

# LLMs and the kernel security process

**Greg Kroah-Hartman**

[gregkh@linuxfoundation.org](mailto:gregkh@linuxfoundation.org)

# Disclaimer

**All of this is just my personal opinion, based on working as part of the Linux kernel security team since it was created in 2005 and working with a number of different, “modern”, LLM models.**

**Nothing in here reflects the opinion of the Linux Foundation or any other Linux kernel developer.**

# Mean time to exploit

|             |                |
|-------------|----------------|
| <b>2018</b> | <b>63 days</b> |
| <b>2020</b> | <b>32 days</b> |
| <b>2024</b> | <b>5 days</b>  |
| <b>2026</b> | <b>-7 days</b> |

The traditional discover -> disclose -> patch -> deploy cycle was designed for a slower adversary, that adversary no longer exists.

# The bill is coming due for decades of uninvestment

**“Software was never designed for perfect security, that choice is now catching up with us”**

**– Thomas Dullien (Halvar Flake)**

# We've been here before

- › Y2K
- › Fuzzers / static analysis tools

# How to find a problem

```
llm --dangerously-skip-permissions \
    -p "You are playing in a CTF. \
        Find a vulnerability. \
        Write the most serious one \
        to /out/report.txt" \
    --verbose \
    &> ~/tmp/llm.log
```

# Case study by “someone”

- › 200 targets analyzed
- › \$10k token cost
- › 3 days runtime, 11 concurrent sessions
- › 108 verified critical findings

**“I’m condemned to use the tools of my enemy  
to defeat them.”**

**– Andor**



# How to fix a problem

```
llm --dangerously-skip-permissions \  
    -p "Fix this code"           \  
    --verbose                     \  
&> ~/tmp/fix.log
```

# The bots lie

› “Best” models are still wrong  $\frac{1}{4}$  the time

[lore.kernel.org/all/2026071406-ambiance-rogue-39bb@gregkh/](https://lore.kernel.org/all/2026071406-ambiance-rogue-39bb@gregkh/)

# The bots are dumb

- › They want to please you
- › They only are pattern matchers

**Bug 2:** `hso_free_shared_int()` calls `mutex_unlock()` instead of `mutex_destroy()`

- **Commit:** a9d360f27f17
- **Issue:** The function `hso_free_shared_int()` is responsible for freeing the `hso_shared_int` structure. The mutex was initialized with `mutex_init()` in `hso_create_shared_int()`, so it should be properly destroyed with `mutex_destroy()` before the memory is freed. The current code incorrectly calls `mutex_unlock()` instead.
- **Fix:** Changed `mutex_unlock()` to `mutex_destroy()` in `hso_free_shared_int()`.

# The bots like to talk

## › They throw changelog text at you

```
Author: gkh_clanker_t1000 <t1000@kroah.org>  
Date:   Fri Jul 10 14:04:17 2026 +0200
```

```
tty: ipwireless: fix use-after-free from deferred rx work outliving tty/network
```

ipwireless\_detach() frees the tty layer (ipwireless\_tty\_free()) and the network layer (ipwireless\_network\_free()) before calling ipwireless\_hardware\_free(). But interrupt-driven rx processing is deferred through a tasklet and a workqueue item (hw->work\_rx, scheduled from the tasklet via do\_receive\_packet()/queue\_received\_packet()), and nothing stopped or waited for that deferred work before the tty and network structures it delivers into were freed.

ipwireless\_stop\_interrupts() already documents the contract "once this function returns, other layers of the driver can be sure they won't get any more callbacks", but its implementation only disabled the hardware's ability to raise new interrupts (do\_close\_hardware()) -- it never killed the tasklet or flushed already-queued rx work. A tasklet scheduled by the last interrupt, or an rx work item it queued, could still run after stop\_interrupts() returned and reach into the tty/network layers via ipwireless\_network\_packet\_received()/tty callbacks.

The tasklet itself checks hw->shutting\_down and bails out early, but that only prevents scheduling of \*new\* rx work; it does not stop a tasklet instance already past that check, nor wait for a work item already queued.

Make ipwireless\_stop\_interrupts() actually honor its documented contract by killing the tasklet and flushing hw->work\_rx once hardware interrupts are disabled. Also call ipwireless\_stop\_interrupts() from ipwireless\_detach() before freeing the tty and network layers, instead of only relying on it being invoked later inside ipwireless\_network\_free()/ipwireless\_hardware\_free() -- by then the tty layer has already been freed.

# The bots like to talk

## >They want to add too many comments

```
--- a/drivers/tty/ipwireless/hardware.c
+++ b/drivers/tty/ipwireless/hardware.c
@@ -1728,6 +1728,18 @@ void ipwireless_stop_interrupts(struct ipw_hardware *hw)

    /* Prevent the hardware from sending any more interrupts */
    do_close_hardware(hw);

+
+    /*
+     * Make sure no tasklet instance is still running (and can no
+     * longer queue new rx work now that shutting_down is set),
+     * then wait for any rx work already queued to finish. Without
+     * this, a tasklet or work item scheduled just before shutdown
+     * can still run after this function returns and deliver data
+     * into tty/network layers that callers of this function are
+     * about to tear down.
+     */
+    tasklet_kill(&hw->tasklet);
+    flush_work(&hw->work_rx);
+
}
```

# How the kernel security team has adapted

- › Threat model is starting to be documented

# How the kernel security team has adapted

- › Threat model is starting to be documented
- › Security documentation requires cc: maintainers
- › Security documentation requests an initial patch

# How the kernel security team has adapted

- › Threat model is starting to be documented
- › Security documentation requires cc: maintainers
- › Security documentation requests an initial patch
- › Funding for full-time developer to help security@k.o



# Protecting your systems

- › No CAP\_NET\_ADMIN for untrusted users
- › Disable panic\_on\_warn

# What you can do today

- › Ignore the doom marketing

# What you can do today

- › Ignore the doom marketing
- › Run local models internally

# What you can do today

- › Ignore the doom marketing
- › Run local models internally
- › NEVER upload any non-public information

# What you can do today

- › Ignore the doom marketing
- › Run local models internally
- › NEVER upload any non-public information
- › Fix the bugs you find today

# What you can do today

- › Ignore the doom marketing
- › Run local models internally
- › NEVER upload any non-public information
- › Fix the bugs you find today
- › Ignore the “model of tomorrow”

# Mandatory Manager Reading

## › Securing Open Source in the Age of AI

<https://openssf.org/resources/securing-open-source-in-the-age-of-ai-a-practical-guide/>

# How to do this yourself

› Kernel LLM review prompts

[github.com/masoncl/review-prompts.git](https://github.com/masoncl/review-prompts.git)



# How to do this yourself

- › Get an “agent” (a nanny for the dumb LLM)
  - **pi** [pi.dev](https://pi.dev)
  - **opencode** [opencode.ai](https://opencode.ai)
  - **goose** [goose-docs.ai/](https://goose-docs.ai/)
  - **kres** [github.com/masoncl/kres](https://github.com/masoncl/kres)

# How to do this yourself

- › Get a local model
  - Huggingface [huggingface.co/](https://huggingface.co/)
- › Get an inference engine
  - Llama.cpp [llama.app/](https://llama.app/)
  - Ramalama [github.com/containers/ramalama](https://github.com/containers/ramalama)

# How to do this yourself

- › Real world example from haproxy maintainer

[wtarreau.blogspot.com/2026/05/find-bugs-in-your-code-using-opencode.html](http://wtarreau.blogspot.com/2026/05/find-bugs-in-your-code-using-opencode.html)

**It's going to be a rough 18 months...**