
From Firewalls to Frontiers: AI Red-Teaming is a Domain-Specific Evolution of Cyber Red-Teaming

Anusha Sinha*
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

Keltin Grimes*
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

James Lucassen
Independent

Michael Feffer
Carnegie Mellon University

Nathan VanHoudnos
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

Zhiwei Steven Wu
Carnegie Mellon University

Hoda Heidari
Carnegie Mellon University

Abstract

A red team simulates adversary attacks to help defenders find effective strategies to defend their systems in a real-world operational setting. As more enterprise systems adopt AI, red-teaming will need to evolve to address the unique vulnerabilities and risks posed by AI systems. We take the position that AI systems can be more effectively red-teamed if AI red-teaming is recognized as a domain-specific evolution of cyber red-teaming. Specifically, we argue that existing Cyber Red Teams who adopt this framing will be able to better evaluate systems with AI components by recognizing that AI poses new risks, has new failure modes to exploit, and often contains unpatchable bugs that re-prioritize disclosure and mitigation strategies. Similarly, adopting a cybersecurity framing will allow existing AI Red Teams to leverage a well-tested structure to emulate realistic adversaries, promote mutual accountability with formal rules of engagement, and provide a pattern to mature the tooling necessary for repeatable, scalable engagements. In these ways, the merging of AI and Cyber Red Teams will create a robust security ecosystem and best position the community to adapt to the rapidly changing threat landscape.

1 Introduction

Red-teaming has a long history in cybersecurity, which has developed a mature ecosystem of tools, methodologies, best-practices, and practitioners [88]. Cyber red-teaming emphasizes grounding engagements in realistic threat modeling and adversary emulation to discover the highest-risk vulnerabilities [45]. Cyber Red Teams [65] are supported by a strong culture of responsible disclosure of vulnerabilities through formal processes such as Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure (CVD) [45, 44]. In contrast, AI red-teaming has only recently emerged as a popular approach to address the risks posed by AI systems [31, 28, 2, 83, 33]. AI red-teaming has seen extensive interest from policy-makers, researchers, and model developers, and red-teaming is quickly becoming a central security approach for many organizations [10, 33, 83, 15, 66, 3].

Although AI Red Teams and Cyber Red Teams are both asked to address AI security concerns with the rapid growth of AI systems, a recent systematic review comparing the red-teaming literature

*Equal contribution. Correspondence to asinha@sei.cmu.edu




Figure 1: Left: Distribution of red team stages across the AI Red Team and Cyber Red Team literature (99 and 69 papers, respectively). The gold bars display the distribution of common red team stages referenced across the Cyber Red Team papers reviewed by [88], while the green bars display the corresponding distribution of AI Red Team papers. The red X's display red-team stages that no papers referenced. Right: Potential benefits to Cyber Red Teams and AI Red Teams of re-framing AI red-teaming as a domain-specific evolution of cyber red-teaming.

for both AI and Cyber Red Teams found that these two communities of practice operate mostly independently, each with their own ecosystem of resources, researchers, conferences, and more [88]. This division hampers both red-teaming communities' ability to effectively respond to threats posed by AI systems. For example, Figure 1 (left) shows the differences between AI Red Teams and Cyber Red Teams by graphing the coverage of the literature reviewed by [88] across common stages of a red team engagement. Cyber Red Teams report better coverage of red-teaming stages, but none of the papers considered by the review noted a Cyber Red Team exploiting an AI component. In contrast, AI Red Teams do not report pre-engagement, scanning, vulnerability analysis, or cyber exploitation stages, but all papers considered noted an AI Red Team exploiting an AI component. The complementary approaches of AI and Cyber Red Teams suggest opportunities to better leverage each community's red-teaming strengths.

We take the position that AI systems can be more effectively red-teamed if AI red-teaming is recognized as a domain-specific evolution of cyber red-teaming. Figure 1 (right) summarizes how the two communities of practice may benefit from each other. Cyber Red Teams augmented with additional AI expertise can utilize both the maturity of cyber red-teaming and the domain-specific knowledge of AI Red Teams to most effectively red-team AI systems, and AI Red Teams can more thoroughly test AI systems by also considering their non-AI components.

In the remainder of this paper, we present an argument for our position and outline a path forward for merging AI and cyber red-teaming. Section 2 details our argument that AI red-teaming should be considered a domain-specific evolution of cyber red-teaming. Section 3 describes the ways in which Cyber Red Teams should adapt to the changing AI threat landscape by leveraging AI red-teaming's expertise. Section 4 compares the current shortcomings of AI red-teaming with the corresponding strengths of Cyber Red Teams and provides recommendations on how to adopt existing cyber red-teaming best-practices.

2 AI Red-Teaming is an Evolution of Cyber Red-Teaming

Our argument that AI red-teaming should be jointly conducted is motivated by current limitations of both fields in addressing system-level vulnerabilities in AI systems. Most AI systems, such as chatbots, self-driving cars, and AI agents, consist of one or more underlying AI models integrated into many layers of traditional software. Attackers do not delineate between arbitrary distinctions of AI vs. non-AI – they exploit the weakest link in a system [4]. Red-teaming only AI components or only traditional software components in these systems fails to properly emulate adversaries – the defining feature of red-teaming [65]. The best path towards achieving effective red-teaming of AI systems is by viewing AI red-teaming as a domain-specific evolution of cyber red-teaming and

utilizing Cyber Red Teams augmented with additional AI expertise or AI Red Teams augmented with additional cybersecurity expertise. Cyber red-teaming has a mature ecosystem built over decades of experience in red-teaming critical systems which AI red-teaming can leverage, and the adoption of AI red-teaming will accelerate cyber red-teaming's evolution towards handling AI systems.

AI red-teaming needs the cyber red-teaming ecosystem. Cyber red-teaming has accumulated decades of expertise in red-teaming critical systems into established red-teaming methodologies and best practices [92, 69, 45, 41, 68, 21]; a strong community with standards, ethics, and procedures around safe and responsible red-teaming [64, 44, 81]; a diverse and mature ecosystem of tools [97, 42, 88, 77]; and established institutions for informing and coordinating a diverse group of stakeholders [44, 81, 19]. In contrast, AI red-teaming suffers from a lack of formalized red-teaming procedures [55], proper adversary emulation [88], responsible disclosure [55], and mature red-team tooling [88]. Cyber red-teaming has established methodologies for handling each of these issues: rules of engagement (RoEs) [45], structured threat modeling [54], CVD [44], and tool libraries [97, 42], respectively. Where possible, it will be easier, faster, and cheaper to expand the existing ecosystem to encompass AI, rather than starting from scratch.

