

---

# DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTELLIGENT LLM-BASED LDAP HONEYPOT

---

**Javier Jiménez Román**  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Avda de la Universidad 30  
Leganés, Madrid, Spain

**Florina Almenares-Mendoza**  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Avda de la Universidad 30  
Leganés, Madrid, Spain  
florina@it.uc3m.es,

**Alfonso Sánchez-Macián**  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Avda de la Universidad 30  
Leganés, Madrid, Spain  
alfonsan@it.uc3m.es,

September 23, 2025

## ABSTRACT

Cybersecurity threats continue to increase, with a growing number of previously unknown attacks each year targeting both large corporations and smaller entities. This scenario demands the implementation of advanced security measures, not only to mitigate damage but also to anticipate emerging attack trends. In this context, deception tools have become a key strategy, enabling the detection, deterrence, and deception of potential attackers while facilitating the collection of information about their tactics and methods. Among these tools, honeypots have proven their value, although they have traditionally been limited by rigidity and configuration complexity, hindering their adaptability to dynamic scenarios. The rise of artificial intelligence, and particularly general-purpose Large Language Models (LLMs), is driving the development of new deception solutions capable of offering greater adaptability and ease of use. This work proposes the design and implementation of an LLM-based honeypot to simulate an LDAP server, a critical protocol present in most organizations due to its central role in identity and access management. The proposed solution aims to provide a flexible and realistic tool capable of convincingly interacting with attackers, thereby contributing to early detection and threat analysis while enhancing the defensive capabilities of infrastructures against intrusions targeting this service.

**Keywords** Deception Technology, AI-powered Honeypot, Large Language Models (LLM), LDAP Protocol, Cyber Threat Intelligence, Threat Detection

## 1 Introduction

Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) is the standard protocol for querying and modifying information stored in directory services. These directories are widely used for identity and credential management (e.g., Microsoft Active Directory, OpenLDAP, or enterprise SSO systems) and typically contain highly sensitive information such as usernames, email addresses, roles, and passwords. Such information is extremely valuable to attackers, as it enables the use of valid credentials, lateral movement, privilege escalation, and even provides internal reconnaissance of an organization's structure [1].

The LanDscAPe study analyzed the global LDAP exposure surface and identified more than 82,000 publicly reachable LDAP servers [2]. The results revealed that a significant portion of the LDAP ecosystem is misconfigured, allowing unauthorized access to sensitive data. Among the most severe issues were the presence of servers still running the deprecated LDAP v2 protocol and instances exposed without any authentication (enabling anonymous access). Other problems included systems remaining vulnerable despite the availability of patches and around 34% of TLS enabled servers relying on weak or outdated cryptographic configurations.

While these findings reflect the risks of publicly exposed servers, it is likely that similar misconfigurations may also affect internal corporate environments, extending the threat surface to organizational infrastructures.

A paradigmatic example of LDAP being exploited indirectly is the Log4Shell vulnerability (CVE-2021-44228) [3]. Although the flaw originated in the Log4j library, attackers leveraged LDAP servers as a channel to deliver malicious payloads via JNDI. This case demonstrates that, even when not the root cause of a vulnerability, LDAP can still play

a critical role in large-scale exploitation campaigns, highlighting the importance of securing LDAP within a broader security context.

A direct impact on LDAP itself can be observed in one of its most common vulnerabilities called LDAP Injection. This type of attack is similar to SQL Injection and occurs when applications dynamically construct LDAP queries from user input without proper sanitization. As a result, attackers may manipulate the query to gain unauthorized access to information or even alter the behavior of the directory service [4].

Given the critical role of LDAP in identity management and the vulnerabilities that affect it, it becomes essential to explore defensive mechanisms capable of detecting and analyzing malicious activity. Honeypots emerge as a suitable approach, as a security mechanism designed to simulate vulnerable resources, such as operating systems, protocols, or networks, with two main purposes.

On the one hand, honeypots serve as a research and intelligence gathering tool, attracting attackers and recording their activities. The subsequent analysis of these interactions provides valuable insights into adversarial behavior and their TTPs (Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures). This type of information constitutes threat intelligence that can be integrated into other security tools to improve detection capabilities and prevent future incidents. In this way, honeypots can contribute to the identification of new IOCs from emerging campaigns and even enable the discovery of zero-day vulnerabilities [5, 6].

On the other hand, honeypots can also play a defensive and reactive role by acting as decoys within an organization's infrastructure. In this approach, they lure attackers and redirect malicious activity toward non-critical systems, thereby reducing risk to production assets. At the same time, they enable the detection of active threats and provide actionable intelligence to reinforce defenses in real time [7].

Different types of honeypots exist, and the most common classification is based on the level of interaction allowed with the attacker [8]. Low-interaction honeypots emulate services or protocols only in a very basic manner (e.g., SSH, FTP, MySQL, HTTP) without fully implementing their functionality. Their purpose is mainly to detect connection attempts (such as collecting IP addresses) without allowing arbitrary code execution. Their main advantages are ease of deployment and low risk of compromise, although they provide limited intelligence.

At the next level, medium-interaction honeypots provide more realistic services and allow limited interaction with the attacker within a controlled environment. This enables the collection of more detailed information, such as exploitation attempts or recorded command sequences, while maintaining moderate risk by preventing full system compromise.

Finally, high-interaction honeypots are the most advanced and realistic but also the riskiest. They typically involve full systems, often virtual machines or containers with intentionally vulnerable versions exposing them to real attacks. In these environments, adversaries may fully compromise the system and deploy malware, offering an opportunity to study TTPs in depth. From a forensic and threat discovery perspective, these honeypots are extremely valuable, though they require strict isolation to avoid their misuse for lateral movement or incorporation into botnets.

An alternative classification, independent of interaction level, encompasses other honeypot modalities. One example is honeytokens, which are not full systems but lightweight digital decoys such as fake credentials, configuration files, beacons, documents, dummy API keys, or database records that should never be accessed legitimately. Interaction with these artifacts triggers an alert, signaling intrusion or potential data exfiltration. A practical example is the EDR SentinelOne, which places specific files in the "C:\\" path so that they appear first when sorted alphabetically. If the system detects that one of these files begins to be encrypted, it interprets the action as a potential ransomware attempt [9].

Another modality is honeynets, which, instead of simulating a single service or system, reproduce entire networks of interconnected honeypots to emulate full enterprise or industrial infrastructures. This approach enables the study of sophisticated attacks, observation of lateral movement techniques, and analysis of how adversaries coordinate their actions within a realistic environment.

Finally, email/web honeypots are decoys specifically designed to attract spam or phishing campaigns. They are implemented through fake email addresses or controlled websites that collect information about attackers, the infrastructure they use, and their distribution tactics. These mechanisms help improve spam filters, detect active campaigns, and gather intelligence on malicious actors [10].

Building on these concepts, this work focuses on the design of a honeypot specifically adapted to the LDAP protocol, leveraging recent advances in Large Language Models. The goal is to combine the strengths of honeypots as deception tools with the adaptability of LLMs, thereby addressing existing gaps in the literature.

The scope of this project is to demonstrate that an LLM-based honeypot can simulate LDAP with reasonable accuracy and robust responses, covering a broad range of the operations defined by the protocol. In addition, the work contributes

a dataset of LDAP traffic, addressing the current lack of publicly available sources. The tool has also been designed to systematically record logs of all interactions, enabling their subsequent analysis and the extraction of threat intelligence. Since the objective is to develop a tool from scratch, the focus has been placed on building a foundation that delivers essential functionality while maintaining the flexibility to be extended in future iterations. Features beyond the scope of this work, such as TLS encryption of LDAP traffic, are not included, nor is the aim to replicate the full complexity of an Active Directory environment, which encompasses additional services and characteristics beyond the protocol itself. Likewise, the purpose of this work is not to perform an in-depth optimization of the underlying LLM, but rather to validate its viability as the core of a functional honeypot system.

