OWASP MCP Top 10

Compliance assessment — 2025

Server: agentipy

Slug: agentipy
Scan id: f0c45b87-32d2-46ad-bbaa-e174a79c65f4

Assessed at: 2026-05-24 06:33:59 UTC
Sentinel version: 0.4.0
Rules version: 2026-04-23

' Non-compliant

DRAFT for review — not legal advice. See attestation block for verification instructions.

DRAFT

Table of contents

1. Executive summary
2. Coverage & transparency
3. Controls summary
4. Control details
5. Multi-step attack chains
6. Cryptographic attestation

1. Executive summary

Assessment of agentipy against OWASP MCP Top 10: overall status non compliant. Of 10 controls, 0 met, 2 unmet, 0 partial, 8 not assessed, 0 not applicable. 2 control(s) had complete mapped-assessor execution evidence; 8 lacked sufficient execution evidence and 0 were outside the current assessor mapping. Unmet controls have findings at or above the framework's mandatory severity threshold and should be remediated before relying on this server in a regulated deployment. All claims are traceable to individual finding rows via finding_id and to the governing rule via rule_id; the enclosing signed envelope commits MCP Sentinel to the exact bytes of this report.

2. Coverage & transparency

Coverage band: minimal

Coverage ratio: 6%

Rules version: 2026-04-23

Analysis techniques applied:

- composite
- dependency-audit
- similarity
- structural

3. Controls summary

ControlName	Status	Evidence
MCP01Prompt Injection?	Not assessed	0
MCP02Tool Poisoning?	Not assessed	0
MCP03 Command		

Injection? Not assessed0

MCP04Data Exfiltration? Not assessed0

MCP05 Privilege Escalation? Not assessed0

MCP06 Excessive Permissions? Not assessed0

MCP07 Insecure Configuration ? Not assessed0

MCP08 Dependency Vulnerabilities' Unmet2

MCP09 Logging & Monitoring Failures? Not assessed0

MCP10Supply Chain Compromise' Unmet2

4. Control details

MCP01 — Prompt Injection

? Not assessed

0/24 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: A1 (execution-ledger); A5 (execution-ledger); A7 (execution-ledger); A8 (execution-ledger); A9 (execution-ledger); B5 (execution-ledger); F1 (execution-ledger); F6 (execution-ledger); G1 (execution-ledger); G2 (execution-ledger); G3 (execution-ledger); G4 (execution-ledger); G5 (execution-ledger); H2 (execution-ledger); H3 (execution-ledger); I3 (execution-ledger); I6 (execution-ledger); I7 (execution-ledger); J3 (execution-ledger); J5 (execution-ledger); J6 (execution-ledger); N4 (execution-ledger); N9 (execution-ledger); N12 (execution-ledger).

MCP02 — Tool Poisoning

? Not assessed

0/15 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: A2 (execution-ledger); A4 (execution-ledger); A6 (execution-ledger); F2 (execution-ledger); F5 (execution-ledger); G6 (execution-ledger); I1 (execution-ledger); I2 (execution-ledger); I5 (execution-ledger); I16 (execution-ledger); J5 (execution-ledger); J6 (execution-ledger); K12 (execution-ledger); K13 (execution-ledger); L15 (execution-ledger).

MCP03 — Command Injection

? Not assessed

0/6 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: C1 (execution-ledger); C9 (execution-ledger); C13 (execution-ledger); C16 (execution-ledger); J2 (execution-ledger); J7 (execution-ledger).

MCP04 — Data Exfiltration

? Not assessed

0/15 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: A3 (execution-ledger); F1 (execution-ledger); F3 (execution-ledger); F7 (execution-ledger); G7 (execution-ledger); I9 (execution-ledger); I13 (execution-ledger); K18 (execution-ledger); O4 (execution-ledger); O5 (execution-ledger); O6 (execution-ledger); O8 (execution-ledger); O9 (execution-ledger); O10 (execution-ledger); P3 (execution-ledger).

MCP05 — Privilege Escalation

? Not assessed

0/7 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: C2 (execution-ledger); C8 (execution-ledger); C10 (execution-ledger); C12 (execution-ledger); I4 (execution-ledger); I12 (execution-ledger); J1 (execution-ledger).

MCP06 — Excessive Permissions

? Not assessed

0/7 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: A2 (execution-ledger); B3 (execution-ledger); B7 (execution-ledger); E4 (execution-ledger); F2 (execution-ledger); I11 (execution-ledger); I16 (execution-ledger).

