

The Missing Postmortem OWASP BeNeLux days December 2025 - Mechelen, Belgium





In April 2024, the OpenJS Foundation, home to open source projects used by billions of website, <u>announced</u> it had intercepted a potential open source project takeover attempt similar to XZ Utils.





This is its missing post-mortem.





Have you dealt with a vulnerability

- 1. in your code base?
- 2. in your open source project?
- 3. in someone else's open source project?





Have you dealt with a security incident

- 1. in your organization?
- 2. in someone else's organization?
- 3. in an open source project?
- 4. involving multiple, unrelated open source projects?
- 5. involving multiple, unrelated high-profile open source projects?





Well, I did.





₩ho am I?

Tobie Langel

- Jazz drummer \rightarrow open source dev \rightarrow consulting
- UnlockOpen, open source strategy consulting firm
- CPC Vice Chair & Board Director OpenJS
- No security background
- Open Regulatory Compliance (ORC) WG
- **EU CRA Expert Group**





Targeted Project

- Widely used JavaScript project (critical infra)
- High-impact, low-visibility dependency
- Single exhausted maintainer





Timeline

- Predating suspicious activity (before Q3 2023)
- Pressure campaign starts (Q3 2023)
- XZ Utils backdoor announced (March 29, 2024)
- Project secured
- Broader ecosystem risk identified
- **Escalation to CISA**
- The Stall
- The Lightbulb moment
- The Scramble





Predating suspicious activity

Months before anything started:

- Odd and/or low-quality pull requests: e.g. replacing boolean false with string "false" in tests (equivalent to true in JS)
- Possible motivations:
 - Positioning establish a contribution history
 - Test evasion weaken guardrails for future changes
- •• Individually harmless, but collectively?





Pressure campaign

- Strong resemblance to early XZ Utils patterns
- Multiple emails send to community representatives, Cross Project Council (CPC) mailing list, and project maintainers over months
- Multiple identities, overlapping language, sometimes nearly verbatim copies of emails
- Repeated themes: "Project is unmaintained", "Security vulnerabilities must be fixed", "The foundation should appoint new maintainers", etc.
- Noteworthy: Pull request appeared within 24 hours of us replying to an email after *months* of silence.





XZ Utils backdoor announced

- Had found those emails suspicious previously
- But that's when it clicked!
- Later, we found out the emails to the CPC mailing list where bouncing and I was one of the only one getting them besides the maintainers





Project secured

- Securing the project was fairly quick
- Maintainer had been maintaining a tight ship
- Knew maintainer from way back, trust already established
- Lucky to have security expert on staff paid by the Sovereign Tech Fund for a different project
- rescalated to OpenSSF & Linux Foundation





Broader ecosystem risk identified

- Identified contribution from threat actors in other OpenJS projects
- Threat actors listed as maintainer in multiple, high-profile JS projects outside of OpenJS
- Threat actors listed as maintainer in high-profile C projects used by about a billion of consumers





Escalation to CISA

- © Concerned this wasn't taken seriously enough
- Reached out to personal contact at CISA
- Joined CISA's Joint Cyber Defense Collaborative Partner Program (with my company!)
- Invited to shared Slack channel used to coordinate XZ Utils incident





The Stall

- ? And then... nothing happened!
- A few folks I knew from the industry that were in the channel helped investigate a bit, but that was it.
- X No support from anyone besides providing a shared channel.





The Lightbulb moment

- This is were the security expert we had on staff played a critical role by explaining what was going on.
- CISA's role is vulnerability and incident coordination, not intelligence gathering.
- Intelligence gathering is the role of... the intelligence community (FBI in the US).
- X Except there was not enough there to launch an investigation.
- Washington Center (SOC) investigate internally.
- Collected evidence allows for intelligence community involvement.





We were on our own.





The Scramble

- OpenSSF & LF wanted to make a public announcement to warn maintainers
- All targeted projects needed to be informed urgently. No one was there to do it.
- Leveraged personal network to reach out.
- Had to figure out who was trustworthy, and who wasn't, by myself.
- CISA then just trusted those folks without further vetting.





What's a post mortem for?





"Identify the causes of a project failure (or significant business-impairing downtime), and how to prevent them in the future." (Wikipedia)





So let's give it a try!





We know how to handle vulnerabilities.

We do *not* know how to handle incidents in open source.

- CVEs, coordinated disclosure, patches → mature
- Social engineering, impersonation, multi-persona attacks → no playbooks
- FOSS has long assumed it wasn't a target
- Attackers no longer share that assumption



No open source SOC

- Governments assume every organizations has a SOC
- X There's no SOC for open source
- Open source incidents fall in a conceptual gap between SOCs and CSIRTs.



Other wrong assumptions about open source

- X Vetted employees
- Control and surveillance of the computers and network used by developers
- All developers work for the same organization
- All developers work for a single organization



Trusted introduction model fails for open source

- CSIRTs rely on trusted introductions
- Intros assume institutional vetting
- In open source, intros are personal and informal
- In our case, intros were over-trusted
- CSIRT processes assume corporate vetting structure. Open source doesn't have that



Additional gaps

- No place to send "something feels wrong"
- No cross-ecosystem warning channels
- Personal relationships fill the role of institutional processes
- No entity able to request or trigger a forensic investigation



Why this matters now

- Cyber Resilience Act (CRA) formalizes notification requirements for both vulnerability and incidents
- Supply Chain Attacks are an increasing threat
- Attackers specifically target open source maintainers leveraging burnout, trust and process gaps
- We need to address theses issues



Closing

We have mature processes for vulnerability handling. We have **nothing** for incidents management in open source.

Our whole incident response model is based on primitives that don't exist in open source. We need to identify them and address them.

Until we fix the structural void, the next XZ Utils-style attack may not be caught in time.