It should also be noted that the project was developed without access to large-scale dedicated infrastructure for training and deploying LLMs. Instead, it relied on cloud-based resources, such as Google Colab Pro with an NVIDIA A100 GPU, which are powerful but still subject to practical constraints in availability and configuration. This setup was sufficient for the objectives of the project, emphasizing feasibility and reproducibility over exhaustive optimization.

The remainder of this work is structured as follows. Section II provides the background and related work, starting with an overview of traditional honeypots, followed by early applications of artificial intelligence in deception systems, and concluding with recent approaches based on LLMs. Section III details the design and implementation of the system, including the dataset generation process, the overall architecture, and the description of each module that composes the honeypot. Section IV reports the evaluation methodology and experimental results, introducing a custom set of metrics specifically designed to assess the behavior of an LLM-based LDAP honeypot. Finally, Section V summarizes the main contributions and outlining possible directions for future work.

## 2 Background & Related Work

Before presenting the design and implementation of the proposed honeypot, it is essential to review the current state of the art in deception technologies and related approaches. This section provides the necessary background to contextualize the work, starting with an overview of traditional honeypots, followed by early applications of artificial intelligence in deception systems, and concluding with recent efforts that integrate LLMs. This review highlights the evolution of the field, the limitations of existing approaches, and the opportunities that motivate the development of an LLM-based honeypot for the LDAP protocol.

### 2.1 Traditional Honeypots

The concept of a honeypot in cybersecurity dates back to the late 1980s and early 1990s, with documented cases such as those described by Clifford Stoll (1989) and Bill Cheswick (1991) [11, 12]. Since then, honeypots have evolved from experimental solutions to widely adopted implementations in research environments, corporate networks, government agencies, and law enforcement, adapting to emerging technologies and an increasingly complex threat landscape. In this context, the HoneyNet Project was established in 1999 as a non-profit international initiative “dedicated to the research and development of honeypot and honeynet technologies with the goal of improving information security through the collection and analysis of real attack data” [13]. The project remains highly active today, hosting events and publishing valuable resources, while maintaining an extensive collection of honeypots covering various technologies, along with repositories useful for threat intelligence.

At present, there is a wide range of active, fully open-source projects that are regularly updated, many of them curated and promoted by the HoneyNet Project. Among these, T-Pot [14] stands out as an open-source platform that integrates multiple types of honeypots and complementary tools into a single, easily deployable environment. Similar to the HoneyNet Project, T-Pot consolidates various threat collection and analysis technologies, providing centralized data gathering alongside monitoring, visualization, and correlation capabilities. Related to this ecosystem, GreedyBear [15] focuses on aggregating and correlating data from multiple honeypots, and offers a set of public feeds [16] for automated consumption and threat intelligence analysis. Other notable projects, although older and no longer actively maintained, include Honeyd [17] and Honeytrap [18], both of which were highly relevant in their time: Honeyd for its ability to flexibly and cost-effectively emulate multiple systems and services on a single physical machine, and Honeytrap for its modular design enabling malicious traffic capture and analysis across different protocols and services.

When focusing specifically on honeypots designed for the LDAP protocol, available developments are considerably more limited. One notable example is a study conducted by researchers from a Danish university, aimed at analyzing various attacks targeting LDAP by deploying honeypots to log malicious activity [19]. However, the collected data was not made publicly available, and despite attempts to contact the authors, it has not been possible to incorporate this traffic into the dataset used in this work. There are also other attempts with a certain level of maturity in implementing LDAP within honeypots, such as the work by Dimas & Charles [20]. In this study, the authors employed the previously

mentioned Honeytrap framework to analyze four services: Ethereum, SMTP, FTP, and LDAP. In the case of LDAP, only a very small number of samples were collected, most of which contained a few basic LDAP operations. According to the researchers, these appeared to be primarily attempts to determine whether the service was active, suggesting a simple port scan targeting the exposed service. Notably, this work reflects on how honeypots can facilitate the capture of real-world attacks, particularly against less monitored services such as LDAP.

More recently, a low-interaction honeypot project for LDAP has been published, which focuses exclusively on recording authentication attempts by capturing credentials [21]. This project does not implement other LDAP operations and lacks LDAPS support. Another relevant repository is Chameleon [22], which implements modules for multiple protocols and lists LDAP as future work; however, it has not been updated for two years. The lack of open-source projects focused on LDAP may be attributed to the wide range of operations defined by the protocol and the inherent complexity of realistically simulating complete interactions.

## 2.2 Early Applications of AI in Honeypots

Before the exponential growth of artificial intelligence driven by the Transformers architecture, advances in Natural Language Processing (NLP), and the emergence of general-purpose models such as ChatGPT, several works had already been published that applied AI algorithms to bring new approaches to the field of deceptive tools such as honeypots. An example is QRASSH [23], which applies Deep Q-Learning with a neural network as an approximator to control a self-adaptive SSH honeypot. Its goal is to combine honeypots with reinforcement learning to select the best action for each attacker behavior, maximizing the utility of the interaction. The reward function is designed to incentivize adversary behaviors, such as malware downloads, that enrich the logs and facilitate the extraction of more relevant Indicators of Compromise (IOCs).

Another example is the work by Huang & Zhu, which uses a Semi-Markov model to maximize the attacker's engagement time in a honeynet while minimizing the risk of compromising the decoy through adaptive network policies [24].

In the field of Industrial Control Systems (ICS) protocols, a notable case is NeuralPot [25], which trains two Deep Neural Network (GAN and Autoencoder) models with Modbus traffic captures, achieving realistic responses to Modbus queries and actively misleading intruders.

## 2.3 Honeypots Powered by LLM-Based AI

With the rapid emergence of artificial intelligence and the widespread adoption of LLMs — general-purpose models that have begun to permeate every field — various implementations have also been proposed in the domain of honeypots. A 2024 study explored this concept by conducting a series of experiments on datasets simulating SSH servers, using GPT-3.5 without fine-tuning, to evaluate whether the use of LLMs could enhance honeypot capabilities [26].

The results highlighted several key findings: (1) simple commands yielded better performance compared to more complex ones; (2) maintaining conversational context across sessions proved to be important; (3) the authors concluded that LLMs are particularly well-suited for request–response protocols; (4) compared to high-interaction honeypots that emulate protocols, LLM-based systems reduce the likelihood of a real system compromise; and (5) certain limitations were identified, such as response latency — which could alert an attacker — and the difficulty for LLMs to provide accurate real-time date and time information when required.

Similar ideas are observed in other studies, such as [27], which also leverage GPT-based models to simulate an SSH environment. In addition, this work focuses on securing the model itself, aiming to mitigate direct attacks against the LLM, such as prompt injection.

The application of LLMs within deceptive tools is not limited to honeypots. Several studies have explored this combination to generate honeytokens including passwords, configuration files, and other decoys using automated prompt engineering techniques [28]. These experiments have revealed that not all LLMs respond with the same level of effectiveness, indicating that model selection plays a significant role in the reliability and quality of the generated artifacts.

It can be observed that this is a field in which numerous works have been developed in recent years, including some notable examples integrated into broader projects previously mentioned, such as T-Pot [14]. T-Pot also incorporates advanced LLM-based honeypots, including Beelzebub [29], which simulates a wide range of protocols, and Galah [30], which focuses specifically on the HTTP protocol.