AI red-teaming can be readily incorporated into the cyber ecosystem. The line between an AI system and a software system is blurring as AI systems are growing to involve many layers of software that interact with an underlying AI model (e.g. [6]). From the security side, a vulnerability in a complex AI system is unlikely to have a single point of failure in an underlying AI model, but rather stem from complex dependencies with software components [43]. To maintain relevance, AI red-teaming will have to become increasingly system-focused, and therefore cybersecurity-focused. Of course, AI systems are notably distinct from traditional software in many ways, but these differences are not a deterrent to integration, as we discuss below. If AI systems are software systems, they are part of cyber red-teaming and there is no need to rebuild cyber institutions for the sake of AI security.

Cyber red-teaming will best adapt to AI systems by adopting AI red-teaming. Regardless of where AI red-teaming sits in relation to cyber red-teaming, Cyber Red Teams will have to adapt to the consequences of the proliferation of AI. AI is reshaping the threat landscape, posing new risks and failure modes, and giving attackers and defenders new tools and assets with which to compromise and secure. However, cyber red-teaming is a broad framework that encompasses many unique technologies with unique behaviors and considerations. For previous major technological shifts, such as the widespread adoption of the Internet [67], cloud services [47], and IoT devices [57], cyber red-teaming successfully both imposed structure and evolved to accept the new domain. The AI red-teaming community has the native AI expertise that cyber red-teaming requires, and incorporating AI into cyber will accelerate this evolution. The melding of AI and cyber red-teaming will not be immediate; it will take work and collaboration from both sides. However, the nature of the technology demands a comprehensive approach to security, covering both AI and traditional software components. The adoption of AI red-teaming by cyber red-teaming will best position the two fields to collaborate effectively.

2.1 Alternative View

An alternative view to our position is that software systems and AI systems are different in kind and therefore the red-teaming of each should focus on the core set of problems unique to each. Proponents of this view advocate for creating new, distinct CVD centers for coordinating the disclosure of AI vulnerabilities [56] and separate bug-bounty programs for AI vulnerabilities with different rules and expectations for AI red-teams [14]. Furthermore, proponents of this view argue that AI is sufficiently different from software such that boxing AI red-teaming into the realm of cybersecurity will stifle effectiveness and progress by imposing the wrong structure during a period of rapid change [70].

We believe that this is the wrong approach. Even if software systems and AI systems are different in kind, the vulnerabilities to each are not. For example, adversaries do not delineate between an 'AI problem' or a 'software problem', they follow the path of least resistance [4]. Furthermore, adversary emulation requires system-level thinking, encompassing software, AI, and the interaction between the two, and thus indicates a need for a combined approach to red-teaming. For example, systems whose components are individually safe and secure can still be vulnerable due to possible non-linear

interactions of their components [29, 5]. Similarly, a secure system can be constructed from insecure components, provided that proper controls are in place [5].

3 Evolving Cyber Red-Teaming in Response to AI

AI is bringing about a new era of software that cyber red-teaming must address, and augmenting Cyber Red Teams with the expertise of AI red-teaming will best position Cyber Red Teams to evolve to the new threat landscape. AI is fundamentally reshaping the cybersecurity landscape by not only changing systems that must be secured, but also transforming the types of tools both red-teamers and adversaries have at their disposal. Not only do AI systems pose an array of new risks, but the risks also manifest through a range of new failure modes, demanding new threat models, red-teaming techniques, and mitigation prioritization. Though cyber red-teaming is well-poised to absorb these changes (just as it has with previous software revolutions), managing this change will still require considerable research, investment, and coordination from the AI and cyber red-teaming communities. Cyber red-teaming can best facilitate this transition by adopting the AI red-teaming community’s expertise in managing the unique considerations of AI systems.

3.1 AI Poses New Risks Beyond Those of Traditional Software

AI systems pose new risks that require new considerations to understand, emulate, and respond to threats. Cyber red-teaming has developed a sophisticated ecosystem for modeling cyber threat actors, using comprehensive shared frameworks [92], system telemetry [103], and community threat intelligence sharing [48], but this ecosystem is focused on traditional cybersecurity risks.

In Figure 2 we categorize some of the risks of AI systems, including traditional cybersecurity risks of non-AI components, AI-specific technical risks, and socio-technical risks, and give a few implications these risks have on AI red-teaming. The AI community has been strongly invested in understanding these risks, and Cyber Red Teams should leverage their insights.




Figure 2: A layered taxonomy of AI risks and their implications for red-teaming. As risks expand outward from traditional cybersecurity issues to AI-specific and socio-technical concerns, red-teaming methods must evolve accordingly.

AI exacerbates traditional cybersecurity risks. The traditional cybersecurity risk taxonomy of confidentiality, integrity, and availability (CIA) [17] remains applicable to AI systems, but with different information, data, and systems at risk. These risks include an increased risk of theft of intellectual property, such as training datasets, training methods, model architectures, and model weights; theft of sensitive data, such as personal medical information [51, 23]; and the disruption of processes such as training or inference pipelines. Furthermore, AI-enabled cyberattacks lower the barrier to entry for executing cyberattacks against software systems. Real-world cyber threat actors are turning to AI systems to help with or automate parts of the attack chain [37, 75]. The continued improvement of AI capabilities could profoundly change the cybersecurity threat landscape [37].

AI models have unique technical risks that Cyber Red Teams must address. There are an array of risks specific to AI models that require domain-specific knowledge to address. These include adversarial examples [93], membership inference [86], model extraction [98], training data

extraction [16], prompt injections [36], reward hacking [89], data poisoning [11], and more. The potential harms from these risks can map to both traditional cybersecurity risks (e.g., membership inference attacks risk loss of confidentiality), and to AI-specific socio-technical risks.

AI systems pose socio-technical risks beyond the scope of typical cybersecurity risks. Traditional cyber red-teaming is primarily concerned with harms to organizations [45], such as economic or reputational harms. AI systems, however, pose a variety of risks deeply intertwined with societal or human factors. Recent advances in generative AI have raised concerns over psychosocial harms such as content safety and mental health, which have led to AI red-teaming efforts to avoid such behaviors [102, 15]. AI systems even present risks for the red-teamers themselves, in ways similar to those for content safety moderators [105]. AI models can be misused to cause harm to other systems [102], for example by automating cyber attacks [75]. Open-source models complicate the handling of misuse risks, as developers must defend against adversaries with full white-box access, and vulnerabilities cannot be mitigated after model release [82, 27, 12]. Advances in agentic AI capabilities have led to increasing concerns about misalignment of AI systems, or systems that operate autonomously in ways that do not reflect the intentions of developers [83]. This differs substantially from existing cybersecurity threat models, as the software itself is presented as the adversary, although parallels can be drawn to insider threat modeling [34]. Misaligned systems currently appear to pose very little risk [50, 13] or only demonstrate misalignment in artificial scenarios [35, 61], but this may be an increasingly relevant concern as AI agents become more capable and interact more with the real world.

