



**CSAI**

**CSA** cloud  
security  
alliance®

**CSAI Foundation**

Cloud Security Alliance AI Safety Initiative

# **Kyber Ransomware: Post-Quantum Encryption as an Attack Weapon**

Unofficial AI-assisted Research

2026-04-23

**© 2026 Cloud Security Alliance. Some rights reserved.**

You may download, store, display, view, print, redistribute, and link to this document in its original, unmodified form, provided that attribution to the Cloud Security Alliance is maintained and all trademark and copyright notices remain intact.

This document may not be modified or altered. You may quote portions of the document as permitted by the Fair Use provisions of the United States Copyright Act, provided that attribution is given to the Cloud Security Alliance.

This document may be shared on professional and social media platforms in its original form with attribution.

*This document was generated with AI assistance and has not undergone official CSA review and approval processes.*

---

## Key Takeaways

- In March 2026, the Kyber ransomware group deployed NIST-standardized post-quantum cryptography in an active ransomware campaign targeting a multi-billion-dollar U.S. defense contractor—one of the first publicly documented instances of this technique in live ransomware.
  - The group's Windows variant genuinely implements Kyber1024 (ML-KEM-1024, FIPS 203) for symmetric key protection alongside X25519 and AES-256-CTR, while the ESXi variant falsely claims post-quantum encryption but relies on conventional RSA-4096 and ChaCha8.
  - For victims of the Windows encryptor, the attacker's use of Kyber1024 eliminates the residual recovery option that conventional ransomware occasionally left open—the hope of retaining encrypted files until a future key recovery or cryptanalytic breakthrough—because the attacker's key material is itself quantum-resistant.
  - Defenders should treat this event as a trigger for accelerating cryptographic inventory programs, zero-trust segmentation of virtualization infrastructure, and immutable backup architectures.
- 

## Background

### The Post-Quantum Transition and the Threat It Creates

For decades, the security community has understood that sufficiently capable quantum computers will break the public-key cryptosystems underpinning most of the internet's security infrastructure—RSA, Diffie-Hellman, and elliptic curve cryptography among them. This threat prompted NIST to launch a multi-year post-quantum cryptography (PQC) standardization competition in 2016 [13]. In August 2024, NIST published three finalized Federal Information Processing Standards: FIPS 203 (ML-KEM, derived from CRYSTALS-Kyber), FIPS 204 (ML-DSA), and FIPS 205 (SLH-DSA) [1, 10]. These algorithms derive their security from the computational hardness of problems involving structured mathematical lattices, which are believed to resist attacks from both classical and quantum computers.

The defensive rationale for this transition is clear: organizations that migrate critical systems to quantum-resistant algorithms before "Q-Day" will not be vulnerable to adversaries who eventually acquire quantum computing capability. However, the Kyber ransomware campaign illustrates a significant implication—the same publicly standardized, freely available algorithms that defenders are adopting to protect data can be deployed by attackers to make ransomware encryption permanently irrecoverable, removing a recovery option that has historically offered victims a degree of hope.

The quantum threat timeline is accelerating. Quantum resources required to threaten RSA have dropped significantly since mid-2025, with recent research suggesting that where 20 million qubits were once required to break RSA, new architectural approaches may require fewer than one million [2]. Intelligence community assessments and government advisories indicate that nation-state adversaries have likely already begun "harvest now, decrypt later" collection campaigns, stockpiling encrypted data with the expectation of future quantum decryption [7]. CISA released enterprise guidance on PQC-ready product categories in early 2026, and Google issued a public advisory in February 2026 stressing the immediacy of the transition [3, 7]. The March 2026 campaign demonstrates that ransomware operators have achieved operational deployment of NIST-standardized PQC within months of the final standards being published.

## What Is Kyber1024 (ML-KEM-1024)?

ML-KEM, the standard formerly known as CRYSTALS-Kyber, is a key-encapsulation mechanism—a cryptographic primitive that allows one party to establish a shared symmetric secret using the recipient's public key. It does not directly encrypt data; instead, it secures the key used for bulk encryption. ML-KEM specifies three parameter sets: ML-KEM-512, ML-KEM-768, and ML-KEM-1024, representing increasing security levels. ML-KEM-1024, the variant deployed by the Kyber ransomware group, operates at NIST security level 5, considered equivalent in classical terms to AES-256 [4]. Its 1,568-byte public key is substantially larger than an RSA-2048 key, reflecting the mathematical structure required for lattice-based security, but this overhead is operationally acceptable for a ransomware key-wrapping workflow.