From the reviewed literature, two main approaches can be identified when integrating LLMs into honeypot systems. The first involves using LLMs through APIs provided by vendors such as OpenAI or Google, typically combined with

prompt engineering techniques to refine responses. The second consists of fine-tuning open-source models to achieve behavior more closely aligned with the specific system or protocol being simulated.

- **Fine-tuning:** This approach involves retraining an open-source LLM on a domain-specific dataset so that its responses are tailored to the exact context, system, or protocol it aims to emulate. Several works fall into this category, including a honeypot simulating the SSH protocol [31], others targeting the MySQL database protocol [32], more domain-specific protocols such as those used in the industrial sector [33], and even honeypots designed to mimic a real-world API [34].
- **API-based:** Studies in this group rely on accessing LLMs via external APIs to simulate interactive environments without the need to host or train the model locally. This approach offers the ability to leverage state-of-the-art proprietary models. Examples include the simulation of SSH consoles [35, 36] and various shell environments [37, 38, 39], where LLMs are tasked with convincingly emulating user–system interactions in real time.

### 3 Design & Implementation

Following the literature review, this work aims to broaden the existing range of solutions and address identified gaps, supported by evidence from prior studies showing that delegating a honeypot’s responses to an LLM can yield significant improvements. Among the most frequently cited advantages, adaptability stands out, enabling the system to respond dynamically to varied attacker behaviors. Additionally, by not exposing a real system, the risk of an actual machine compromise is inherently reduced. However, this does not entirely eliminate security concerns, as LLMs themselves introduce a distinct set of risks, as outlined in the OWASP LLM Top 10 [40].

Probably the most significant drawback of an LLM-based honeypot is response latency, which is influenced by the number of tokens the model must generate and the hardware on which it is executed. These factors can be adjusted to reduce response time, either by sacrificing some degree of accuracy or by deploying the model on high-performance infrastructure.

Within the broad spectrum of potential systems, protocols, and functionalities that could be simulated, LDAP was selected as the target for this study. This decision is motivated by the protocol’s critical role in modern infrastructures and the sensitivity of the information it manages. Furthermore, this work addresses the absence of any publicly documented LLM-based honeypot capable of simulating the LDAP protocol, as no prior publications evidencing such a system have been identified.

As the project evolved, several key design decisions were made. One of these concerned whether to implement the system through an API-based approach or to apply some form of fine-tuning. Ultimately, the latter option was chosen, as it was believed to offer better results and enable the development of a more comprehensive tool. To support this decision, the works reviewed in the preceding section were analyzed, leading to a set of conclusions for each approach, which are summarized in Table 1.

Aspect	API	Fine-tune
Implementation Ease	High	Low
Control	Limited by prompts	Full output control
Deploy Time	Days–weeks	Weeks–months
Realism	Good if base strong	Higher; domain-trained
Cost	Low–medium	High

Table 1. LLM: API vs. Fine-tuning

During the development phase, few-shot learning was tested as a potential approach. This technique ranges from zero-shot (no examples provided) to n-shot (a limited set of examples), guiding a model to perform a task without full retraining. Initial experiments with models such as LLaMA showed that it could handle very simple scenarios; however, as soon as the complexity increased — particularly due to LDAP’s variability in operations, attributes, and structures — the model failed to provide adequate responses. The limited examples were insufficient for the model to generalize effectively, reinforcing the conclusion that fine-tuning was the most appropriate solution for the problem.

Another relevant aspect of the implementation is the adjustment of data handling to ensure that both input and output are in JSON format. The model receives a request in JSON and returns its response in the same structure. This choice is

driven by several factors: JSON offers a convenient and human-readable format for programming, development, and testing; it enables the serialization of the LLM’s textual output, allowing the necessary fields to be reconstructed in an orderly manner for the client’s response; and it is widely used in logging, with native support in many tools for importing and processing JSON data.

Some of the most popular tools used within organizational ecosystems that can integrate this type of data include Azure Monitor, Splunk, and the ELK/Logstash stack. Azure Monitor, Microsoft’s monitoring service, can ingest JSON-formatted files through data collection rules [41]. Splunk provides a dedicated sourcetype for processing JSON logs [42]. Finally, the ELK stack leverages Logstash, a plugin capable of parsing JSON messages and decomposing them into structured fields [43].

### 3.1 Dataset

Regarding dataset generation, this step was necessary to perform fine-tuning, as no public datasets containing LDAP traffic were found. To address this, three LDIF (LDAP Data Interchange Format) files were created using the tool LDIF Generator [44], which allows the construction of complex directory structures by customizing parameters such as the number of users, groups, or the depth of nested OUs. For each file, a different domain was selected: domain.example.org, corp.local, and globex.internal. These structures were then further enriched to increase diversity and enable additional operations. Specifically, attributes such as email, phone number, department number, job title/position, and passwords were added, the latter making it possible to perform authentication operations [45]. This enrichment process was partially automated through a custom script, which ensured consistency across generated entries while maintaining variability. Once defined, the files were imported one by one into an OpenLDAP server.

For each OpenLDAP configuration, a plan was designed and executed that comprised a broad range of operations, including authentications (40.67%), queries (43.12%), creations (1.83%), modifications (7.34%), moves (0.31%), deletions (1.53%), comparisons (4.28%) and extended operations (0.92%), the distribution can be observed in Fig. 1. In total, the dataset contains 328 records and also includes failed operations. The percentages reflect a diverse distribution of operation types, with queries and authentications dominating, which is consistent with typical LDAP usage in production environments: “A typical client session consists of one or more bind operations, followed by a number of search operations, and then an unbind.” [46].




Fig. 1. Distribution of LDAP Operations in the Dataset.

To perform these, most commands were executed with the *ldap-utils* package, complemented by actions from Nmap scripts, Metasploit modules, and other graphical tools. These tools were included because it is possible that attackers may rely on them during reconnaissance phases in real-world scenarios.

In order to construct the dataset, each operation defined in the plan was executed while capturing the corresponding network traffic with Wireshark, storing every action individually in .pcap, .pcapng, or .cap files. Once the LDAP traffic was collected, a custom parser script was used to automate its transformation into a single CSV file. The process decoded LDAP messages from the raw captures, preserved the request–response mapping based on *messageID*, and exported them as structured JSON pairs, as can be observed in Fig. 2. The resulting unified CSV contains all operations in two columns —input and output— representing the interaction between client and server. This process is summarized in Fig. 3.

It is important to note that a single request can generate multiple responses, particularly in search operations where multiple entries may be returned, followed by a final message indicating the end of the response. As this characteristic is inherent to LDAP, the dataset was explicitly designed to capture it, ensuring that each request can be associated with several nested JSON responses.

```

{
  "messageID": 9,
  "protocolOp": {
    "searchRequest": {
      "baseObject": "dc=corp,dc=local",
      "scope": 2,
      "sizeLimit": 20,
      "filter": {
        "equalityMatch": {
          "attributeDesc": "objectClass",
          "assertionValue": "person"
        }
      },
      "attributes": ["cn","sn","mail","objectClass"]
    },
  }
}

{
  "messageID": 9,
  "protocolOp": {
    "searchResEntry": {
      "objectName": "cn=prokosch oosterink,ou=Accounting,...",
      "attributes": [
        {"type": "objectClass", "vals": ["top","person","organizational\\Person","inetOrgPerson"]},
        {"type": "cn", "vals": ["prokosch oosterink"]},
        {"type": "sn", "vals": ["oosterink"]},
        {"type": "mail", "vals": ["new.admin@corp.local"]}
      ]
    }
  }
}

```

Fig. 2. Example of LDAP request and response encoded in JSON.




