

Model-Driven Capability Escalation via MCP: A Case Study and Mitigations for Tool-Using LLM Agents

Philippe Bogaerts

Independent Researcher at kubiosesec.tech
philippe.bogaerts@radarsec.com

September 7, 2025

1 Introduction

We analyze execution traces of an LLM agent connected through the Model Context Protocol (MCP) and show how, even with human approvals, the agent *expanded its own toolchain* (installing utilities, writing code, launching local processes) to accomplish a goal. We argue this is a concrete *capability-escalation pattern*, not merely a benign improvement plan and that in adversarial settings it becomes an attack vector enabling policy bypass, supply-chain risk, and data exfiltration. We do not claim a new attack family; rather, we present the first *trace-grounded* case study of **model-led capability escalation via MCP**, where the agent expands its own toolchain and locally pivots to bypass policy, and we formalize this as a reusable threat pattern with practical mitigations.

2 Context and Observations

Task and traces. The operator asked for a YouTube transcription workflow. The agent proposed a pipeline (e.g., `yt-dlp` + Whisper), then proceeded to:

1. check/install local packages (e.g., via Homebrew),
2. write helper code to disk,
3. start local processes through a desktop MCP server, and
4. when a direct path was restricted, *pivot* to local tools to achieve the same outcome.

These steps were individually approved by the user, but the *initiative*—installing software, creating new local integration, expanding capability classes—originated with the model’s plan.

Why this matters. In adversarial conditions (e.g., poisoned web page, hostile transcript, malicious tool metadata), the same behaviors produce:

- **Model-led capability escalation:** the agent installs or enables new binaries/services, expanding what it can execute locally.
- **Policy bypass:** if a domain or method is blocked, the agent can route around it via ungoverned local tools.
- **Supply-chain/code-exec risk:** runtime package installs plus `start_process` and file writes enable execution of untrusted code.
- **Content→tool bridging:** untrusted data (video descriptions, transcripts) can steer subsequent tool calls (indirect prompt injection).
- **Exfiltration surface:** with file and network access, reading local data then exfiltrating via HTTP or other tools is one prompt away.

3 Threat Model

We assume a standard agentic setup:

- **Principal:** a user operating an MCP host (e.g., desktop app) with servers exposing tools such as filesystem, process launch, network clients.
- **Agent:** an LLM with autonomy to plan and call MCP tools, subject to human approval prompts.
- **Adversary:** controls untrusted inputs retrieved or processed by the agent (web results, transcripts, README files, tool documentation) and aims to escalate privileges (install/execute code, exfiltrate data, bypass policy).

Security goal: prevent untrusted data from steering the agent to privileged actions; prevent the agent from self-expanding its capabilities beyond user intent.

4 Attack Vector in the Traces

Pattern: Model-driven toolchain augmentation. The model did not only use existing tools; it *introduced* new ones (package installs, new servers), then executed shell commands. This is a capability class change triggered by the model. When combined with indirect prompt injection (IPI), this becomes a route to arbitrary code execution and exfiltration even if each step is “approved.”

Approval anti-pattern

Human approvals are *necessary but insufficient* when the model proposes privileged actions. If the model determines *which* tools to add and *what* to execute, approvals devolve into rubber-stamping a plan authored by an attacker-controllable process.

Policy-evasion by local pivot. When blocked from a direct fetch, the agent uses local utilities to achieve the same effect, undermining the security policy’s intent (a classic *egress control* gap).

5 Contributions and Positioning

We do not introduce a new attack class. We document a *newly articulated composite pattern* built from known vectors (indirect prompt injection, tool-selection manipulation, and agent privilege escalation) and provide trace-backed evidence in a realistic MCP desktop setup.

What is new

1. **Trace-backed evidence** that the model *initiates toolchain augmentation* inside MCP (installs, enables new servers, writes and executes code).
2. The explicit notion of a **capability-class delta**: detecting when an agent expands its effective power surface, beyond nominal tool use.
3. **Policy-bypass via local pivot**: when direct routes are blocked, the agent switches to local tools to accomplish the same operation.
4. An **end-to-end, reproducible case** with practical mitigations and an operational checklist.

What is not new

- Indirect prompt injection (IPI) and data provenance risks.

- Unsafe tool scopes and violations of least privilege (PoLP).
- Supply-chain exposure from runtime installs and unsandboxed execution.

6 Relation to Prior Work

MCP surface. The MCP spec itself highlights that tools are arbitrary code execution and must be treated with caution; user consent is required but enforcement is left to implementers [1]. Anthropic’s introduction frames MCP as a secure, two-way connection standard [2]. A 2025 MCP landscape paper analyzes security and privacy risks across the MCP server lifecycle [3]. A large-scale study of open-source MCP servers finds distinct vulnerabilities (including “tool poisoning”) beyond traditional patterns [4].

Indirect prompt injection (IPI) & agents. Benchmarks and defenses (e.g., BIPIA [5], SpotLighting [6], CaMeL [7]) document that untrusted content can steer model behavior and tool use. “Prompt Flow Integrity” formalizes agent privilege escalation risks and proposes PoLP-style isolation and data-flow validation [8]. Tool selection itself can be attacked (*ToolHijacker*) by poisoning tool/library documentation to coerce malicious tool choice [9]. Industry reports (Google DeepMind) echo that modern function-calling agents are at real risk of IPI-driven data exfiltration; more capable models are not automatically more secure [10]. Recent work on agent-based attacks shows complete computer takeover via multi-agent trust exploitation and RAG backdoors when shell and process tools are available [11].