---

# Security Analysis

## The March 2026 Incident

Incident responders at Rapid7 identified two coordinated ransomware variants in March 2026 during an engagement at a U.S. defense contractor and IT services provider with revenues in the multi-billion-dollar range [5, 12]. The attackers deployed both variants simultaneously against the same network,

targeting both Windows file servers and VMware ESXi hypervisors in a synchronized campaign. Both variants shared identical campaign identifiers and communicated with a single Tor-based extortion portal, indicating that a single operator or closely affiliated group coordinated the dual-platform deployment.

The combination of a defense contractor target profile, cross-platform simultaneous deployment, and the deliberate integration of NIST-standardized PQC algorithms signals a level of operational sophistication that distinguishes Kyber from the typical ransomware-as-a-service affiliate running commodity tooling. However, Rapid7 researchers noted that the initial access and lateral movement relied on native tool abuse rather than custom exploits or zero-days—standard techniques proved sufficient to reach mission-critical infrastructure.

## Windows Variant: Genuine Post-Quantum Implementation

The Windows encryptor, written in Rust, implements a layered hybrid cryptographic architecture. At the bulk-encryption layer, AES-256-CTR processes individual files using a per-file symmetric key. That symmetric key is then protected using a combination of Kyber1024 and X25519. The hybrid design is intentional: X25519 provides classical elliptic curve key exchange for compatibility and baseline protection, while Kyber1024 adds the quantum-resistant layer. The operator's private Kyber1024 key is required to recover the per-file symmetric keys; without it, neither classical cryptanalysis nor any currently envisioned quantum algorithm can recover the plaintext.

The variant demonstrates careful engineering of its entropy pipeline. Rather than relying solely on the Windows cryptographic API, it aggregates entropy from system time, the Windows CSPRNG, the RDRAND processor instruction, and running process metadata. This approach suggests that the developer understood the importance of key quality and took steps to ensure that poor entropy—a historically exploitable weakness in ransomware implementations—would not create a decryption opportunity for victims.

The variant implements an extensive suite of anti-recovery commands targeting shadow copies, system logs, backup agents, and running virtual machines. It issues eleven elevated PowerShell, WMIC, and vssadmin commands to delete Volume Shadow Copies, disable the Windows Recovery Environment, clear event logs via wevtutil, empty the Recycle Bin, and terminate services associated with SQL Server, Microsoft Exchange, VSS, Veeam, and backup agents. An experimental Hyper-V shutdown feature uses PowerShell to force hard shutdown of virtual machines, ensuring that files held open by running VMs are accessible for encryption. Encrypted files receive the `.#~::~` extension, and the variant registers this extension via the Windows registry alongside a custom icon directory at `C:\fucked_icon\` to make the encrypted state visually apparent [5].

File targeting follows a partial-encryption strategy: files under 1 MB are fully encrypted; files between 1 MB and 4 MB have only their first megabyte encrypted; and files over 4 MB receive proportional encryption at roughly 10% of their length. This approach maximizes operational throughput while rendering large files functionally unusable, a tradeoff employed by numerous modern ransomware families including LockBit and BlackCat, designed to maximize throughput before detection.

## ESXi Variant: Post-Quantum Marketing Without Implementation

The Linux/ESXi encryptor presents a more nuanced picture. Its ransom note claims the same post-quantum Kyber1024 encryption as the Windows variant, but Rapid7's analysis found that the claim is false. The ESXi binary, statically linked against OpenSSL 1.0.1e-fips, uses ChaCha8 for bulk file encryption and RSA-4096 for key wrapping—entirely conventional cryptography. Researchers suggest the operator likely copied the Windows ransom note template without updating it to reflect the ESXi implementation, an operational error that reveals the group's post-quantum capability as specific to the Windows toolchain rather than a platform-wide achievement [5].