Fig. 3. Dataset Creation Process




Fig. 4. Overview of the Honeypot-LLM LDAP system architecture

### 3.2 Architecture

The architecture developed in this work is composed of several coordinated components that together simulate the behavior of an LLM-based honeypot for the LDAP protocol. The workflow begins with the reception of LDAP requests by a local listener, which parses them and transforms them into JSON format to be interpreted by the model. These requests are then forwarded to a remote service running on Colab, where the LLM generates the corresponding responses.

The responses are transmitted back in JSON format, reconstructed into ASN.1/BER, and finally returned to the LDAP client as if they originated from a real server. At this stage, all interactions are also recorded in dedicated logs, ensuring that the traffic generated by the honeypot can later be analyzed to extract valuable insights into attacker behavior and potential threats.

The Fig. 4 provides a schematic overview of this workflow, which is subsequently explained in detail through the description of each individual module.

### 3.3 Listener LDAP

The *ldap\_monitor.py* script serves as the socket server, responsible for receiving network frames and handling incoming raw LDAP requests encoded in BER. It converts the LDAP data into hexadecimal format and delegates the parsing and response generation to other components. Once the responses are produced, it also manages the construction of the corresponding TCP packets. If an unbind operation is received from the client, it is ignored. This script acts as the entry point of the entire system, and the IP address and port on which it runs can be configured as needed.

### 3.4 LDAP Orchestrator

LDAP as a protocol follows the ASN.1 (Abstract Syntax Notation One) standard, which defines how data structures are represented so that clients and servers share a common syntax to exchange messages. Each operation is subject to specific rules defined in RFC 4511 [47]. LDAP traffic is not transmitted in plain text but rather encoded using BER (Basic Encoding Rules), which serialize ASN.1 messages into bytes before transmission. Consequently, in order for the honeypot to process incoming messages and generate responses that comply with the RFC specification, a Python

script *ldap\_parser\_and\_responder.py* was designed to translate a BER-encoded hex stream containing LDAP data into a plain-text JSON format, in accordance with RFC 4511.

A widely used library, *pyasn1* [48], implements the ASN.1 specification along with its primary encoding rules (BER, DER, CER). Building on this foundation, additional libraries such as *pyasn1-modules* [49] extend its functionality by providing Python classes for a variety of RFCs. However, none of these modules specifically implement RFC 4511. An alternative project, *asn1ate* [50], offers the capability to transform an ASN.1 definition into a Python class, thereby enabling encoding and decoding in compliance with a given RFC.

At the beginning of this work, several experiments were conducted using *asn1ate* to generate Python classes compliant with RFC 4511. While the resulting implementation was able to successfully handle basic operations, such as authentication and simple searches, it failed when dealing with more complex requests. Eventually, the open-source library *pyasn1-ldap* [51] was identified. This library, which also leverages *asn1ate*, provides a functional Python implementation of LDAP message parsing. Since it demonstrated robust handling of various LDAP operations, it was adopted as the foundation for this project.

Once the request is parsed, it is forwarded to the LLM, delegating this action to the next script in the chain. When the response from the LLM is received, either as a single JSON object or as multiple ones, it is reconstructed one by one into ASN.1 and re-encoded into BER before being returned to the listener.

In addition to generating and transmitting responses, the system incorporates a dedicated logging mechanism. Every request–response pair is stored in JSON format, including metadata such as the exact timestamp of the interaction and the client’s IP address. This feature not only ensures traceability of all simulated traffic but also provides a structured dataset that can later be leveraged for threat intelligence, forensic analysis, and system debugging. Moreover, the logs can be integrated into the workflow of real-time security mechanisms, enabling the automatic triggering of alerts when suspicious activity is detected.

### 3.5 Bridge LLM

The *ldap\_colab\_client.py* script functions as an HTTP bridge between the local orchestrator and the inference service deployed in Colab. Specifically, it sends the LDAP request already serialized to JSON by the orchestrator via a POST request to the public `/receive_data` endpoint exposed through ngrok. The client supports response streaming, enabling line by line processing in cases where the LLM produces multiple JSON objects, as commonly occurs with search operations. In this way, each response generated by the LLM in Colab can be retrieved individually.

Alternative approaches (e.g., SSH tunnels or VPNs) were considered for connectivity, but an HTTP client using ngrok was selected due to its ease of integration and because the expected workload did not exceed the free tier quotas. Within this architecture, the ngrok token is configured on the server side (the Flask service running in Colab) to open the tunnel and publish a public URL. The client itself does not transmit credentials; instead, it simply posts the request to the exposed URL (e.g., `https://...ngrok-free.app/receive_data`).

### 3.6 Deployment Platforms

Due to the lack of dedicated infrastructure to execute an LLM, the Google Colab platform was used, as it provides access to powerful GPUs capable of performing fine-tuning within a reasonable time frame and executing the model efficiently. Alongside this platform, Unsloth [52], an open-source project that provides tools to simplify the fine-tuning of LLMs, was employed. Unsloth enables faster and more efficient training by reducing resource consumption without compromising output quality. As a result, even large-scale LLMs can be adapted within modest computational environments. In this work, Unsloth significantly facilitated the fine-tuning process through its well-structured Colab notebook templates, which provide guided introductions and initial benchmarking for experimentation.

Another noteworthy feature integrated into these notebooks is LoRA (Low-Rank Adaptation) [53], a fine-tuning technique designed to adapt large-scale models without retraining all of their original parameters. Instead of updating the entire network, LoRA introduces low-rank matrices into specific layers, dramatically reducing the number of parameters that need to be optimized. This approach results in significantly lower resource consumption while maintaining the ability to fine-tune state-of-the-art models.

Among the available options, the LLaMA 3.1 (8B) model was selected for this work, primarily due to its popularity, efficiency, and extensive community support. Furthermore, it includes native function-calling capabilities, which were initially considered useful for validating the correctness of JSON outputs during response generation, although this feature was ultimately not utilized in practice.

Our model is fine-tuned using a sequence-to-sequence framework with 6 training epochs. The batch size is set to 16 per device, with no gradient accumulation. We employ a cosine learning rate scheduler with a base learning rate of  $5 * 10^{-5}$  and a dynamic warm-up ratio of 0.12. Gradient clipping is applied with a maximum norm of 0.5, and weight decay is set to 0.01. Optimization is performed using AdamW with 8-bit precision. For numerical stability, mixed precision is enabled with BF16, which is natively supported on NVIDIA A100 GPUs. The training process is conducted with PyTorch and the TRL library.

The choice of a cosine learning rate scheduler is motivated by its ability to smoothly decrease the learning rate, which helps avoid abrupt changes during optimization and often results in better convergence compared to step-based schedules [54]. Gradient clipping with a maximum norm of 0.5 is applied to stabilize training, as it prevents exploding gradients in transformer architectures, particularly when using large batch sizes or long sequences [55]. Additionally, a weight decay of 0.01 is used to regularize the model, reducing overfitting by penalizing large parameter values, a technique widely adopted in fine-tuning large language models [56].

During the training phase in the Google Colab environment, several relevant features were incorporated. For each request-response pair in the dataset, a prompt was applied together with specific instructions. The primary objective was to guide the LLM not only toward predicting a valid LDAP response but, more importantly, toward generating a correctly structured JSON output. Particular attention was paid to the proper use of quotation marks, braces, and brackets to ensure strict compliance with the required syntax.

In the prediction phase, two prompt modes were defined for the LLM. The first, automatic mode, allowed the model to infer context autonomously from the request itself, adapting the response according to attributes present in the input, for example the domain specified or the email domain included in a search filter. In this way, if the domain contained a “.es” TLD, the model tended to produce names and values in Spanish in its responses.

The second mode, manual, was designed for the operator to explicitly configure a fixed context. In this case, parameters such as the base distinguished name (DN), language, and organizational type to be simulated could be specified, ensuring greater coherence with the operational environment in which the tool was deployed.