Cyber Red Teams should consider the additional risks of AI systems. Accurate enumeration of high-risk vulnerabilities will require an up-to-date understanding of the expanded attack surface and how threat activity and offense-defense balances have shifted across that attack surface. We suggest that Cyber Red Teams take the following additional steps when red-teaming AI systems:

- Quantify the business or mission value of AI system assets and their likelihood of exploitation in the pre-engagement phase.
- If the goals of the engagement include socio-technical risks, consult with relevant domain experts to accurately assess risks, such as psychologists or sociologists for psychosocial harms, and chemists or virologists for AI-assisted weapon development.
- If psychosocial harms are considered within the engagement, take steps to avoid exposing red-teamers to content safety risks and provide recovery services.

3.2 AI Has New Failure Modes, Requiring New Red-Teaming Tactics to Trigger Them

The risks posed by AI systems can manifest through failure modes beyond those of traditional software. New red-teaming techniques and methodologies are therefore needed to effectively expose and mitigate vulnerabilities. We identify the domain, emergent behavior, and opacity of AI systems as the core properties that distinguish AI systems from traditional software. Augmenting Cyber Red Teams with AI-specific red-teaming expertise will promote the development of tools and techniques that better address risks stemming from these properties of AI systems.

Domain. AI has seen the most development in domains where traditional software struggles to provide value, such as classifying [25] or detecting objects [52], translating [8] or generating text [107], and autonomously operating games [87] or machines [71]. Tools will need to be developed or improved to handle the unique requirements of these domains and interface with existing tooling. For example, the introduction of autonomous vehicles has required cybersecurity to adapt practices to that domain [18], such as the development of virtual simulators to assess the collision risks posed by cyberattacks on vehicle communication networks [46].

Emergence. While there has been much debate around the nuances of ‘emergent’ abilities in AI models [101, 80], it is clear that AI models routinely succeed and fail in ways that humans fail to predict. Failures that only emerge in rare or critical situations pose challenges for red-teaming as it is often unclear how to go about finding them. For instance, failures may come from specific pieces of data whose impact only manifests down the pipeline [32, 72]. In comparison, common non-AI vulnerabilities tend to be the result of specific isolated mistakes, such as not sanitizing input data or misconfiguring access controls [69].

Opacity. When AI failures occur, it is often difficult to understand why that particular failure occurred. AI models are popularly described as ‘black-boxes’ [76], where our understanding only comes from input-output behavior, rather than the internal mechanisms used to produce the outputs. Although progress has been made on interpreting the behavior of model internals, many open problems remain [85]. Traditional software generally does not have this issue, as the source code is designed to be human-understandable. However, there are cases where software functions as a black-box, such as closed-source APIs, binaries, or poorly documented source-code.

Cyber Red Teams should incorporate new red-teaming techniques to fully assess the AI components of systems under test. As AI systems blur the boundary between software behavior and learned policy, additional techniques are useful for Cyber Red Teams to develop. Areas for consideration include:

- Adapt and develop red-teaming tools to increase red-team effectiveness in AI-specific domains such as machine vision, natural language, and autotomy.
- Design engagements that can capture behavior under uncertainty or nondeterminism (e.g., randomized testing, varying environmental conditions, adversarial probing).
- Develop long-tail testing frameworks for rare issues and emergent behavior.

3.3 AI Re-prioritizes Disclosure and Mitigation Strategies

Persistent, unpatchable AI vulnerabilities pose challenges which require re-prioritization of careful disclosure protocols and comprehensive mitigation strategies during the cyber red-teaming lifecycle.

AI has unpatchable vulnerabilities. Many of the most well-known vulnerabilities in AI systems lack known fixes [40]. Adversarial examples on image classifiers [93], for example, have been studied for over a decade yet little progress on robustness has been made [22]. In contrast, cybersecurity vulnerabilities are often addressed with small code changes.

Cyber also contends with unpatchable vulnerabilities. While most cybersecurity vulnerabilities can be addressed with feasible solutions, the field does have notable examples of long-lived, unpatchable vulnerabilities. For example, Spectre is a class of vulnerabilities in modern processors that is considered to be unpatchable in general [49, 60], and the Internet’s Border Gateway Protocol (BGP) is an inherently insecure protocol that is too entrenched to replace [74, 7, 39]. In these kinds of cases, the industry’s approach is to patch specific known exploits where possible, implement safeguards that increase attack costs, and maintain an overall defense-in-depth approach [99, 49, 53, 106].

AI vulnerabilities require greater caution. To secure AI systems, Cyber Red Teams and system owners will need to develop methodologies to assess the systemic impact of vulnerabilities that are unpatchable or time-consuming to mitigate, test secure-by-design assumptions earlier in the development lifecycle [20], and document mitigation pathways beyond conventional patching [62]. Unlike the Internet’s dependence on BGP [39], AI systems are not yet locked into insecure legacy processes, offering a rare opportunity to standardize around secure architectures before insecure practices take hold. Realizing this opportunity will require coordination across the AI and cybersecurity communities and may necessitate regulatory or incentive-driven interventions to ensure adoption of robust practices.

Cyber Red Teams should change reporting to accommodate unpatchable AI vulnerabilities.

- Promote secure design practices that do not rely on perfect security of AI models.
- Emphasize defense-in-depth to layer security around insecure AI models and raise attack costs.
- Treat unpatchable AI vulnerabilities as *classes* of vulnerabilities, and specific implementations of these attack classes as distinct vulnerabilities, similar to CWEs vs. CVEs.
- Prepare CVD protocols to manage unpatchable vulnerabilities, especially in open-source models. These may require extended disclosure timelines and greater coordination among more stakeholders.

4 Evolving AI Red-Teaming in Response to Cyber Red Team Best Practices

The relatively recent development of AI red-teaming has left little time to develop and formalize best-practices, tools, or methodologies. We argue that many of the current limitations of AI red-teaming are already addressed by current cyber red-teaming practices. In this section, we suggest ways that an existing AI Red Team may be able to accomplish more of their goals by incorporating Cyber Red Team best practices.

Specifically, we suggest three areas where AI Red Teams can draw from their cybersecurity colleagues. First, AI red-teams lack detailed threat modeling and adversary emulation [88], leading to outcomes that potentially do not address real threats to systems [59]. Second, AI red-teaming fails to establish shared expectations for red-teaming and disclosure among various stakeholders [55, 56, 88], which reduces mutual accountability. Finally, AI Red Teams lack mature tooling as the open-source tools that exist are largely repositories of research code.