MCP07 — Insecure Configuration

? Not assessed

0/11 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: B6 (execution-ledger); C7 (execution-ledger); C8 (execution-ledger); C11 (execution-ledger); C14 (execution-ledger); C15 (execution-ledger); D6 (execution-ledger); E1 (execution-ledger); E2 (execution-ledger); I15 (execution-ledger); J4 (execution-ledger).

MCP08 — Dependency Vulnerabilities

' Unmet

0/7 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; 2 finding(s) observed (2 high); at least one finding is at or above the high threshold (status: unmet). 7 mapped assessor(s) did not execute, so this finding-backed result does not imply complete control coverage.

Evidence:

[High] Typosquatting Risk in Dependencies (finding b4791ae5-28ca-44fb-a9ed-382b20d625a1, confidence 90%)

SOURCE: external-content at pypi:pydantic-ai@0.0.19 — Dependency names are external content resolved from public package registries. A near-miss to a popular canonical name is a supply-chain anomaly u

[High] Typosquatting Risk in Dependencies (finding 599b03bc-c245-

44cb-9fab-5227c
2b7cc72,
confidence 88%)
SOURCE: external-content at pypi:pynacl@1.5.0 — Dependency names are external content resolved from public package registries. A near-miss to a popular canonical name is a supply-chain anomaly under I

Required mitigations:

- Verify that the flagged dependency is the package you intended to install. Open the registry page for the candidate and compare publisher, publish date, download count, and postinstall scripts against the target. If it is not the intended package, replace it with the legitimate target, regenerate the lockfile, and audit the install environment (CI and developer machines) for any artifacts the malicious package may have written. Adopt a typosquat-aware package firewall (Socket.dev, Snyk Advisor, GitHub Dependabot) that rejects near-miss names at install time, in line with ISO 27001 A.5.21 supply-chain controls.

MCP09 — Logging & Monitoring Failures

? Not assessed

0/6 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; no adverse findings were observed, but the control is not assessed because execution evidence is incomplete. Unexecuted assessors: C6 (execution-ledger); E3 (execution-ledger); K1 (execution-ledger); K2 (execution-ledger); K3 (execution-ledger); K20 (execution-ledger).

MCP10 — Supply Chain Compromise

' Unmet

0/27 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; 2 finding(s) observed (2 high); at least one finding is at or above the high threshold (status: unmet). 27 mapped assessor(s) did not execute, so this finding-backed result does not imply complete control coverage.

Evidence:

[High]
Typosquatting
Risk in
Dependencies
(finding b4791ae
5-28ca-44fb-a9e
d-382b20d625a1
, confidence
90%)
SOURCE: external-content at pypi:pydantic-ai@0.0.19 — Dependency names are external content resolved from public package registries. A near-miss to a popular canonical name is a supply-chain anomaly u

[High]
Typosquatting
Risk in
Dependencies
(finding
599b03bc-c245-
44cb-9fab-5227c
2b7cc72,
confidence 88%)
SOURCE: external-content at pypi:pynacl@1.5.0 — Dependency names are external content resolved from public package registries. A near-miss to a popular canonical name is a supply-chain anomaly under I

Required mitigations:

- Verify that the flagged dependency is the package you intended to install. Open the registry page for the candidate and compare publisher, publish date, download count, and postinstall scripts against the target. If it is not the intended package, replace it with the legitimate target, regenerate the lockfile, and audit the install environment (CI and developer machines) for any artifacts the malicious package may have written. Adopt a typosquat-aware package firewall (Socket.dev, Snyk Advisor, GitHub Dependabot) that rejects near-miss names at install time, in line with ISO 27001 A.5.21 supply-chain controls.

5. Multi-step attack chains

No multi-step attack chains were synthesized for this server.

6. Cryptographic attestation

Algorithm: HMAC-SHA256
Key ID: mcps-hkdf-e8990a4e1526
Signer: mcp-sentinel/v1
Signed at: 2026-05-24T06:33:59.977Z
Canonicalization: RFC8785

HMAC-SHA256 signature (base64, wrapped at 64 chars):

```
Ih8v3xEgP0maLIRv7MM2Nuj0ni84br71U6Zvnk/E3hU=
```

Verification instructions:

```
To verify this report:
  1. Extract the report body (everything except the .attestation field).
  2. Canonicalize the body via RFC 8785 (JCS).
  3. Compute HMAC-SHA256 with the signing key for key_id "mcps-hkdf-e8990a4e1526".
  4. Base64-encode the result and compare with the signature above.
```