In both modes, a set of common instructions was enforced: replicating the same *messageID* from the request within the response, ensuring the syntactic validity of the JSON, and consistently reusing the input DN throughout the response.

Additional safeguards were implemented in the Python script executed in Colab. These included an estimated calculation of the number of tokens required, based on an analysis of the data generated during dataset construction. Similar to the strategy proposed by Ragsdale and Boppana (2023) [27], careful prompt engineering was applied to minimize randomness and reduce unnecessary token consumption. Accordingly, a maximum token allocation was set depending on the operation type. For instance, broad search queries, or requests with a higher sizeLimit, were assigned a large number of maximum tokens. While simple authentication operations (*bindRequest*) required much shorter outputs and thus significantly fewer tokens.

If the operation type was not recognized, the function default value is set to 1,000 tokens, providing a sufficient margin to attempt handling unexpected outputs.

Finally, due to the token limitations of the LLM, it was possible for responses to exceed the estimated maximum and become truncated. To mitigate this issue, the system evaluated the generated output by splitting it into JSON blocks and discarding any incomplete ones. In the specific case of search operations, if the response was detected to be truncated or missing the appropriate closing *searchResDone*, the system automatically generated a closing JSON object including the same *messageID*, thereby ensuring communication consistency and structural validity.

## 4 Evaluation & Results

### 4.1 Custom Evaluation Framework

In the context of this work, traditional evaluation metrics commonly applied to machine learning models are not directly suitable for assessing the behavior of an LLM-based honeypot simulating LDAP. Accuracy, understood as the proportion of outputs identical to the expected ones, would be ineffective since exact string-level matches are rarely achievable: distinguished names (DNs) may vary in the order of their attributes, optional fields such as *diagnosticMessage* may legitimately differ, and the ordering of *searchResEntry* results in a search operation is not semantically relevant. Likewise, metrics such as Precision, Recall, or F1-score are designed for tasks where there is a well-defined set of expected and predicted elements (e.g., classification or entity detection). Applying them here would require a rigorous definition of what constitutes a “correct” response: whether it is the presence of all required attributes, the use of the correct *messageID*, or the consistent return of a *searchResDone* message. For these reasons, a custom evaluation system

was designed, tailored to the specific characteristics of LDAP and the objectives of this honeypot. That system consists of different key properties of the LDAP structure, which are objectively measurable without penalizing natural variation.

- **Syntax Pass Rate:** This metric measures the percentage of responses that are valid, parseable JSON objects. It additionally performs validation against the ASN.1 specification of LDAP, following the same approach as in the parser. In practice, it penalizes any output that is truncated, contains unmatched brackets, or has incorrect types that prevent it from being interpreted as an LDAPMessage.
- **Structure Pass Rate:** This metric represents the percentage of responses that contain the expected operation according to the request performed, applying strict rules. For instance, a *bindRequest* must be followed only by a *bindResponse*; a *searchRequest* must include one or more *searchResEntry* messages followed by a closing *searchResDone*; modification operations (\*modify, add, del, modDN) must contain their respective responses; and an *abandonRequest* must not produce any response. The goal is to verify that the minimal structure is respected with no additional or unintended operations.
- **Key Field Accuracy:** This metric evaluates the consistency of key fields that must match between request and response. Mismatches between the values are strongly penalized. Additionally, it compares the expected and predicted operation types using a Jaccard similarity index, as shown in Eq. 1. The final score is the average of both components.

$$Jaccard(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|} \quad (1)$$

$A = \text{output\_protocolOps}, \quad B = \text{predicted\_protocolOps}$

- **Completeness Score:** This metric assesses the completeness of responses, applied exclusively to *searchRequest* operations. It considers two factors: the coverage of returned entries and the presence of a closing *searchResDone*. Coverage is measured by comparing the number of predicted *searchResEntry* elements with those expected; the expected value is taken from the reference output, and if unavailable, the *sizeLimit* from the request or at least one entry is used as a baseline. For non-search operations, the metric returns NaN; in such cases, its weight is automatically redistributed to the Structure Pass Rate to avoid artificially inflating the overall score.
- **Weighted Validity Score:** This metric aggregates all previous ones into a single score. Two formulas are applied depending on the type of operation: one for searches (where completeness is explicitly considered), and another for non-search operations (where the weight of completeness is redistributed to structure). The specific formulations are illustrated in Eq. 2 and Eq. 3. In both cases, syntactic robustness and structural validity are prioritized over key field accuracy or completeness, reflecting the principle that the most important requirement is for responses to be well-formed and contain the minimum required operation. A further advantage of this approach is its flexibility: weights can be adjusted according to system needs, either favoring robustness against malformed outputs or emphasizing accuracy and completeness, thus providing an adaptable evaluation metric.

Search Operation Formula

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Weighted} = & 0.4 \cdot \text{Syntax} + 0.3 \cdot \text{Structure} \\ & + 0.2 \cdot \text{KeyFields} + 0.1 \cdot \text{Completeness} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Non-Search Operation Formula

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Weighted} = & 0.4 \cdot \text{Syntax} + 0.4 \cdot \text{Structure} \\ & + 0.3 \cdot \text{KeyFields} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Based on this system, the evaluation script supports two execution modes.

In the first mode (*-infer* option), the script takes as input a CSV file with two columns (input and output), where input corresponds to the LDAP request in JSON format and output represents the expected correct response. From this file, the script invokes the Bridge LLM functionality to connect to Colab and submit the requests. The predictions generated by the model are then stored alongside the request-response pairs, producing a new CSV file with three fields: input,

output, and prediction. This file is subsequently processed by the evaluation system described earlier, generating a detailed report for each evaluated row as well as an aggregated summary with average metrics.

In the second mode (`-data` option), the script starts from a CSV file that already contains all three fields (input, output, prediction). In this case, the inference phase is skipped, and the system proceeds directly to evaluation. This mode enables faster refinement and validation of the metrics, avoiding the need for new LLM calls and thereby accelerating testing cycles.

For the evaluation dataset, a broad range of LDAP operations was incorporated, including authentications through *bindRequest* (44.62%), queries via *searchRequest* (35.38%), modifications (6.15%), comparisons (4.62%), deletions (3.08%), additions (3.08%), and extended operations (3.08%), the distribution can be observed in Fig. 5. In total, the dataset comprises 65 records, with failed operations also included in order to replicate more realistic conditions. In this case, the domain used was `uc3m.es`, which had not been shown to the LLM during the training phase, thereby ensuring the independence of the evaluation data from the training set. Moreover, the use of this domain also makes it possible to observe how effectively the model is able to infer context in scenarios not explicitly covered during training.




Fig. 5. Distribution of LDAP Operations in the Evaluation Dataset.

The dataset was generated following the same collection process described previously: executing operations with different tools, capturing the traffic with Wireshark, and then processing the resulting files with the same custom script to produce a unified CSV.

## 4.2 Results & Metrics

This section presents the results obtained from testing and evaluating the proposed system. The experiments were designed to validate both the functional behavior of the honeypot and its ability to correctly simulate LDAP interactions using an LLM.

It is important to note that all evaluations were performed under the same conditions as the training phase, using the same hardware configuration and the same LLM model. This ensures consistency across the experimentation pipeline and eliminates variability derived from changes in computational resources.

As a first step, individual tests were carried out using small scripts that executed a sequence of LDAP operations: a *bindRequest*, a *searchRequest* configured to produce multiple responses, and finally an *unbindRequest*. The traffic generated during these operations was captured with Wireshark and inspected at the network level. The analysis confirmed that the system functioned correctly, with well-formed TCP segments, flags, and acknowledgments. At the application level, the LDAP responses were also verified to be correct, ensuring proper end-to-end behavior of the system.