4.1 Adversary-based Threat Modeling Can Help Discover High-risk Vulnerabilities

AI systems must be red-teamed as *systems*, not as AI models. This requires consideration of the entire risk surface, including, and especially, traditional cyber threats [4]. AI red-teaming has been criticized for overly focusing on the underlying AI model and failing to follow realistic threat models or emulate real-world adversaries [4, 88]. As cyber red-teaming already places major emphasis on adversary emulation and threat modeling [45, 104, 88], viewing AI red-teaming as an evolution of cyber red-teaming naturally motivates more comprehensive evaluation of AI systems.

Cyber red-teaming uses structured threat modeling to target high-risk vulnerabilities. The cybersecurity risk surface is extremely broad, and red-teaming, by nature, is resource intensive [95]. It is therefore crucial that Cyber Red Teams prioritize high-risk vulnerabilities to maximize impact. Cyber red-teaming uses a structured approach to threat modeling, explicitly modeling the goals, resources, and Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTPs) [48] of specific threat actors or archetypes, in order to emulate likely attack behaviors [45, 104, 88], thereby identifying vulnerabilities that genuine threat actors are most likely to exploit. This does not preclude the use of speculative threat models to discover emerging attack techniques, especially for researchers, but simply demands that threat models be comprehensive and grounded in reality, and that engagements emulate the threat model accurately [78].

AI red-teaming places little emphasis on practical threat modeling. AI Red Teams often fail to engage rigorously in practical threat modeling (c.f. Figure 1), with common failures including focusing solely on the AI model, ignoring easier paths to the same end, or speculating on threat models without grounding them in real-world threat intelligence. Recent AI security research on jailbreaks (forcing generative AI models to generate content against their safety policies) has been criticized for failing to consider alternative ways the content could be produced or found (e.g., via a web search [59]), leaving threat models implicit, and prioritizing marginal gains in attack success rate rather than downstream impact [88, 73]. In generative AI more broadly, there has been some criticism of the focus on future AI risks, rather than current concerns [26, 9].

AI Red Teams should adopt structured threat modeling for threat prioritization. The breadth of risks posed by AI systems and the limited resources available to address them suggest a prioritization through structured threat modeling. We recommend to:

- Define an explicit threat model with as much specificity as possible and adhere to it closely.
- Develop threat actor profiles based on threat intelligence and system telemetry, and update these threat actor profiles frequently to reflect new intelligence, telemetry, and research.
- Target the highest risk vulnerabilities by weighing the quantified risk and likelihood of exploitation.

4.2 Mutual Accountability Enables Impactful Red Team Outcomes

AI red-teaming has been criticized for a lack of accountability among stakeholders [55, 88]. We recommend AI Red teams leverage cyber red-teaming's existing culture of mutual responsibility to promote more effective red-teaming. Red-teaming requires investment, coordination, and trust from many disparate parties who must hold each other responsible for the security of a system. In

particular, it relies on close coordination between the red-team and the host organization to define the goals, threat model, RoEs, and reporting requirements [88]. Critics highlight a lack of trust between hosts and red-teams [55], as well as a lack of clear reporting and disclosure procedures [55, 88]. These failures demonstrate a lack of mutual accountability which, if left unresolved, may stifle collaboration and good-faith efforts to red-team AI systems.

Rules of engagement manage risk and influence outcomes. Cyber Red Teams take care to collaborate with the host organization to define the RoEs prior to a red-teaming engagement, which define the scope, threat model, rules, and legal considerations of the engagement [45, 88]. RoEs determine the way red-teams operate by prioritizing certain risks, methodologies, team dynamics, expertise, and tools, all of which impact the results of the engagement [28]. They also balance incentives and risks for each party, as well as other stakeholders, by setting safeguards and establishing red lines for red-teamers to prevent incidental losses [41, 38]; defining expectations for disclosure, mitigation, and publication timelines [44, 56]; and providing legal protections for good-faith red-teaming [24, 55].

Reporting will alert affected parties and inform mitigations. Cyber red-teaming has a strong reporting culture [100], reflecting the importance of communicating vulnerabilities to motivate mitigations [84]. Reporting is viewed as a joint effort between Cyber Red Teams and host organizations, where the red-team is responsible for demonstrating the vulnerability and fairly advocating for the risk it poses, and the host is responsible for collaborating with the red-team to develop and implement mitigations [90, 79, 91]. Depending on the situation, one of the parties will also be responsible for following CVD protocols [44, 43]. Outside of specific engagements, organizations are expected to share threat intelligence to inform threat models [48].

AI Red Teams often do not have explicit accountability mechanisms in place. Despite the emphasis on coordination between host and red-team in cyber red-teaming, AI red-teaming has not yet exhibited the same commitment. The usage policies of leading AI model providers often do not provide protection for good-faith security research [55]. Security researchers often fail to engage in standard responsible disclosure practices or fail to follow practical threat models [88]. Although prior work has advocated for CVD in AI red-teaming [56], we emphasize that the success of CVD processes depends on mutual accountability between parties across the security ecosystem to both disclose and be receptive of vulnerabilities. For example, a vulnerability for extracting training data discovered by Nasr et al. [63] was disclosed to, and patched by, OpenAI, yet Google later released models with the same vulnerability [63], a situation which could potentially have been avoided with better coordination. Organizations must be willing to both share vulnerabilities and implement mitigations for CVD to be effective, and avoid similar situations in the future.

AI Red Teams should adopt accountability mechanisms to build trust with hosts. In Table 1 we compare the responsibilities of the host organization and red-team, which highlights the joint nature of the red-teaming process and the mutual accountability of both.

Table 1: Mutual responsibilities of host organizations and red-teams.

Host Responsibilities	Red-Team Responsibilities
Define in the RoEs the scope and desired outcomes, threat profiles and prioritization, and desired artifacts to inform mitigations (reports, demos, etc.).	Inform the RoEs with prior experience. Prioritize the host’s goals and follow the RoEs and chosen threat models.
Grant reasonable legal protections to good-faith red-teaming via bug bounties and research exemptions.	Red-team in good faith and stay within the established bounds.
Establish responsible disclosure policies and permit publishing vulnerabilities following a grace period.	Communicate vulnerabilities in accordance with responsible disclosure policies.
Establish which parties are responsible for CVD. If responsible, follow established CVD protocols. Update the red-team on the status of disclosure.	If responsible, follow established CVD protocols. If not, consider following up on the status of disclosure.