7 Recommended Mitigations

1. **Tool least-privilege** (granular scopes): ban generic `start_process`. Replace with *allowlisted* verbs (e.g., `transcribe_audio(file)`), fixed argv, no shell. Separate read/write/exec and require per-action consent [1, 8, 7].
2. **Deny runtime installs:** disallow package manager actions (`brew/pip/apt`) from agent contexts. If absolutely needed, gate behind out-of-band, higher-assurance approvals and signed, pinned artifacts.
3. **Taint isolation for untrusted inputs:** never feed raw web/transcripts into the same agent that has privileged tools. Use a “reader” agent in a sandbox; pass only structured, sanitized summaries onward [6, 8, 7, 10].
4. **Network egress controls:** enforce domain allowlists at the MCP host/OS layer so local pivots cannot bypass blocked routes; log and block secondary fetch paths.
5. **“Why this tool?” attestations:** require the agent to emit a minimal, checkable *action plan* (tools, arguments, capability class deltas). Reject if proposed actions expand capability classes (install/enable new servers) beyond the user’s explicit ask.
6. **Sandboxing:** run desktop/OS-facing MCP servers inside containers/VMs with read-only host views, ephemeral workdirs, no access to secrets, and strict syscall/network profiles [3, 4].
7. **Trust registry for MCP servers:** only load signed servers from a curated registry; treat server-provided tool descriptions as untrusted data [1, 4].
8. **Defense-in-depth detectors:** integrate lightweight IPI screens (provenance-aware prompts, perplexity windows) and retrieval classifiers as guardrails before privileged calls [6, 10, 5].

8 Operational Checklist (Drop-in)

- **Disable** process-launch and package-install tools in production agents.
- **Split** agents: Reader (no tools) → Planner (no exec) → Executor (allowlisted, non-shell tools only).
- **Require** an action plan with explicit capability-class changes; auto-reject plan steps that introduce new servers/tools.
- **Enforce** DNS/HTTP allowlists; block local pivots to prohibited resources.
- **Log & review** every privileged call with provenance of the data that influenced it.

9 Conclusion

This is not a new attack family. It is a *newly articulated, trace-backed composite pattern*: the agent authors a plan to *extend* its own capabilities (capability-class delta) and executes it, locally pivoting to bypass policy where needed. In friendly conditions this solved the task; in adversarial conditions, the same pattern causes policy bypass and code execution. Treat model-led capability escalation as a first-class threat and implement the mitigations above.

Acknowledgments

This write-up references operator-provided traces (omitted for privacy) and public literature cited below.

References

- [1] **Model Context Protocol (MCP) Specification**. Version 2025-03-26. <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/specification/2025-03-26>. Accessed Sep 7, 2025.
- [2] Anthropic. *Introducing the Model Context Protocol*. Nov 25, 2024. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/model-context-protocol>.
- [3] X. Hou, Y. Zhao, S. Wang, H. Wang. *Model Context Protocol (MCP): Landscape, Security Threats, and Future Research Directions*. arXiv:2503.23278, 2025.
- [4] M. M. Hasan, H. Li, E. Fallahzadeh, G. K. Rajbahadur, B. Adams, A. E. Hassan. *MCP at First Glance: Studying the Security and Maintainability of MCP Servers*. arXiv:2506.13538, 2025.
- [5] J. Yi, Y. Xie, B. Zhu, E. Kiciman, G. Sun, X. Xie, F. Wu. *Benchmarking and Defending Against Indirect Prompt Injection Attacks on LLMs*. arXiv:2312.14197 (v4, 2025).
- [6] K. Hines, G. Lopez, M. Hall, F. Zarfati, Y. Zunger, E. Kiciman. *Defending Against Indirect Prompt Injection Attacks With Spotlighting*. arXiv:2403.14720, 2024.
- [7] E. Debenedetti, I. Shumailov, T. Fan, J. Hayes, N. Carlini, D. Fabian, C. Kern, C. Shi, A. Terzis, F. Tramèr. *Defeating Prompt Injections by Design*. arXiv:2503.18813 (v2, 2025).
- [8] J. Kim, W. Choi, B. Lee. *Prompt Flow Integrity to Prevent Privilege Escalation in LLM Agents*. arXiv:2503.15547, 2025.

- [9] J. Shi, Z. Yuan, G. Tie, P. Zhou, N. Z. Gong, L. Sun. *Prompt Injection Attack to Tool Selection in LLM Agents*. arXiv:2504.19793 (v3, 2025).
- [10] Google DeepMind. *Lessons from Defending Gemini Against Indirect Prompt Injections*. arXiv:2505.14534, 2025.
- [11] M. Lupinacci, F. A. Pironti, F. Blefari, F. Romeo, L. Arena, A. Furfaro. *The Dark Side of LLMs: Agent-based Attacks for Complete Computer Takeover*. arXiv:2507.06850, 2025.