



LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

CYBERRAMBLERS

November 15, 2025

In-Person

Number of Teams	Max Team Points Received	Min Team Points Received	Mean Team Points Received	Total Points Possible
93	8,783	1,267	6,146.81	10,000

TEAM 33 SCORECARD

This table highlights the team's efforts for the 2025 CyberForce Competition®.

Score Category	Team Points	Percent of Points	Team Ranking
Anomalies	402	26.80%	55
Security Documentation	1210	96.80%	8
C-Suite Panel	852	68.16%	85
Red Team	1750	70.00%	8
Blue Team	1967	98.35%	5
Green Team Surveys	1216	81.07%	15
Deductions	0		
Overall	7397	73.97%	15

ANOMALY SCORING

Anomalies simulate the real-world challenges that cybersecurity professionals face daily in the industry. These carefully crafted challenges not only test technical skills but also emphasize daily time management skills that professionals must demonstrate to effectively perform their roles. This year, challenges were longer, and some required more than one person to answer, effectively requiring teams to evaluate risk versus reward.

Anomaly Score	402
----------------------	-----

Below highlights whether the anomaly was correct or incorrect for your team.

1	No	10.7		17	Yes
2		10.8		18	Yes
3		10.9		19	Yes
4	Yes	11.1	Yes	20	No
5	No	11.2	Yes	21	
6		11.3	Yes	22	
7		11.4	Yes	23	
8		11.5		24	
9	No	11.6		25	
10.1	Yes	11.7		26	
10.2	Yes	12		27.1	Yes
10.3	Yes	13		27.2	Yes
10.4		14		28	Yes
10.5		15	Yes	29	No
10.6		16	Yes	30	Yes

ORANGE TEAM

SECURITY DOCUMENTATION

Blue team participants should use the Security Documentation section as an opportunity to highlight unique approaches to securing their infrastructure.

Security Documentation Score	1210
-------------------------------------	------

<i>Strong Points</i>	<i>Areas of Improvement</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The team did an outstanding job with their documentation. They did especially well in identifying vulnerabilities on each asset. They also had very strong system hardening strategies. All vulnerabilities are identified and mitigation is prioritized by business risk. The vulnerability section was documented well. The ability to manage all the tasks of the project. You created a clear and visually effective network diagram, and the color coding you 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The system overview could have some more information on the specific function of each asset. Divide long paragraphs and tables into shorter sections. Use more headings and visual breaks to make reading easier. More detail could have been included in the system overview. With more confidence in communication skills This was a very solid attempt overall. Adding just a little more explanation behind a few of your choices would help bring even more

<i>Strong Points</i>	<i>Areas of Improvement</i>
used for the vulnerability urgency showed strong attention to clarity and prioritization. This level of organization made your work easy to understand and demonstrated real care in how you presented your analysis.	depth to an already well-executed submission. You are clearly on the right path, and the quality of your work shows real potential.

C-SUITE PANEL

C-Suite Panel will be a pre-recorded video based on the task outlined in this document. This video should be recorded and placed somewhere accessible to judges.

C-Suite Panel Score	852
----------------------------	------------

<i>Strong Points</i>	<i>Areas of Improvement</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline of Compromise • The visual aids were laid out well. • It was good to see all the team members participating equally. • Able to explain the risk and develop a solution • The graphics in your slides (especially your timeline Graphic) were really good and helped to tell your story. Also, using different speakers to emphasize the changing of topics was good. • the problem statement was really easy to understand, provided enough detail to convey risks and solutions well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were some spelling errors on the slides. Also, some bullet points were redundant. • No clear lines separating strategy to reduce risks and high priority recommendations. Too much technical depth into actions. No discussion of how remediations tie to risks identified. • There needs to be finances discussion with the solution • Black on white is a stark choice and not really desirable for slides. You should have put \$ and timeline information into the solutions. • video transitions need some work, be mindful of time allotted, could reduce time used by first presenter, find more free/open source tools for solutions, some explained were costly.

RED TEAM SCORING

RED TEAM FLAG INPUTS (ASSUME BREACH & WHACK A MOLE)

This year we will be using **Assume Breach** as part of your Red team score. This will be worth **1,750 points**. The purpose of the assume breach model is for your team to investigate and accurately report back incident details after experiencing a successful execution of an attack chain. The **Whack a Mole** portion of the Red team score will be worth **750 points**. This will be done in a traditional method of “hacking” through holes created through known vulnerabilities in the system.

Assume Breach						
AB1	AB2	AB3	AB4	AB5	AB6	AB7
250	250	250	125	0	250	250

Whack a Mole		
WAM1	WAM2	WAM3
250	0	125

BLUE TEAM SCORE

The Blue team scoring (service scans) is completely based on the Blue team's ability to keep services active. In an industry environment, every security professional's primary responsibility is to keep business operational and secure. Service uptime is based on the required services and their respective uptimes. Teams earn points for each availability scan that results in positive service uptime for a total of 2000 points. Throughout the day, services will be validated as operational by the scoreboard polling system. Each service is scored and weighted the same, which means availability is scored purely on the service being operational.

Service Scans	ICS Score
1475	492

Each team was scanned *27 times* throughout the competition. Below identifies your team's number of successful service scans per required service. Each successful scan was awarded 5 points.

SMTP	IMAP	SMB (task)	NFS	SSH	HTTP	WinRM	LDAP	MariaDB	phpmyadmin	SMB (db)
27	27	27	26	27	26	27	27	27	27	27

The ICS Score was determined by the number of barrels you were able to produce during the competition. The max number of barrels a team should be able to produce (+/- slight variance) was 45,000 barrels. There were two periods in which minimal barrels, if any, should have been produced due to significant weather. The total number of points awarded was 515.

No. of Barrels Produced	Percentage of Total Barrels
42994.51	95.54%

GREEN TEAM SCORE

The Green team will review and complete surveys to evaluate each Blue team system's usability and user experience. Points will be awarded based on the user's ability to complete the tasks outlined in the user acceptance testing guide at the end of this document. The Green team will assess their ability to validate these tasks. The guide that will be provided to Green team users is available in the Rubrics section. It is in your best interest to run through this user testing to ensure that you can complete all the steps they are.

Green Team Score
1216

Green Team Survey Comments

- was unable to see users 'blue@obsidianrift.oil' and 'green-admin@obsidianrift.oil' in user management

Green Team Survey Comments

- Image has yellow tint, navigation bar should say ObsidianRift Energy Co., and admin users are missing.
- "green-user is the only account listed under User Management.
- check footer positions on homepage, login page, and admin pages. no admins listed
- check footers on homepage, login, admin pages. no listed admins
- no admins assigned
- admin users are missing
- no listed admins, footer in wrong place on homepage and login screen
- Rock-solid work! Even Obsidian Rifts rigs approve though the login and signup pages are missing their footers, and that burgundy/maroon theme isn't consistent across the site. Also, All of your Admins are belong to us!
- When logging into the page, the footer text that has the address is within the login page. However, I was still able to login as a user. On the user management page, there are 3 users, but 2 are red users. There is no admin blue or green that has admin privileges. Your rig has 'Normal Operation'.
- footer wrong on admin, login, and home screen. no admins listed
- missing both admin users
- 5:47 This site cant be reached
- Site is down