4.3 Maturing AI Red-Teaming Tools Will Lower the Barrier to Effective Engagements

AI red-teaming could greatly benefit from a mature, comprehensive set of red-teaming tools. Cyber red-teaming employs a comprehensive suite of mature tools, many open-source, which, despite dual-use concerns, consistently promote a defender's advantage by better allowing vulnerabilities to be patched prior to deployment. Popular programs like Kali Linux [97] and Metasploit [42] centralize a large number of tools, allowing many different tools to be used in conjunction. In contrast, however, the maturity of open-source AI red-teaming tools, and their integration with existing cyber red-teaming tools, has lagged behind the development of AI systems [88].

Cyber red-teaming's mature tool ecosystem promotes security. Cyber red teams employ a diverse selection of well-known, well-maintained, and widely used tools, which automate or reduce the complexity of common tasks [88]. The breadth of options in tool suites like Kali Linux and Metasploit reflect cyber red-teaming's comprehensive system-level approach to red-teaming (Figure 1) [42, 97]. Many tools are open-source [88], and although there are legitimate concerns about the malicious use of these tools [1, 30], they ultimately provide a defender's advantage by making vulnerability discovery repeatable and efficient [88]. Cyber red-teaming emphasizes the importance of using tools to mitigate 'low-hanging fruit' before considering more complex vulnerabilities, since it reflects adversaries' behavior [69, 58].

AI red-teaming has a lack of mature tools. The AI red-teaming community, on the other hand, does not have a comparable tool ecosystem [88]. Red-teaming tools exist largely as research code and are often neither regularly maintained nor designed to be scalable for production-level red-teaming. The tools are also highly model-centric and ignore much of the software surrounding the underlying model in production systems, reflecting the lack of threat modeling discussed in Section 4.1. While the lack of mature AI red-teaming tools is perhaps understandable given the newness of the technology, it does not reflect the growth of production-level AI systems and is an indicator of security lagging behind capabilities. There are corporate solutions being developed (see, e.g., [94, 96]), but their level of adoption is unclear and do not replace the need for a robust open-source ecosystem.

AI Red Teams should mature the red-teaming tool ecosystem by sharing the tooling they develop. Specific recommendations include:

- Develop open-source tooling by contributing to existing projects or publicly releasing new tools.
- Build interoperability between AI-specific tools and existing cyber red-teaming tools in order to share out with red teams of various levels of AI expertise.
- Encode red-teaming best-practices such as logging, reproducibility, and safety controls, within the tooling developed to support engagements.

5 Conclusion

AI red-teaming should be understood as a domain-specific evolution of cyber red-teaming: grounded in the same foundational practices but expanded to address the distinct challenges introduced by AI systems. This framing strengthens both fields, bringing structure, accountability, protections, and tool-driven rigor to AI red-teaming while pushing cybersecurity to evolve its practices in response to AI-specific risks. A shared framework avoids fragmenting the security landscape, supports consistent evaluation standards, scales tools and workflows across domains, and enables more effective coordination across research, industry, and policy. Most importantly, it ensures red-teaming resources are focused on the most consequential vulnerabilities spanning both AI and traditional software systems.

We call for closer collaboration between the AI and cybersecurity communities to develop integrated red-teaming programs that combine expertise in AI systems, security engineering, software infrastructure, and threat modeling. Cyber Red Teams must begin treating AI systems as core components of the modern attack surface. Future work should aim to formalize hybrid threat modeling, build frameworks that encompass both traditional and AI-specific vulnerabilities, situate hybrid red-teaming within AI governance frameworks, and develop lifecycle-aware evaluation processes that keep pace with AI's rapid evolution. A unified red-teaming discipline is essential for securing the next generation of software systems.

6 Acknowledgments

Copyright 2025 Carnegie Mellon University.

This material is based upon work funded and supported by the Department of Defense under Contract No. FA8702-15-D-0002 with Carnegie Mellon University for the operation of the Software Engineering Institute, a federally funded research and development center.

The view, opinions, and/or findings contained in this material are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Government position, policy, or decision, unless designated by other documentation.

NO WARRANTY. THIS CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE MATERIAL IS FURNISHED ON AN "AS-IS" BASIS. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY MAKES NO WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OR MERCHANTABILITY, EXCLUSIVITY, OR RESULTS OBTAINED FROM USE OF THE MATERIAL. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY DOES NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM FROM PATENT, TRADEMARK, OR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.

[DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A] This material has been approved for public release and unlimited distribution. Please see Copyright notice for non-US Government use and distribution.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. Requests for permission for non-licensed uses should be directed to the Software Engineering Institute at permission@sei.cmu.edu.

DM25-1040

References

- [1] J Agcaoili and E Earnshaw. Locked, loaded, and in the wrong hands: Legitimate tools weaponized for ransomware in 2021. *Trend Micro*, 2021.
- [2] Lama Ahmad, Sandhini Agarwal, Michael Lampe, and Pamela Mishkin. Openai’s approach to external red teaming for ai models and systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16431*, 2024.
- [3] Anthropic. Responsible scaling policy, 2025. URL <https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/872c653b2d0501d6ab44cf87f43e1dc4853e4d37.pdf>. Accessed: 2025-05-20.
- [4] Giovanni Apruzzese, Hyrum S Anderson, Savino Dambra, David Freeman, Fabio Pierazzi, and Kevin Roundy. “real attackers don’t compute gradients”: bridging the gap between adversarial ml research and practice. In *2023 IEEE conference on secure and trustworthy machine learning (SaTML)*, pages 339–364. IEEE, 2023.
- [5] A. Avizienis, J.-C. Laprie, B. Randell, and C. Landwehr. Basic concepts and taxonomy of dependable and secure computing. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 1(1):11–33, 2004. doi: 10.1109/TDSC.2004.2.
- [6] Claudine Badue, Rânik Guidolini, Raphael Vivacqua Carneiro, Pedro Azevedo, Vinicius B Cardoso, Avelino Forechi, Luan Jesus, Rodrigo Berriel, Thiago M Paixao, Filipe Mutz, et al. Self-driving cars: A survey. *Expert systems with applications*, 165:113816, 2021.
- [7] Hitesh Ballani, Paul Francis, and Xinyang Zhang. A study of prefix hijacking and interception in the internet. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, 37(4):265–276, 2007.
- [8] Loïc Barrault, Ondřej Bojar, Marta R Costa-Jussa, Christian Federmann, Mark Fishel, Yvette Graham, Barry Haddow, Matthias Huck, Philipp Koehn, Shervin Malmasi, et al. Findings of the 2019 conference on machine translation (wmt19). *ACL*, 2019.
- [9] Emily M Bender and Alex Hanna. Ai causes real harm. let’s focus on that over the end-of-humanity hype. *Scientific American*, 12, 2023.