Another simple but relevant experiment was conducted using the graphical application Apache Directory Studio. A search operation limited to five users was performed, requesting multiple attributes. The test was successful, and the results were displayed in the application's interface as expected. This experiment not only confirmed that the honeypot can respond adequately to a real LDAP client application, but also demonstrated that the generated messages were syntactically correct and structurally consistent, enabling them to be parsed and visualized without errors.

These initial validation tests confirm that the system behaves correctly at both the network and application levels, providing a solid foundation before moving on to more systematic evaluations with the constructed datasets.

Shifting from functional validation to evaluation with the constructed dataset, the first step was to measure how well the model performed without any fine-tuning. This baseline evaluation provided an essential reference point, making it possible to later contrast the results against those obtained after fine-tuning. By establishing this comparison, it becomes

clearer to what extent fine-tuning improves the system’s ability to generate robust and accurate LDAP responses under realistic conditions.

The results of the baseline evaluation are summarized in Table 2. Overall, the metrics reflect that, while the model is able to generate syntactically valid outputs in most cases, significant limitations remain in terms of structural consistency and completeness.

Metric	Value
Syntax Pass Rate	0.9231
Structure Pass Rate	0.5077
Key Field Accuracy	0.4723
Completeness Score	0.1000
Weighted Validity Score	0.6618

Table 2. Baseline Model Evaluation

The Syntax Pass Rate exceeded 90%, which can be partly attributed to the fact that JSON is a widely adopted format and that the prompts were explicitly designed to reinforce correct syntax. By contrast, the Structure Pass Rate, just above 50%, reveals that the baseline model frequently failed to correctly associate requests with their expected responses, reflecting that without training it lacks an understanding of which operation pairs belong together. Regarding Key Field Accuracy, which averaged around 47%, the analysis shows that most of the penalties came from the Jaccard similarity on the operation type rather than from *messageID* mismatches, suggesting that while identifiers were often preserved, the predicted operation class was not always aligned with the expected one. The Completeness Score, close to 10%, further confirms that the baseline model struggled in particular with search operations, where coverage and proper termination were rarely achieved.

The Weighted Validity Score places overall performance at around two-thirds of the maximum possible value. This confirms that the baseline model is capable of producing syntactically correct outputs but lacks a reliable grasp of LDAP semantics, particularly in terms of operation pairing and search completeness. These limitations make clear the necessity of fine-tuning to strengthen structural validity and improve overall protocol fidelity.

With regard to the evaluation of the fine-tuned model, it should be mentioned that a small number of preliminary experiments were carried out to adjust training parameters such as the number of epochs and additional configuration details. These adjustments were only intended to reach a reasonable balance between accuracy and coherence in the generated responses. The results of these trials are not included here, as the primary goal of this work is not to optimize the model, but rather to demonstrate that the honeypot is capable of responding adequately to LDAP requests, as discussed in the introduction regarding its scope.

The results of the fine-tuned model are summarized in Table 3. Compared with the baseline, the improvements are substantial across all metrics, demonstrating that fine-tuning was critical to achieve robust LDAP simulation.

Metric	Value
Syntax Pass Rate	1.0000
Structure Pass Rate	1.0000
Key Field Accuracy	0.9769
Completeness Score	0.8132
Weighted Validity Score	0.9888

Table 3. Fine-Tuned Model Evaluation

The Syntax Pass Rate reached 100%, confirming that every response generated was a valid and parseable JSON object. While the baseline already performed relatively well in this metric, the fine-tuned model completely eliminated cases of malformed or truncated outputs. This shows that the model internalized the reinforced syntax rules applied during training, guaranteeing syntactic reliability regardless of the complexity of the request.

The Structure Pass Rate also attained 100%, a striking contrast with the baseline’s performance just above 50%. This result resolves one of the baseline model’s main shortcomings, as it consistently demonstrates the ability to reproduce LDAP’s operational logic and correctly pair requests with their corresponding responses. This improvement directly addresses one of the most critical limitations of the baseline model, namely its inability to reproduce the operational logic of LDAP without supervision.

The Key Field Accuracy improved to nearly 98%. A detailed review shows that all *messageID* values were correctly preserved, and the remaining penalties in this metric were exclusively due to the Jaccard similarity on the operation type. The fine-tuned model not only preserved identifiers consistently but also learned to map the correct class of operations, thereby ensuring coherence between client requests and honeypot responses.

The Completeness Score rose to above 80%, which is remarkable given that this metric was the weakest point of the baseline model at only 10%. This shows that the fine-tuned model is capable of producing search results that closely match the expected coverage, while also ensuring the presence of the required closing *searchResDone*. Since search operations dominate typical LDAP traffic, this improvement is critical to making the honeypot convincing in realistic attack scenarios.

Finally, the Weighted Validity Score reached almost 99%, which reflects a near-optimal balance across syntax, structure, key fields, and completeness. Unlike the baseline model, whose weighted score highlighted inconsistencies in semantic validity, the fine-tuned model demonstrates that it can deliver outputs that are not only syntactically correct but also semantically faithful to the LDAP specification.

In summary, fine-tuning transformed the model from one that could only approximate LDAP responses into a system capable of reliably simulating the protocol with high fidelity. The improvements in structural validity and completeness are particularly important, as they determine whether the honeypot is perceived as realistic by potential attackers. These results validate the fine-tuning approach as essential for bridging the gap between syntactic correctness and full protocol compliance.

The results show that the model is highly robust in simple LDAP operations such as *bindRequest*, *addRequest*, *delRequest*, *compareRequest*, and *extendedReq*, where it achieved 100% in syntax, structure, and key fields, resulting in perfect overall scores. This indicates that in basic interaction scenarios the system is stable and reliable, accurately reproducing the expected behavior.

In contrast, *searchRequest* operations represent the main weakness. Although syntax and structure are always correct, there is a noticeable drop in key fields (93.5%) and, more significantly, in completeness (81.3%). This means that the model tends to return partial responses, omitting some *searchResEntry* elements before closing with *searchResDone*. As a result, overall performance is slightly affected in more complex scenarios involving larger result sets, suggesting that further improvements are needed in handling long responses.

For further detail, Table 4 presents the disaggregated results by operation type. As shown, the model consistently achieves perfect scores in simple operations such as *bindRequest*, *addRequest*, *delRequest*, *compareRequest*, and *extendedReq*. The performance of *searchRequest* operations, however, is comparatively lower in terms of key fields and completeness, which confirms the observations discussed above.

Operation	Cases	Syntax Pass	Structure Pass	Key Fields	Completeness	Weighted Score
<b>bindRequest</b>	29	1.00	1.00	1.00	–	1.00
<b>addRequest</b>	2	1.00	1.00	1.00	–	1.00
<b>delRequest</b>	2	1.00	1.00	1.00	–	1.00
<b>compareRequest</b>	3	1.00	1.00	1.00	–	1.00
<b>extendedReq</b>	2	1.00	1.00	1.00	–	1.00
<b>searchRequest</b>	23	1.00	1.00	0.935	0.813	0.968

Table 4. Evaluation Metrics by Operation

In this sense, the experiments confirm that the approach is feasible and that the tool fulfills its intended purpose. These findings provide the basis for the discussion presented in the following section, where the main conclusions of the work are outlined together with its limitations and potential directions for future research.

