U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S CYBERFORCE COMPETITION®
DEFENDING U.S. ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

OTTOBOTS

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 66 SCORECARD

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

Score Category	Team Points	Percent of Points	Team Ranking
Anomalies	435	29.00%	46
Security Documentation	828	66.24%	81
C-Suite Panel	954	76.32%	60
Red Team	625	25.00%	67
Blue Team	1601	80.05%	60
Green Team Surveys	1090	72.67%	67
Deductions	0		
Overall	**5533**	**55.33%**	**67**

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	435

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

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

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	828

Strong Points	*Areas of Improvement*
• Excellent realism and consistency across systems. • Strong point for this entry was definitely the network diagram. Easy to comprehend, easy to read. • It was a great start to the documentation process. • Covered great amount of details with clarity and looking good to present. Overall great effort by the team.	• Could shorten some technical sections for clarity. • Certain items looked a bit rushed due to potential misspellings (for example: RPD instead of RDP, port for Ignition/HTTP was 8088 but listed as 8080). It's good to start off with a solid foundation of those services before trying to expand and add Sensors/Valves/Pumps. The identified vulnerabilities could have done with slightly more detail regarding mitigation. Ensure to include a plain-language justification for the

Strong Points	Areas of Improvement
	actions listed in hardening instead of just listing actions. • Some sections needed more completion and to be reviewed to ensure that there was sufficient and correct data. • Network diagram is not much readable with all the color and different fonts.

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	954

Strong Points	Areas of Improvement
• Very good slides. Brief given with an ownership perspective by the cyber team - excellent! Only team to mention forensics. Excellent discussion about vetting contractors. • I was very impressed with the overarching organization of this presentation. While I find the template selection engaging and vibrant, what truly impressed me was the thoughtful and thorough bar chart that clearly laid out each of the recommendations costs both in terms of initial investment and recurring costs. Furthermore, you are the first team that I have seen who actually offered a clear and well-thought out timeline! This made this so much more meaningful not just in terms of what it will cost in money, but also what it will cost in time. Again, this was a fantastically constructed part of your presentation, proverbially saving the best for last. • Technical details for most of the presentation • Abled to point the risk and solution • The slide formats were clean, three members participated in the presentation, and each recommendation was given it's own slide allowing the presenter to thoroughly cover the topic. • Good job with your high priority recommendations. They tie back to the risks you articulate	• First speaker talked too fast. Team # not shown. Label speaker names under their photos. Speaker overlays words on Strategy and Timeline slides. Summary costs not shown. Vetting contractors will be continuous. Include costs in timeline. Final slide - do not say Thank You, instead use Questions. • On the flip side, the major area of improvement was the initial setup where the risks and impact are discussed in terms of barrels and days. What do either of these actually cost us? What does it mean to be the main source of oil for the western US—especially in terms that we need to be able to convey to our stakeholders? Giving us the solutions in terms of costs, but not offering us the risks and impact in the same terms does not allow us to clearly make a decision to go with your proposal or not. We need to know how all of this is directly impacts our corporate bottom line. And if I have to do the heavy lifting like calculating cost per 2000 barrels of oil lost per 8-10 days, I am going to be lost in the math and wholly ignoring what you are saying and whether or not your solution will solve our problem in a meaningful way. The ultimate goal in presentations like this is to make your suggestion clearly the easiest and best option to implement, which means the speaker has to do most of the heavy lifting • Review your presentation and the volume of the speakers, not shaky video, re-phrasing

Strong Points	*Areas of Improvement*
	of certain technical controls, change the presentation format from an mp4 to YouTube or .vid format • The speech needs to be more clearly and louder • The way the camera was injected into the slides covered up information. Also Daniella and Gianna spoke exceptionally fast during their portions. • Strategy categories are good, but the details are full of jargon and it isn't clear how they will reduce your risks. Next time, make sure you don't cover your slides with the video feed

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
0	125	0	0	0	0	125

Whack a Mole		
WAM1	WAM2	WAM3
0	125	250

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
1405	196

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	23	26	26	24	24	24

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
17140.10	38.09%

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
1090

Green Team Survey Comments
• Footer is visible on every page except the homepage
• The header should say ObsidianRift Energy Co., the footer is missing on the home page, and the logos are missing in the header.
• check your headers and footers!
• "No header logo No Footer address on home-screen"
• The footer text contained the web site name, also the logos were not in the header. Good luck!
• footer not showing on main page, logos not visible in header, company name misspelled
• server crashed while using it
• "Internal Server Error ErrorException file_put_contents(/var/www/html/storage/framework/views/37ac11ce8393b80e5b4b330af5e1352e.php): Failed to open stream: Permission denied"
• Can't connect
• footer on home page is not on the bottom
• "No footer on Login or Sign Up pages, footer includes the site URI, which is not listed in the footer 'Should read:' requirements. Nice work otherwise!"
• make sure to include the Rift in ObsidianRift! also, your footer has a little something extra on it.
• Good job
• web.blue0066.cfc.local refused to connect.
• website is down