[Distribution Statement A] Approved for public release and unlimited distribution.

- [10] Joseph R Biden. Executive order on the safe, secure, and trustworthy development and use of artificial intelligence. 2023.
- [11] Battista Biggio, Blaine Nelson, and Pavel Laskov. Poisoning attacks against support vector machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.6389*, 2012.
- [12] Rishi Bommasani, Sayash Kapoor, Kevin Klyman, Shayne Longpre, Ashwin Ramaswami, Daniel Zhang, Marietje Schaake, Daniel E Ho, Arvind Narayanan, and Percy Liang. Considerations for governing open foundation models. *Science*, 386(6718):151–153, 2024.
- [13] Alexander Bondarenko, Denis Volk, Dmitrii Volkov, and Jeffrey Ladish. Demonstrating specification gaming in reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13295*, 2025.
- [14] Benjamin S Bucknall and Robert F Trager. Structured access for third-party research on frontier ai models: Investigating researchers’ model access requirements, 2023.
- [15] Blake Bullwinkel, Amanda Minnich, Shiven Chawla, Gary Lopez, Martin Pouliot, Whitney Maxwell, Joris de Gruyter, Katherine Pratt, Saphir Qi, Nina Chikanov, et al. Lessons from red teaming 100 generative ai products. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.07238*, 2025.
- [16] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramer, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Ulfar Erlingsson, et al. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650, 2021.
- [17] Jennifer Cawthra, Michael Ekstrom, Lauren Lusty, Julian Sexton, and John Sweetnam. Data integrity: Detecting and responding to ransomware and other destructive events. Technical report, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2020.
- [18] CISA. Autonomous ground vehicle security guide: Transportation systems sector. Technical report, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, 2021.
- [19] CISA. Vulnerability disclosure policy platform 2023 annual report. Technical report, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, 2024.
- [20] CISA, NSA, and FBI. Shifting the balance of cybersecurity risk: Principles and approaches for secure by design software. Technical report, Cybersecurity Infrastructure and Security Agency, 2023.
- [21] PCI Security Standards Council. Payment card industry data security standard, 2024.
- [22] Francesco Croce, Maksym Andriushchenko, Vikash Sehwal, Edoardo DeBenedetti, Nicolas Flammarion, Mung Chiang, Prateek Mittal, and Matthias Hein. Robustbench: a standardized adversarial robustness benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09670*, 2020.
- [23] Tirth Dave, Sai Anirudh Athaluri, and Satyam Singh. Chatgpt in medicine: an overview of its applications, advantages, limitations, future prospects, and ethical considerations. *Frontiers in artificial intelligence*, 6:1169595, 2023.
- [24] Joseph V DeMarco. An approach to minimizing legal and reputational risk in red team hacking exercises. *Computer law & security review*, 34(4):908–911, 2018.
- [25] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- [26] Nature Editorials. Stop talking about tomorrow’s ai doomsday when ai poses risks today. *Nature*, 618:885–886, 2023.
- [27] Francisco Eiras, Aleksandar Petrov, Bertie Vidgen, Christian Schroeder De Witt, Fabio Pizzati, Katherine Elkins, Supratik Mukhopadhyay, Adel Bibi, Botos Csaba, Fabro Steibel, et al. Near to mid-term risks and opportunities of open-source generative ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17047*, 2024.

- [28] Michael Feffer, Anusha Sinha, Wesley H Deng, Zachary C Lipton, and Hoda Heidari. Red-teaming for generative ai: Silver bullet or security theater? In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, volume 7, pages 421–437, 2024.
- [29] Ivo Friedberg, Kieran McLaughlin, Paul Smith, David Lavery, and Sakir Sezer. Stpa-safesec: Safety and security analysis for cyber-physical systems. *Journal of Information Security and Applications*, 34:183–196, 2017. ISSN 2214-2126. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jisa.2016.05.008>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214212616300850>.
- [30] Sean Gallagher. The sophos annual threat report: Cybercrime on main street 2025. Technical report, Sophos, 2025.
- [31] Deep Ganguli, Liane Lovitt, Jackson Kernion, Amanda Askeell, Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Ben Mann, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Kamal Ndousse, et al. Red teaming language models to reduce harms: Methods, scaling behaviors, and lessons learned. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07858*, 2022.
- [32] Micah Goldblum, Dimitris Tsipras, Chulin Xie, Xinyun Chen, Avi Schwarzschild, Dawn Song, Aleksander Mądry, Bo Li, and Tom Goldstein. Dataset security for machine learning: Data poisoning, backdoor attacks, and defenses. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(2):1563–1580, 2022.
- [33] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [34] Ryan Greenblatt, Buck Shlegeris, Kshitij Sachan, and Fabien Roger. Ai control: Improving safety despite intentional subversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06942*, 2023.
- [35] 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.
- [36] Kai Greshake, Sahar Abdelnabi, Shailesh Mishra, Christoph Endres, Thorsten Holz, and Mario Fritz. Not what you’ve signed up for: Compromising real-world llm-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, pages 79–90, 2023.
- [37] Google Threat Intelligence Group. Adversarial misuse of generative ai. Technical report, Google, 2025.
- [38] Neha R Gupta, Jessica Hullman, and Hariharan Subramonyam. A conceptual framework for ethical evaluation of machine learning systems. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, volume 7, pages 534–546, 2024.
- [39] William Haag, Douglas Montgomery, Allen Tan, and William Barker. Protecting the integrity of internet routing: Border gateway protocol (bgp) route origin validation. Technical report, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2019.
- [40] Dan Hendrycks, Nicholas Carlini, John Schulman, and Jacob Steinhardt. Unsolved problems in ml safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13916*, 2021.
- [41] Pete Herzog et al. Open-source security testing methodology manual. *Institute for Security and Open Methodologies (ISECOM)*, 2003.
- [42] Filip Holik, Josef Horalek, Ondrej Marik, Sona Neradova, and Stanislav Zitta. Effective penetration testing with metasploit framework and methodologies. In *2014 IEEE 15th International Symposium on Computational Intelligence and Informatics (CINTI)*, pages 237–242. IEEE, 2014.
- [43] Allen Householder, Vijay Sarvepalli, Jeffrey Havrilla, Matthew Churilla, Lena Pons, Shing-hon Lau, Nathan Vanhoudnos, Andrew Kompanek, and Lauren McIlvenny. Lessons learned in coordinated disclosure for artificial intelligence and machine learning systems. Technical report, Software Engineering Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, 2024.