The ESXi variant accesses hypervisors via SSH using `esxcli` to enumerate running virtual machines and gracefully shut them down before encrypting datastore files. Management interfaces are defaced: the variant overwrites `/etc/motd` and VMware's web UI index pages with ransom notes, ensuring that every administrator who opens a console or browser session to the host sees the extortion demand immediately. Encrypted datastore files receive the `.xhsyw` extension. Importantly, CISA confirmed in February 2026 that CVE-2025-22225, a VMware ESXi arbitrary-write vulnerability, is being actively exploited by ransomware operators in 2026 [6], providing a plausible initial access vector for groups targeting ESXi hosts at scale.

## Why Post-Quantum Key Wrapping Changes the Victim's Position

For most ransomware incidents, law enforcement seizure of a ransomware operator's infrastructure, defector disclosures of private keys, or cryptographic weaknesses in the ransomware's implementation have occasionally produced decryptors that allow victims to recover without paying a ransom. In its conventional usage, "harvest now, decrypt later" refers to sophisticated adversaries collecting encrypted network traffic today with the intent to decrypt it once quantum computing capability matures. The analogous residual hope for ransomware victims—retaining ransomware-encrypted files in anticipation of a future key recovery or cryptanalytic breakthrough against the attacker's RSA key—has historically offered some organizations a recovery path. Kyber1024 closes that window for the Windows variant: the attacker's key material is itself quantum-resistant, so no classical or quantum cryptanalytic advance will yield a decryptor.

Kyber1024-protected key material is resistant to this scenario under current and foreseeable cryptanalytic methods. No known classical or quantum attack on ML-KEM-1024 exists, and its security rests on the hardness of Module Learning With Errors—a problem not believed tractable for quantum computers [4].

This does not mean that Kyber ransomware is cryptographically invincible—a poor entropy implementation, a vulnerability in the Rust cryptographic library, or a key management error by the operator could still create a decryption opportunity. But the deliberate use of a NIST-standardized, heavily peer-reviewed algorithm at the highest security parameter set signals that the operator is aware of these pitfalls and has attempted to engineer around them.

---

## Recommendations

### Immediate Actions

Organizations should treat the Kyber ransomware incident as grounds for urgent review of ESXi management exposure. SSH access to VMware ESXi hosts should be disabled unless actively required for operations, and all management interfaces should enforce multi-factor authentication. Monitoring should be configured to alert on anomalous `esxcli` invocations that terminate running virtual machines—particularly bulk shutdowns initiated outside maintenance windows or by service accounts—as this behavior is associated with ESXi ransomware activity when combined with other indicators of compromise. Windows environments should establish detection coverage for mass shadow copy deletion via `vssadmin`, `WMIC`, or `PowerShell`, as well as for the Kyber Windows variant's specific mutex `boomplay[.]com/songs/182988982` and file extensions `.#~::~`. The Rapid7 report provides SHA-256 hashes for both analyzed binaries [5].

### Short-Term Mitigations

Backup architecture should be evaluated for resilience against a coordinated dual-platform ransomware attack. Backups stored on Windows hosts or accessible from Windows service accounts are vulnerable to the Windows variant's targeted service termination and shadow copy deletion. Immutable, off-host, or air-gapped backup repositories—ones that the ransomware's elevated process cannot reach—represent the most effective mitigation against encryption-based extortion regardless of the cryptographic algorithm used. Organizations running mixed Windows and ESXi infrastructure should verify that backup

agents and their credentials are isolated from both attack surfaces. Network segmentation between Windows endpoints and ESXi management networks reduces the likelihood of a single compromised account enabling simultaneous deployment of both variants.

## Strategic Considerations

The Kyber ransomware campaign is the most operationally compelling argument to date for accelerating enterprise cryptographic migration programs. The irony is precise: the NIST PQC standards exist to protect data from quantum-enabled adversaries, and ransomware operators have integrated those same standards to make their attacks more durable. Organizations that have not yet initiated a cryptographic inventory—identifying where RSA, Diffie-Hellman, and ECC are in use across their environment—should begin immediately. CISA, NSA, and NIST have jointly published a quantum-readiness roadmap [7] recommending that organizations prioritize systems protecting critical processes and sensitive data. CISA estimates that a realistic enterprise PQC migration takes three to five years [7, 9], meaning organizations that defer this work into 2027 or 2028 will have less time to complete migration before post-quantum ransomware becomes widespread and before quantum computing threatens the classical encryption they have not yet replaced.