## 5 Conclusion and Future Work

This work has presented the design and implementation of a functional honeypot based on LLMs, capable of simulating the LDAP protocol with reasonable reliability and robustness. The primary objective, developing a deception system that attracts attackers, records their interactions, and generates reliable LDAP responses, has been achieved. As with any honeypot, the system enables the extraction of IOCs and TTPs from the interactions it records. These records can also be integrated into monitoring environments, such as a SIEM, where any interaction with the honeypot itself may serve as an early warning of an attempted compromise.

The evaluation results demonstrate not only that the system is capable of producing adequate LDAP responses, but also that the decision to fine-tune the model was essential in achieving this outcome. Fine-tuning significantly improved performance across all metrics, with notable gains in syntax and structural validity. The model learned to consistently reproduce the expected request–response pairs, eliminating the baseline errors where operations were mismatched. Similarly, improvements in key fields confirmed that the model reliably preserved identifiers and maintained coherence across multiple operations. Perhaps most importantly, the handling of *searchRequest* operations, which represent the majority of real LDAP traffic, showed substantial progress compared with the baseline, underscoring the practical relevance of the improvements.

Additional mechanisms implemented during development also contributed to the robustness of the system. Token management strategies enabled faster responses for short operations, addressing one of the main disadvantages of LLMs while allowing parameters to be tuned for operations that required longer outputs. The automatic discarding of malformed responses and the correction of incomplete search operations (e.g., appending a missing *searchResDone*) further strengthened the reliability of the honeypot, ensuring that its behavior remained consistent even in edge cases.

The custom evaluation framework proved to be well-suited to the specific requirements of LDAP, avoiding reliance on traditional machine learning metrics such as accuracy or F1-score, which would not provide meaningful insights in this context. Instead, the system evaluated responses according to protocol semantics and structural correctness. This design not only supports the assessment of the current implementation but also allows future extensions, for instance by placing greater emphasis on completeness or incorporating new evaluation dimensions.

Taken together, the integration of an LLM at the core of the honeypot, the supporting mechanisms for token management and response validation, and the custom evaluation system provide a flexible framework that can be adapted to different scenarios and improved over time. The work therefore demonstrates both the feasibility of using LLMs for deception purposes and the potential for refinement of the proposed system.

Beyond the tool itself, this work addresses a clear gap in the literature. To the best of our knowledge, no previous research has proposed or implemented an LLM-based honeypot for LDAP with comparable depth. The contribution is therefore twofold: on the one hand, a novel honeypot system specifically tailored to LDAP available on Github [57]; and on the other, the creation of a dataset of LDAP traffic that is being made publicly available via platforms such as Hugging Face [58]. This dataset constitutes a valuable resource for the community, enabling further research and experimentation in an area where publicly available data has been lacking.

While the results achieved demonstrate the feasibility and robustness of the proposed system, several aspects remain open for improvement and further exploration. Future work will focus on extending the current foundation with additional capabilities, enhancing realism, and addressing limitations that were intentionally left out of the present scope.

- **Encrypted LDAPS traffic:** Although the parser is capable of encoding and decoding ASN.1 without crashing, the values remain encrypted when LDAPS is used. While much of the literature reports the presence of plaintext LDAP servers, in more mature environments it would be unusual to find an LDAP service without encryption, which could raise suspicion for an attacker. Furthermore, attempts to interact with the honeypot over LDAPS would likely produce unfavorable results. A possible solution would be to introduce an intermediate layer that handles TLS, ensuring that the LLM receives the decrypted traffic as plaintext while preserving the realism of encrypted communication.
- **Exploring alternative models:** In this project, LLaMA was chosen as the main model due to its strong performance and familiarity within the research community. However, one of the clearest avenues for improvement is to evaluate different LLMs, including lighter models with fewer parameters that could provide more real-time responses. An interesting candidate for future testing is Qwen2.5-7B [59], which in addition to being smaller, has been specifically designed to generate structured outputs such as JSON, making it particularly relevant for this use case.
- **Expanding the dataset:** Although the current dataset includes a wide range of operations and covers most of the possibilities defined in the LDAP protocol, its scope could be further extended. Future work could focus

on enriching the dataset with more diverse operations, edge cases, and real-world interaction patterns observed in production systems. Increasing dataset variety would not only improve the training process but also enable the model to better handle unexpected or less frequent queries.

- **Maintaining session context:** One limitation of the current implementation is the lack of session persistence, which can result in inconsistencies. For example, repeating the same query may produce different results, a behavior that would likely raise suspicion for an attacker. To address this, future versions of the honeypot should incorporate mechanisms to maintain session context, storing previous requests and responses so that subsequent interactions remain coherent. Preserving this continuity would increase the realism of the honeypot, making it more convincing in long-lived attacker sessions and providing richer intelligence on adversarial behavior.

## Acknowledgments

Florina Almenares would like to acknowledge the support of R&D projects: PID2023-148716OB-C32 (DISCOVERY) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, PRTR-INCIBE-2023/00623/001 (I-Shaper Strategic Project), funded by the “European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR” due to the collaboration agreement signed between the Instituto Nacional de Ciberseguridad (INCIBE) and the UC3M, and TEC-2024/COM-504 (RAMONES-CM), funded by the Comunidad de Madrid.

Alfonso Sánchez-Macián would like to acknowledge the support of R&D project PID2022-136684OB-C21 (Fun4Date) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and TUCAN6-CM (TEC- 2024/COM-460), funded by Comunidad de Madrid (ORDEN 5696/2024)

## References

- [1] Red Hat, “What is ldap authentication?” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.redhat.com/en/topics/security/what-is-ldap-authentication>
- [2] J. Kaspereit, G. Öndarö, G. L. Cesar, S. Ebbers, F. Ising, C. Saatjohann, M. Jonker, R. Holz, and S. Schinzel, “LanDscAPe: Exploring LDAP weaknesses and data leaks at internet scale,” in *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. Philadelphia, PA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2024, pp. 1225–1242. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity24/presentation/kaspereit>
- [3] National Vulnerability Database (NVD), “Cve-2021-44228: Apache log4j2 jndi remote code execution vulnerability (log4shell),” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2021-44228>
- [4] OWASP Cheat Sheet Series, “Ldap injection prevention cheat sheet,” 2025. [Online]. Available: [https://cheatsheetseries.owasp.org/cheatsheets/LDAP\\_Injection\\_Prevention\\_Cheat\\_Sheet.html](https://cheatsheetseries.owasp.org/cheatsheets/LDAP_Injection_Prevention_Cheat_Sheet.html)
- [5] GreyNoise Intelligence, “Greynoise intelligence discovers zero-day vulnerabilities in live streaming cameras with the help of ai,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.greynoise.io/blog/greynoise-intelligence-discovers-zero-day-vulnerabilities-in-live-streaming-cameras-with-the-help-of-ai>
- [6] BleepingComputer, “Hackers exploit critical juniper rce bug chain after poc release,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bleepingcomputer.com/news/security/hackers-exploit-critical-juniper-rce-bug-chain-after-poc-release/>
- [7] —, “Uk creates fake ddos-for-hire sites to identify cybercriminals,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bleepingcomputer.com/news/security/uk-creates-fake-ddos-for-hire-sites-to-identify-cybercriminals/>
- [8] N. Kambow and L. K. Passi, “Honeypots: The need of network security,” *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technologies*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 6098–6101, 2014.
- [9] SentinelOne, “What are honeytokens in cybersecurity?” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sentinelone.com/cybersecurity-101/cybersecurity/honeytokens/>
- [10] BleepingComputer, “Microsoft creates fake azure tenants to pull phishers into honeypots,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bleepingcomputer.com/news/security/microsoft-creates-fake-azure-tenants-to-pull-phishers-into-honeypots/>
- [11] Wikipedia, “The cuckoo’s egg (book),” 2025. [Online]. Available: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Cuckoo’s\\_Egg\\_\(book\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Cuckoo’s_Egg_(book))
- [12] —, “Honeypot (computing),” 2025. [Online]. Available: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honeypot\\_\(computing\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honeypot_(computing))

