If deployers weaken A1 (e.g., optional justifications) or choose a non-monotone  $F$ , the theorem’s preconditions fail; our enforcement then reduces to I3 (static PoLP) only. Such configuration choices are auditable because denials will cite “no justification/non-monotone trust” in logs.

## B Case Study: B-I-P for the GitHub MCP Incident and Chain Cutting at Stage 3

**Context and Assumptions.** We reuse the notation from Sec. 3 in the main paper. An instrumented agentic system is modeled as  $M = \langle S, E, \Rightarrow, P, V \rangle$ , with events  $E = \{\text{recv}(p), \text{plan}(\xi), \text{permit}(\alpha), \text{exec}(\alpha), \text{log}(\mu)\}$ . Beliefs carry labels  $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\text{src}} \times \Lambda_{\text{int}} \times \Lambda_{\text{age}} \times \Lambda_{\text{path}}$ ; intentions are tuples  $\xi = \langle \alpha, \text{args}, \text{tgt}, \text{just} \rangle$  with machine-parsable  $\text{just.uses} = \{(\varphi_k, \lambda_k)\}$ . Trust is computed by a monotone aggregator  $\text{Trust}(\varphi, \lambda) = F(\tau_{\text{epi}}(\varphi), \tau_{\text{prov}}(\lambda)) \in \{\text{High}, \text{Low}\}$ . Risk  $\rho(\alpha) \in \{\text{Low}, \text{High}\}$  classifies action consequences.



### B.1 Reconstruction of the MCP Incident without Stage 3

We formalize the four-step mismatch chain (Fig. 5) for the GitHub MCP incident reported in Sec. 4.2 (external/tool returns):

1. **Stage 1 (Belief Corruption).**

$$M, s \models [\text{recv}(p_{mal})] B_i(\varphi_{mal} \mid \lambda_{low}),$$

where  $\lambda_{low}.\text{src} = \text{MCP.ToolReturn}(\text{GitHub.Issues})$ ,  $\lambda_{low}.\text{int} = \text{Instructional}$ , and  $F(\tau_{\text{epi}}, \tau_{\text{prov}}) = \text{Low}$ . The agent reads a public issue containing an indirect prompt injection; the return is unverified content.

2. **Stage 2 (Malicious Intention Generation).** From  $B_i(\varphi_{mal} \mid \lambda_{low})$ , the planner forms

$I_i(\xi) = I_i(\langle \alpha_{danger}, \text{args}, \text{tgt}, \text{just} \rangle)$  with  $\alpha_{danger} = \text{post\_comment}(\text{public\_issue}, \text{content} = \text{read\_file}(\text{private\_repo/secret.txt}))$ , and  $\text{just.uses} \ni (\varphi_{mal}, \lambda_{low})$  (Obligation O2).

3. **Stage 3 (Permission–Intent Intersection).** With belief-blind authorization (common static scopes),  $M, s \models I_i(\xi) \wedge \text{Perm}(\alpha_{danger})$  holds because the agent identity has both “read private repo” and “post public comment” permissions.

4. **Stage 4 (Failure).**  $M, s \models [\alpha_{danger}] \text{Failure}$ : the agent exfiltrates private content into a public issue.

### B.2 Belief-aware Authorization at Stage 3 (Chain Cutting)

We enforce the Stage 3 safety property (Sec. 3.3): no run may contain  $\text{exec}(\alpha)$  with  $\rho(\alpha) = \text{High}$  whose closest preceding plan( $\xi$ ) cites any  $(\varphi, \lambda)$  with  $\text{Trust}(\varphi, \lambda) = \text{Low}$ .

**Policy Rules (minimal instantiation).** Let  $\rho(\cdot)$  label high-consequence actions (e.g., outbound posting, external network writes, destructive filesystem ops). We use three rules:

**R1: Low-Trust  $\rightarrow$  High-Risk = DENY.**

**R2: Missing/Unverifiable Justification = DENY.**

**R3: HITL Zone for High $\times$ High.**

For  $F$ , we adopt the concrete form from Sec. 3.2:  $F(\tau, \pi) = \text{High}$  iff  $\tau \geq \theta$  and  $\pi \in \{\text{attested}, \text{verified}\}$ ; otherwise Low.

**Minimal Audit Log Schema.** To support post-hoc reconstruction (Appendix A.3), we log:

```
{ ts, event, alpha?,
  just.uses: [ {belief_id, \lambda, \tau_au_epi, \tau_au_prov, Trust}, ... ],
  decision: PERMIT | DENY | HITL, reason }
```

### B.3 Drop-in Integration Points for MCP Clients

- **Ingress labeling (O1).** Tag all MCP tool returns with  $\lambda$  at the adapter boundary; unknown or unsigned sources map to  $\tau_{\text{prov}} = \text{unverified}$ .
- **Intent provenance (O2).** The planner must emit  $\text{just.uses}$  with references to consumed beliefs; omissions are treated as Low trust.
- **Stage 3 PEP.** Gate every high-consequence sink (e.g., external posting, network egress, destructive FS ops) using Rules R1–R3.
- **Secure logging.** Emit the minimal log schema above to enable verifiable replay and checks of the Stage 3 property.

**Guarantee.** Under O1/O2 and monotone  $F$ , Rule R1 cuts all trajectories that attempt to enter the Failure quadrant (Low – Trust, High – Risk); only High-risk executions in the HITL zone are admissible (as shown in Fig. 4).