



AUBURN UNIVERSITY

AUBURN TIGORS

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 6 SCORECARD

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

Score Category	Team Points	Percent of Points	Team Ranking
Anomalies	481	32.07%	36
Security Documentation	1105	88.40%	38
C-Suite Panel	1203	96.24%	2
Red Team	1250	50.00%	27
Blue Team	1891	94.55%	20
Green Team Surveys	1384	92.27%	24
Deductions	0		
Overall	7314	73.14%	24

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 | 481

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

1	No
2	
3	
4	Yes
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10.1	Yes
10.2	Yes
10.3	Yes
10.4	Yes
10.5	Yes
10.6	Yes

10.7	
10.8	
10.9	Yes
11.1	Yes
11.2	Yes
11.3	Yes
11.4	Yes
11.5	Yes
11.6	
11.7	Yes
12	
13	
14	
15	Yes
16	Yes

17	Yes
18	Yes
19	Yes
20	Yes
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27.1	Yes
27.2	Yes
28	Yes
29	
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 | 1105

Strong Points	Areas of Improvement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Best one graded so far out of 4 entries. Good document for senior leadership except for IPs on system description.Really thorough vulnerability inspection and remediationsThe tables and diagram were well done.Identified risks of modifying active PLC systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Subnet excludes VMs :(Why is CNC/HMI called "Data Historian" on the network diagram? System hardening steps could use stronger justifications throughout, but at least were adequateSystems overview: systems were defined, but uses a lot of undefined acronyms and was not in ""plain language"" for senior leadershipToo technical for audience. Reconnaissance and enumeration is a precursor to hardening, but not hardening, itself. Removing infections is also not hardening.

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 | 1203

Strong Points	Areas of Improvement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Nicely presented Risk reduction strategy that is clearly connected to identified risks. High Priority recommendations are appropriate. Appreciate the measured approach of not shutting everything down, Graphics were clean and clear and did not distract.Didn't overwhelm with slides they are easy to follow. You did a great job with cheap recommendations.Good strategy recommendations and enumeration of operational and business risksRisk mitigations address aforementioned risksTouched on irregularities, symptoms, risk, strategy and hazards and priority actions. Loved the emphasis on consistent training.Team hit the minimal summary and explained the potential causes and basic strategy to mitigate risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Connect strategy with risks to business reputation.Would you like to see a cost estimate for our potential losses if we don't act, this is important to C-suite, it also helps offset the costs for your recommendation.Cost estimates for high-priority actions don't account for things like the cost of monitoring hardware and training/certifications.Make sure you explain how ALL risks affect the bottom lineI would have liked to see more information with data (i.e. costs associated with risk).Cost analysis and more specific details on high priority recommendations could have been explained more elaborately.

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	0	0	0	250	0	0

Whack a Mole		
WAM1	WAM2	WAM3
250	250	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
1465	426

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	25	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
37253.41	82.79%

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
1384

Green Team Survey Comments

- lots of test users created
- Good job
- Great job Team 6!
- All the requirements are met. Good job!
- Good work! All intended areas are still accounted for within the website and no issues locating anything per the requirements.
- Nice job!
- Site is down