- [13] The HoneyNet Project, “The honeyNet project - advancing the state of the art of threat detection,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.honeynet.org/>
- [14] Telekom Security, “T-pot community edition (t-pot ce),” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/telekom-security/tpotce>
- [15] IntelOwl Project, “Greedybear - low interaction honeypot to detect malicious traffic,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/intelowlproject/GreedyBear>
- [16] The HoneyNet Project, “Greedybear honeypot project,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://greedybear.honeynet.org/>
- [17] Niels Provos, “Honeyd - a virtual honeypot daemon,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.honeyd.org/>
- [18] Honeytrap Project, “Honeytrap - modular honeypot framework,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/honeytrap/honeytrap>
- [19] S. Srinivasa, J. M. Pedersen, and E. Vasilomanolakis, “Deceptive directories and “vulnerable” logs: a honeypot study of the ldap and log4j attack landscape,” in *2022 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*, 2022, pp. 442–447.
- [20] D. Subhan and C. Lim, “Unveiling attack patterns: A study of adversary behavior from honeypot data,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Cryptography, Informatics, and Cybersecurity (ICoCICs)*, 2023, pp. 178–183.
- [21] 0xNslabs, “Ldap honeypot,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/0xNslabs/ldap-honeypot>
- [22] qeeqbox, “Chameleon - honeypot framework,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/qeeqbox/chameleon>
- [23] A. Pauna, A.-C. Iacob, and I. Bica, “Qrassh - a self-adaptive ssh honeypot driven by q-learning,” in *2018 International Conference on Communications (COMM)*, 2018, pp. 441–446.
- [24] L. Huang and Q. Zhu, *Adaptive Honeypot Engagement Through Reinforcement Learning of Semi-Markov Decision Processes*. Springer International Publishing, 2019, p. 196–216. [Online]. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32430-8\\_13](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32430-8_13)
- [25] I. Siniosoglou, G. Efstathopoulos, D. Pliatsios, I. D. Moscholios, A. Sarigiannidis, G. Sakellari, G. Loukas, and P. Sarigiannidis, “Neuralpot: An industrial honeypot implementation based on deep neural networks,” in *2020 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, 2020, pp. 1–7.
- [26] S. B. Weber, M. Feger, and M. Pilgermann, “Don’t stop believin’: A unified evaluation approach for llm honeypots,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 144 579–144 587, 2024.
- [27] J. Ragsdale and R. V. Boppana, “On designing low-risk honeypots using generative pre-trained transformer models with curated inputs,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 117 528–117 545, 2023.
- [28] D. Reti, N. Becker, T. Angeli, A. Chattopadhyay, D. Schneider, S. Vollmer, and H. D. Schotten, “Act as a honeytoken generator! an investigation into honeytoken generation with large language models,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.16118>
- [29] Beelzebub Project, “Beelzebub honeypot - advanced honeypot for modern threats,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://beelzebub-honeypot.com/>
- [30] 0x4D31, “Galah - honeypot project,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/0x4D31/galah>
- [31] H. T. Otal and M. A. Canbaz, “Llm honeypot: Leveraging large language models as advanced interactive honeypot systems,” in *2024 IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*. IEEE, Sep. 2024, p. 1–6. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/CNS62487.2024.10735607>
- [32] Y. Hu, S. Cheng, Y. Ma, S. Chen, F. Xiao, and Q. Zheng, “Mysql-pot: A llm-based honeypot for mysql threat protection,” in *2024 9th International Conference on Big Data Analytics (ICBDA)*, 2024, pp. 227–232.
- [33] C. Vasilatos, D. J. Mahboobeh, H. Lamri, M. Alam, and M. Maniatakos, “Llmpot: Dynamically configured llm-based honeypot for industrial protocol and physical process emulation,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.05999>
- [34] A. Sezgin and A. Boyacı, “Decoyptot: A large language model-driven web api honeypot for realistic attacker engagement,” *Computers & Security*, vol. 154, p. 104458, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167404825001476>
- [35] M. Sladić, V. Valeros, C. Catania, and S. Garcia, “Llm in the shell: Generative honeypots,” in *2024 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*. IEEE, Jul. 2024, p. 430–435. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/EuroSPW61312.2024.00054>
- [36] J. A. Christli, C. Lim, and Y. Andrew, “Ai-enhanced honeypots: Leveraging llm for adaptive cybersecurity responses,” in *2024 16th International Conference on Information Technology and Electrical Engineering (ICITEE)*, 2024, pp. 451–456.

- [37] Z. Wang, J. You, H. Wang, T. Yuan, S. Lv, Y. Wang, and L. Sun, “Honeygpt: Breaking the trilemma in terminal honeypots with large language model,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01882>
- [38] W. Fan, Z. Yang, Y. Liu, L. Qin, and J. Liu, “Honeyllm: A large language model-powered medium-interaction honeypot,” in *International Conference on Information and Communications Security*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2024, p. 253–272. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-8801-9\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-8801-9_13)
- [39] C. Guan, G. Cao, and S. Zhu, “Honeyllm: Enabling shell honeypots with large language models,” in *2024 IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*, 2024, pp. 1–9.
- [40] OWASP Foundation, “Owasp top 10 for large language model applications,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://genai.owasp.org/llm-top-10/>
- [41] Microsoft, “Azure monitor: Data collection log json format,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/azure-monitor/vm/data-collection-log-json>
- [42] Somerford Associates, “How to format json data ready for splunk,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.somerfordassociates.com/blog/how-to-format-json-data-ready-for-splunk/>
- [43] Coralogix, “Tutorial: Shipping your logs to coralogix with logstash,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://coralogix.com/blog/tutorial-shipping-your-logs-to-coralogix-with-logstash>
- [44] ebauman, “ldifgen - ldif generator tool,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/ebauman/ldifgen>
- [45] Faker Project, “Faker - python package for generating fake data,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://faker.readthedocs.io/en/master/>
- [46] X. Wang, H. Schulzrinne, D. Kandlur, and D. Verma, “Measurement and analysis of LDAP performance,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 16, no. 01, pp. 232–243, Jan. 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/TNET.2007.911335>
- [47] IETF, “Rfc 4511 - lightweight directory access protocol (ldap): The protocol,” 2006. [Online]. Available: <https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4511>
- [48] pyasn1 Project, “pyasn1 - asn.1 data structures for python,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/pyasn1/pyasn1>
- [49] etingof, “pyasn1-modules - asn.1 modules for pyasn1,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/etingof/pyasn1-modules/>
- [50] kimgr, “asn1late - asn.1 parser and compiler for python,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/kimgr/asn1late>
- [51] pyasn1-ldap Project, “pyasn1-ldap - asn.1/ldap definitions for pyasn1,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://pypi.org/project/pyasn1-ldap/>
- [52] Unsloth Project, “Unsloth notebooks - get started documentation,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.unsloth.ai/get-started/unsloth-notebooks>
- [53] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685>
- [54] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, “Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.03983>
- [55] R. Pascanu, T. Mikolov, and Y. Bengio, “On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks,” 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1211.5063>
- [56] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, “Decoupled weight decay regularization,” 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05101>
- [57] XaviJR14, “Llm-based ldap honeypot,” <https://github.com/XaviJR14/LLM-based-LDAP-Honeypot>, 2025.
- [58] —, “Ldaptraffic dataset,” <https://huggingface.co/datasets/XaviJR14/LDAPTraffic>, 2025.
- [59] A. Cloud, “Qwen2.5-7b-instruct,” <https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct>, 2025.