

Linux CVE workgroup

Context

- Since Feb '24, Linux is its own CNA
- [Linux Kernel CVEs, What Has Caused So Many to Suddenly Show Up? - Greg Kroah-Hartman @ CNCF](#)
- CVE volume has significantly increased
 - Before: ~20/month
 - After: ~60/**week**
 - 1300+ filed from past commits

Challenge

- How do we triage them all?
- Different challenges for different players in the community
- For a cloud provider:
 - Can't reboot machines
 - Decision in {ignore, (expedite) backport, livepatch}
- Applicability depends on threat model, exploitability, permissions, etc.
- Is there space for collaboration?

Outcome from LPC 2024

- Very high interest demonstrated by many different entities
 - Google, Microsoft, Canonical, Oracle, Red Hat, SUSE, Amazon...
 - Intention to collaborate on community-powered analysis
- CNA team is open to add our analyses to CVE records
- Threat models can be different, but the baseline analysis stays the same
- No engagement should be demanded to maintainers

Linux CVE workgroup

- Idea: share basic and indisputed CVE analysis with the community
 - Following a threat-model agnostic template
 - Everyone is already doing this work independently!
 - Reduce toil
 - Improve accuracy
- Goal: become an established source of vulnerability assessments
- <https://github.com/cloud-its/linux-cve-analysis>
- Bi-weekly meetings
- #linux-cve-workgroup IRC channel on libera.chat

Example – CVE-2024-46800

reachability: Local

memory_corruption: yes

bug_class: Use-After-Free

impact: LPE

privileges_required: no

notes: An exploit has been submitted as part of kCTF (exp192). Privileged capabilities (CAP_NET_ADMIN) in user namespace are sufficient to exploit the bug.

author: Google

Example – CVE-2024-46800

reachability: Local

Some may stop here

memory_corruption: yes

bug_class: Use-After-Free

impact: LPE

Some may worry here

privileges_required: no

notes: An exploit has been submitted as part of kCTF (exp192). Privileged capabilities (CAP_NET_ADMIN) in user namespace are sufficient to exploit the bug.

author: Google

Some may stop here

Why not CVSS?

- ✓ Industry-standard for vulnerability severity scoring
- ✓ Some organizations need to provide it as part of their advisories
- ✗ Fails to properly describe a kernel vulnerability
 - What's the difference between a WARN_ON and a null ptr deref?
 - What's the difference between a local process and a VM?
- ✗ Specific to threat models, environments, configurations
 - Some CVEs already have different CVSS scores

→ Idea: a template that is a **subset** of CVSS

What's working?

- Collaboration is recognized as essential in this space
- Lots of important stakeholders actively participate
- 704 CVEs analyzed
- Active discussions over progressive improvements
 - How to leverage LLMs
 - Focusing only on high-severity issues
 - Etc.

What can be improved

- **Latency**
 - Analyses pushed in batches some time after CVEs were published
 - In the meantime, everyone had to triage them already
- **Throughput**
 - Only a small subset of CVEs is analyzed by the group
- Alignment challenges
- Our template vs CVSS

What's next?

- My 2c: we have to integrate this into our internal processes
- AI to the rescue?
 - AI-powered analysis are becoming better and better, to the point that we should start using and sharing them
 - LLMs can also help with subtasks (e.g., translate internal analysis with upstream-able one)
 - Still, there will always be humans in the loop