Crypto agility—the operational capability to swap cryptographic algorithms without breaking dependent systems—should be an explicit design requirement for any cryptographic infrastructure investments made in 2026 and beyond. The NCCoE has published detailed guidance on implementing crypto-agile architectures [8]. Organizations in defense, critical infrastructure, and financial services sectors face the highest urgency given their data sensitivity and the adversary interest demonstrated by the Kyber group's target selection.

---

## CSA Resource Alignment

CSA's post-quantum cryptography research portfolio directly addresses the threat class illustrated by the Kyber ransomware incident. CSA's *Practical Preparations for the Post-Quantum World* provides a five-phase implementation framework covering cryptographic inventory, risk assessment, algorithm selection, migration planning, and validation—the foundational steps any organization should complete before a post-quantum ransomware incident, not after. CSA's *Quantum-Safe Security Governance with the Cloud Controls Matrix* [11] maps PQC migration requirements to CCM control domains, enabling organizations to track quantum readiness within existing governance structures. The CCM's Encryption &

Key Management (EKM) domain is directly applicable: the Kyber ransomware incident illustrates precisely the scenario that key management controls are designed to prevent, where an attacker's control of key material renders all protective encryption moot for victims.

CSA's Zero Trust guidance is also relevant. The Kyber group's simultaneous deployment against both Windows and ESXi infrastructure succeeded because both attack surfaces were reachable from a single point of compromise. Zero Trust network architecture—microsegmentation, least-privilege access to hypervisor management planes, and continuous authentication for administrative sessions—would have constrained the blast radius of the initial compromise. Organizations following CSA's Zero Trust advancement model should treat hypervisor management networks as a critical trust boundary requiring the same segmentation rigor as production workloads.

CSA's MAESTRO threat modeling framework, developed for agentic AI systems, is less directly applicable here but points to a broader principle: as AI-assisted development tools become available to threat actors, the sophistication threshold for integrating novel cryptographic algorithms into malware will continue to fall. The Kyber group's Rust implementation of ML-KEM demonstrates that integrating NIST-standardized PQC into functional malware is operationally achievable with existing open-source libraries and development tooling, making defensive migration timelines correspondingly urgent.

# References

- [1] NIST. "[NIST Releases First 3 Finalized Post-Quantum Encryption Standards.](#)" NIST News, August 13, 2024.
- [2] The Quantum Insider. "[Q-Day Just Got Closer: Three Papers in Three Months Are Rewriting the Quantum Threat Timeline.](#)" The Quantum Insider, March 31, 2026.
- [3] Kiteworks. "[Google Warns Quantum Threats to Encryption Are Imminent \(2026\).](#)" Kiteworks, 2026.
- [4] NIST. "[Federal Information Processing Standard \(FIPS\) 203, Module-Lattice-Based Key-Encapsulation Mechanism Standard.](#)" NIST CSRC, August 2024.
- [5] Rapid7. "[Kyber Ransomware Double Trouble: Windows and ESXi Attacks Explained.](#)" Rapid7 Threat Intelligence, April 2026.
- [6] Help Net Security. "[CISA confirms exploitation of VMware ESXi flaw by ransomware attackers.](#)" Help Net Security, February 5, 2026.
- [7] CISA. "[Quantum-Readiness: Migration to Post-Quantum Cryptography.](#)" CISA, 2024.
- [8] NCCoE / NIST. "[Migration to Post-Quantum Cryptography: Crypto Agility Considerations.](#)" NCCoE, 2024.
- [9] CISA. "[Strategy for Migrating to Automated Post-Quantum Cryptography Discovery and Inventory Tools.](#)" CISA, September 2024.
- [10] Cloud Security Alliance. "[NIST FIPS 203, 204, and 205 Finalized: An Important Step Towards a Quantum-Safe Future.](#)" CSA Blog, August 15, 2024.
- [11] Cloud Security Alliance. "[Quantum-Safe Security Governance with the Cloud Controls Matrix.](#)" CSA, 2023.
- [12] BleepingComputer. "[Kyber ransomware gang toys with post-quantum encryption on Windows.](#)" BleepingComputer, April 2026.
- [13] NIST. "[Post-Quantum Cryptography.](#)" NIST Computer Security Resource Center, initiated December 2016.