- [44] Allen D Householder, Garret Wassermann, Art Manion, and Chris King. The cert guide to coordinated vulnerability disclosure. Technical report, Software Engineering Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, 2017.
- [45] ISECOM, 2012. URL http://www.pentest-standard.org/index.php/Main_Page.
- [46] Kelly Izlar. Simulating self-driving security, 2023. URL <https://news.vt.edu/articles/2023/01/simulating-self-driving-security.html>. Accessed: 2025-05-22.
- [47] Wayne A Jansen, Tim Grance, et al. Guidelines on security and privacy in public cloud computing. 2011.
- [48] Chris Johnson, Lee Badger, David Waltermire, Julie Snyder, Clem Skorupka, et al. Guide to cyber threat information sharing. *NIST special publication*, 800(150):35, 2016.
- [49] Paul Kocher, Jann Horn, Anders Fogh, Daniel Genkin, Daniel Gruss, Werner Haas, Mike Hamburg, Moritz Lipp, Stefan Mangard, Thomas Prescher, et al. Spectre attacks: Exploiting speculative execution. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(7):93–101, 2020.
- [50] Victoria Krakovna, Jonathan Uesato, Vladimir Mikulik, Matthew Rahtz, Tom Everitt, Ramana Kumar, Zac Kenton, Jan Leike, and Shane Legg. Specification gaming: the flip side of ai ingenuity. <https://deepmind.google/discover/blog/specification-gaming-the-flip-side-of-ai-ingenuity/>, April 2020. Accessed: 2025-05-05.
- [51] Kira Kretzschmar, Holly Tyroll, Gabriela Pavarini, Arianna Manzini, Ilina Singh, and NeurOx Young People’s Advisory Group. Can your phone be your therapist? young people’s ethical perspectives on the use of fully automated conversational agents (chatbots) in mental health support. *Biomedical informatics insights*, 11:1178222619829083, 2019.
- [52] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European conference, zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, proceedings, part v 13*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014.
- [53] Moritz Lipp, Michael Schwarz, Daniel Gruss, Thomas Prescher, Werner Haas, Jann Horn, Stefan Mangard, Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom, et al. Meltdown: Reading kernel memory from user space. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(6):46–56, 2020. URL <https://meltdownattack.com/>.
- [54] Bingchang Liu, Liang Shi, Zhuhua Cai, and Min Li. Software vulnerability discovery techniques: A survey. In *2012 fourth international conference on multimedia information networking and security*, pages 152–156. IEEE, 2012.
- [55] Shayne Longpre, Sayash Kapoor, Kevin Klyman, Ashwin Ramaswami, Rishi Bommasani, Borhane Blili-Hamelin, Yangsibo Huang, Aviya Skowron, Zheng Xin Yong, Suhas Kotha, et al. Position: A safe harbor for ai evaluation and red teaming. In *Forty-First International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [56] Shayne Longpre, Kevin Klyman, Ruth E Appel, Sayash Kapoor, Rishi Bommasani, Michelle Sahar, Sean McGregor, Avijit Ghosh, Borhane Blili-Hamelin, Nathan Butters, et al. In-house evaluation is not enough: Towards robust third-party flaw disclosure for general-purpose ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16861*, 2025.
- [57] Parushi Malhotra, Yashwant Singh, Pooja Anand, Deep Kumar Bangotra, Pradeep Kumar Singh, and Wei-Chiang Hong. Internet of things: Evolution, concerns and security challenges. *Sensors*, 21(5):1809, 2021.
- [58] Bob Martin, Mason Brown, Alan Paller, Dennis Kirby, and Steve Christey. 2011 cwe/sans top 25 most dangerous software errors. *Common Weakness Enumeration*, 7515, 2011.
- [59] Mantas Mazeika, Long Phan, Xuwang Yin, Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Norman Mu, Elham Sakhaee, Nathaniel Li, Steven Basart, Bo Li, et al. Harmbench: A standardized evaluation framework for automated red teaming and robust refusal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04249*, 2024.

- [60] Ross Mcilroy, Jaroslav Sevcik, Tobias Tebbi, Ben L Titzer, and Toon Verwaest. Spectre is here to stay: An analysis of side-channels and speculative execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.05178*, 2019.
- [61] Alexander Meinke, Bronson Schoen, Jérémy Scheurer, Mikita Balesni, Rusheb Shah, and Marius Hobbhahn. Frontier models are capable of in-context scheming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04984*, 2024.
- [62] Peter Mell, James Shook, and Richard Harang. Measuring and improving the effectiveness of defense-in-depth postures. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Industrial Control System Security Workshop*, pages 15–22, 2016.
- [63] Milad Nasr, Javier Rando, Nicholas Carlini, Jonathan Hayase, Matthew Jagielski, A Feder Cooper, Daphne Ippolito, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Florian Tramèr, and Katherine Lee. Scalable extraction of training data from aligned, production language models. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [64] National Institute of Standards and Technology. The nist cybersecurity framework (csf) 2.0. Technical Report NIST CSWP 29, U.S. Department of Commerce, 2024. URL <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.CSWP.29>.
- [65] Committee on National Security Systems. Committee on national security systems (cnss) glossary. Technical report, Committee on National Security Systems, 2015. URL <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/22385-document-08-committee-national-security>.
- [66] OpenAI. Preparedness framework, 2025. URL <https://cdn.openai.com/pdf/18a02b5d-6b67-4cec-ab64-68cdfbddebcd/preparedness-framework-v2.pdf>. Accessed: 2025-05-20.
- [67] Hilarie Orman. The morris worm: A fifteen-year perspective. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 1(5): 35–43, 2003.
- [68] OWASP. Owasp web security testing guide, 2020.
- [69] OWASP Foundation. Owasp top 10: 2021. <https://owasp.org/Top10/>, 2021. Accessed: 2025-05-05.
- [70] Julie Peterson. Ai red teaming: Insights from the front line of genai security, 2025. URL <https://www.troj.ai/blog/ai-red-teaming-insights-from-the-front-lines-of-genai-security>. Accessed: 2025-05-22.
- [71] Dean A Pomerleau. Alvin: An autonomous land vehicle in a neural network. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 1, 1988.
- [72] Sara Price, Arjun Panickssery, Sam Bowman, and Asa Cooper Stickland. Future events as backdoor triggers: Investigating temporal vulnerabilities in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.04108*, 2024.
- [73] Javier Rando. Do not write that jailbreak paper. In *The Fourth Blogpost Track at ICLR 2025*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=TbN25IjHyC>.
- [74] Yakov Rekhter, Tony Li, and Susan Hares. A border gateway protocol 4 (bgp-4). Technical report, The Internet Society, 2006.
- [75] Mikel Rodriguez, Raluca Ada Popa, Four Flynn, Lihao Liang, Allan Dafoe, and Anna Wang. A framework for evaluating emerging cyberattack capabilities of ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.11917*, 2025.
- [76] Cynthia Rudin and Joanna Radin. Why are we using black box models in ai when we don't need to? a lesson from an explainable ai competition. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(2):1–9, 2019.

