OWASP MCP Top 10

Compliance assessment — 2025

Server: io.github.vola-trebla/ast-impact-mapper-mcp

Slug: io-github-vola-trebla-ast-impact-mapper-mcp
Scan id: 2d790550-56dd-4fdc-be0a-0c4cc58a0291

Assessed at: 2026-05-31 07:28:10 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 io.github.vola-trebla/ast-impact-mapper-mcp 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: 0%

Rules version: 2026-04-23

3. Controls summary

ControlName	Status	Evidence
MCP01Prompt Injection?	Not assessed	0
MCP02Tool Poisoning'	Unmet	1
MCP03 Command Injection?	Not assessed	0
MCP04Data Exfiltration?	Not assessed	0
MCP05 Privilege		

Escalation?
Not assessed0
MCP06
Excessive
Permissions?
Not assessed0
MCP07
Insecure
Configuration
? Not
assessed0
MCP08
Dependency
Vulnerabilities
? Not
assessed0
MCP09
Logging &
Monitoring
Failures? Not
assessed0
MCP10Supply
Chain
Compromise'
Unmet1

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

' Unmet

0/15 mapped assessor rule(s) are proven to have executed; 1 finding(s) observed (1 critical); at least one finding is at or above the high threshold (status: unmet). 15 mapped assessor(s) did not execute, so this finding-backed result does not imply complete control coverage.

Evidence:

[Critical]
Official
Namespace
Squatting
(finding ff9258a1
-1228-499f-8376-
bf70496df401,
confidence 90%)

SOURCE: external-content at initialize.server_name — The MCP client surfaces the server name verbatim in its approval dialog, and the LLM ingests the server name alongside the tool descriptions. A nam

Required mitigations:

- If you own the server and are NOT affiliated with the vendor whose namespace it contains, rename the server to remove the vendor token. Choose a name that makes your actual publisher identity clear. If you ARE a vendor-approved partner and intentionally use the vendor's namespace, request inclusion in the rule's OFFICIAL_NAMESPACES.verified_github_orgs list by publishing the server under a vendor-sanctioned GitHub organisation. Users deciding whether to approve the server should check the repository owner against the vendor's published list of approved partners before granting trust.

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

? 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: D1 (execution-ledger); D2 (execution-ledger); D3 (execution-ledger); D4 (execution-ledger); D5 (execution-ledger); D6 (execution-ledger); D7 (execution-ledger).

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; 1 finding(s) observed (1 critical); 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:

[Critical]
Official
Namespace
Squatting
(finding ff9258a1
-1228-499f-8376-
bf70496df401,
confidence 90%)

SOURCE: external-content at initialize.server_name — The MCP client surfaces the server name verbatim in its approval dialog, and the LLM ingests the server name alongside the tool descriptions. A nam

Required mitigations:

- If you own the server and are NOT affiliated with the vendor whose namespace it contains, rename the server to remove the vendor token. Choose a name that makes your actual publisher identity clear. If you ARE a vendor-approved partner and intentionally use the vendor's namespace, request inclusion in the rule's OFFICIAL_NAMESPACES.verified_github_orgs list by publishing the server under a vendor-sanctioned GitHub organisation. Users deciding whether to approve the server should check the repository owner against the vendor's published list of approved partners before granting trust.

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: `2026-05-31T07:28:10.605Z`
Canonicalization: `RFC8785`

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

```
mYoepb7mYJ/VLyvdhKC+IloRK5DHIqA72TGFqfTdOSA=
```

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.
```