- [77] Daniel Russo. Benefits of open source software in defense environments. In *Proceedings of 4th International Conference in Software Engineering for Defence Applications: SEDA 2015*, pages 123–131. Springer, 2016.
- [78] Saqib Saeed, Sarah A Suayyid, Manal S Al-Ghamdi, Hayfa Al-Muhaisen, and Abdullah M Almuhaideb. A systematic literature review on cyber threat intelligence for organizational cybersecurity resilience. *Sensors*, 23(16):7273, 2023.
- [79] Karen Scarfone, Murugiah Souppaya, Amanda Cody, and Angela Orebaugh. Technical guide to information security testing and assessment. *NIST Special Publication*, 800(115):2–25, 2008.
- [80] Rylan Schaeffer, Brando Miranda, and Sanmi Koyejo. Are emergent abilities of large language models a mirage? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:55565–55581, 2023.
- [81] Kim B Schaffer, Kim B Schaffer, Peter Mell, Hung Trinh, and Isabel Van Wyk. *Recommendations for Federal Vulnerability Disclosure Guidelines*. US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2023.
- [82] Elizabeth Seger, Noemi Dreksler, Richard Moulange, Emily Dardaman, Jonas Schuett, K Wei, Christoph Winter, Mackenzie Arnold, Seán Ó hÉigeartaigh, Anton Korinek, et al. Open-sourcing highly capable foundation models: An evaluation of risks, benefits, and alternative methods for pursuing open-source objectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09227*, 2023.
- [83] Rohin Shah, Alex Irpan, Alexander Matt Turner, Anna Wang, Arthur Conmy, David Lindner, Jonah Brown-Cohen, Lewis Ho, Neel Nanda, Raluca Ada Popa, et al. An approach to technical agi safety and security. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.01849*, 2025.
- [84] Sugandh Shah and Babu M Mehtre. An overview of vulnerability assessment and penetration testing techniques. *Journal of Computer Virology and Hacking Techniques*, 11:27–49, 2015.
- [85] Lee Sharkey, Bilal Chughtai, Joshua Batson, Jack Lindsey, Jeff Wu, Lucius Bushnaq, Nicholas Goldowsky-Dill, Stefan Heimersheim, Alejandro Ortega, Joseph Bloom, et al. Open problems in mechanistic interpretability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.16496*, 2025.
- [86] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18. IEEE, 2017.
- [87] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature*, 529(7587): 484–489, 2016.
- [88] Anusha Sinha, James Lucassen, Keltin Grimes, Michael Feffer, Nathan VanHoudnos, Ellie Soto, and Hoda Heidari. What can genai red-teaming learn from cyber red-teaming? Technical report, Carnegie Mellon University Software Engineering Institute, 2025.
- [89] Joar Skalse, Nikolaus Howe, Dmitrii Krasheninnikov, and David Krueger. Defining and characterizing reward gaming. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 9460–9471, 2022.
- [90] Justin Smith, Christopher Theisen, and Titus Barik. A case study of software security red teams at microsoft. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2020.
- [91] Jonathan M Spring, Allen Householder, Eric Hatleback, Art Manion, Madison Oliver, Vijay Sarvapalli, Laurie Tyzenhaus, and Charles Yarbrough. Prioritizing vulnerability response: A stakeholder-specific vulnerability categorization (version 2.0). Technical report, Carnegie Mellon University Software Engineering Institute, 2021.

- [92] Blake E Strom, Andy Applebaum, Doug P Miller, Kathryn C Nickels, Adam G Pennington, and Cody B Thomas. Mitre att&ck: Design and philosophy. In *Technical report*. The MITRE Corporation, 2018.
- [93] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
- [94] Lakera Team. Ai red teaming: Securing unpredictable systems. Technical report, Lakera, 2025. URL <https://www.lakera.ai/blog/ai-red-teaming>. Accessed: 2025-05-22.
- [95] Fabian M Teichmann and Sonia R Boticiu. An overview of the benefits, challenges, and legal aspects of penetration testing and red teaming. *International Cybersecurity Law Review*, 4(4): 387–397, 2023.
- [96] Minsoo Thigpen. Introducing ai red teaming agent: Accelerate your ai safety and security journey with azure ai foundry, 2025. URL <https://devblogs.microsoft.com/foundry/ai-red-teaming-agent-preview/>. Accessed: 2025-05-22.
- [97] Matt Tigner, Hayden Wimmer, and Carl M Rebman. Analysis of kali linux penetration tools: A survey of hacking tools. In *2021 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Energy Technologies (ICECET)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- [98] Florian Tramèr, Fan Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart. Stealing machine learning models via prediction {APIs}. In *25th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 601–618, 2016.
- [99] Kenton Varda. Mitigating spectre and other security threats: The cloudflare workers security model, 2020.
- [100] Thomas Walshe and Andrew C Simpson. Coordinated vulnerability disclosure programme effectiveness: Issues and recommendations. *Computers & Security*, 123:102936, 2022.
- [101] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*, 2022.
- [102] Laura Weidinger, Maribeth Rauh, Nahema Marchal, Arianna Manzini, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Juan Mateos-Garcia, Stevie Bergman, Jackie Kay, Conor Griffin, Ben Bariach, et al. Sociotechnical safety evaluation of generative ai systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11986*, 2023.
- [103] IY Xiang et al. Cisa red team shares key findings to improve monitoring and hardening of networks. *US Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC, Tech. Rep. AA23-059A*, 2021.
- [104] Wenjun Xiong and Robert Lagerström. Threat modeling—a systematic literature review. *Computers & security*, 84:53–69, 2019.
- [105] Alice Qian Zhang, Ryland Shaw, Jacy Reese Anthis, Ashlee Milton, Emily Tseng, Jina Suh, Lama Ahmad, Ram Shankar Siva Kumar, Julian Posada, Benjamin Shestakofsky, et al. The human factor in ai red teaming: Perspectives from social and collaborative computing. In *Companion Publication of the 2024 Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 712–715, 2024.
- [106] Zheng Zhang, Ying Zhang, Y Charlie Hu, and Z Morley Mao. Practical defenses against bgp prefix hijacking. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM CoNEXT conference*, pages 1–12, 2007.
- [107] Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Rich Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 19–27, 2015.