

# CTEMMM Examples and Use Cases

Version: v1.0.0

Release Date: 2025-12-17

## Introduction

This guide provides detailed domain descriptions to support consistent interpretation and use of the Continuous Threat Exposure Management Maturity Model (CTEMMM). While the CTEMMM defines levels of maturity across various capability areas, this companion document focuses on what each domain represents, why it matters, and what is intended to be assessed within each one.

Each entry includes a two-paragraph explanation that outlines:

- The purpose and scope of the domain within a CTEM program
- The types of behaviors, processes, decisions, or outcomes that indicate maturity in this area

The goal is to remove ambiguity, especially for organizations conducting internal maturity assessments or coordinating efforts across business units, security teams, or regulatory stakeholders. Many domain names can be interpreted differently depending on context—this guide ensures that all users of the model are working from a shared understanding of what each domain is intended to measure.

You can use this guide to:

- Align stakeholders during assessment and scoring activities
- Train assessors, architects, and program leads on what to look for in each area
- Guide strategy, tooling, and governance decisions to strengthen CTEM capability
- Support internal communications by clearly describing each area's role in a mature exposure management program

This guide complements the model's maturity level definitions, domain-level examples, and use cases. Together, they provide a full-spectrum reference for organizations seeking to benchmark, plan, and improve continuous threat exposure management in a structured, scalable, and risk-aware way.

# CTEM Examples –

## Scoping Phase

Below are examples of what CTEM maturity might look like at each level across the Scoping capabilities. These are meant to help organizations understand how behaviors, processes, and outcomes evolve as maturity increases.

### Business Context & Crown Jewels Identification

- **Level 1:** No formal inventory or understanding of business-critical assets. Exposure reviews are conducted without any alignment to business priorities.
- **Level 2:** Some business-critical systems are known informally, but prioritization is inconsistent. CTEM activities occur in isolation from business impact.
- **Level 3:** Key business processes and critical assets are documented and maintained. CTEM planning references these assets during exposure prioritization.
- **Level 4:** Business stakeholders are engaged in defining critical assets and processes. Exposure identification is mapped to business risk using structured methods.
- **Level 5:** Crown jewel assets are dynamically linked to CTEM processes through automation and data sources (e.g., tagging, impact mapping). Business alignment is continuously maintained and reviewed.

### Threat Landscape Alignment

- **Level 1:** No consistent use of threat intelligence or awareness of current adversary behaviors.
- **Level 2:** Ad hoc references to threat intelligence during exposure reviews. Teams use informal sources or outdated threat profiles.
- **Level 3:** External and internal threat intelligence is reviewed regularly and applied during CTEM prioritization cycles.
- **Level 4:** Threat modeling informs scoping efforts. Current TTPs and threat actor profiles are mapped to the environment.
- **Level 5:** Threat intelligence is continuously integrated into CTEM workflows. Scoping adjusts in near real-time based on emerging threats and campaigns.

### Exposure Surface Scoping Strategy

- **Level 1:** No defined strategy for what parts of the environment are reviewed for exposures. Scope changes reactively and inconsistently.
- **Level 2:** CTEM scope includes well-known systems but omits dynamic environments, cloud services, or third parties.

- **Level 3:** A documented strategy defines what environments, assets, and technologies are in-scope. It includes known coverage gaps and justifications.
- **Level 4:** Scope is risk-informed, reviewed periodically, and includes dynamic sources such as ephemeral assets or shadow IT.
- **Level 5:** Scoping is adaptive, driven by exposure trends, threat changes, and business inputs. It is reviewed automatically and includes full ecosystem visibility.

## Stakeholder Engagement & Objective Setting

- **Level 1:** CTEM is viewed as a technical activity. No non-security stakeholders are consulted or involved.
- **Level 2:** A few stakeholders are consulted occasionally. Objectives are not clearly defined or communicated.
- **Level 3:** Key stakeholders are involved in setting goals for CTEM activities. Objectives are documented and reviewed periodically.
- **Level 4:** CTEM objectives are linked to organizational risk, compliance, and business resilience goals. Stakeholder feedback influences prioritization and remediation.
- **Level 5:** Stakeholder engagement is embedded in all CTEM phases. Objectives are part of a cross-functional risk strategy and reviewed continuously.

## Frequency & Coverage Planning

- **Level 1:** No plan exists for how often CTEM activities occur or what systems are included.
- **Level 2:** Discovery and scoping activities are scheduled sporadically or only after major events.
- **Level 3:** CTEM frequency is defined for core systems and environments. Coverage is documented and reviewed quarterly.
- **Level 4:** Frequency and coverage plans are risk-based and tied to asset criticality, threat intelligence, and business cycles.
- **Level 5:** Frequency and coverage are dynamically adjusted based on changes in threat, exposure volume, and business operations.

## Regulatory & Compliance Scoping

- **Level 1:** Regulatory drivers are not considered when defining CTEM scope or prioritization.
- **Level 2:** Compliance is addressed only after findings emerge. CTEM does not support regulatory planning.
- **Level 3:** CTEM scoping includes systems subject to key compliance frameworks. Inputs are aligned to audit requirements.
- **Level 4:** Compliance scoping is integrated into CTEM lifecycle planning. Framework mapping supports proactive risk reduction.
- **Level 5:** CTEM supports ongoing compliance assurance. Scoping updates respond to new regulations and integrate with GRC tools.

## Risk Appetite & Tolerance Definition

- **Level 1:** No defined risk appetite. Security decisions are made inconsistently or without business input.
- **Level 2:** Risk tolerance is assumed but not documented. Decisions vary across teams.
- **Level 3:** A formal risk appetite statement is available and referenced during CTEM planning.
- **Level 4:** Risk tolerance informs prioritization thresholds and scoping boundaries. Business risk owners participate in assessments.
- **Level 5:** Risk appetite is measurable and continuously reviewed. CTEM dynamically adapts to reflect changes in business tolerance.

## Business Change Awareness

- **Level 1:** CTEM activities are unaware of business changes, mergers, expansions, or technology shifts.
- **Level 2:** Changes are addressed only when incidents occur. Scoping is rarely updated.
- **Level 3:** Business and IT change calendars are reviewed quarterly to inform CTEM scope and planning.
- **Level 4:** CTEM is linked to change management workflows. New assets and services are assessed within weeks of introduction.
- **Level 5:** CTEM anticipates change through integration with strategic planning and DevOps pipelines. Scoping is preemptively adjusted.

## Security Architecture & Technology Mapping

- **Level 1:** CTEM has no visibility into architectural design or deployed technologies.
- **Level 2:** CTEM relies on partial or outdated architecture diagrams. Integration with enterprise architecture is weak.
- **Level 3:** Security architecture and technology stack are mapped and reviewed during CTEM scoping.
- **Level 4:** Architectural data is integrated into exposure reviews and used to identify systemic gaps or high-risk patterns.
- **Level 5:** Architecture mapping is dynamic and linked to CTEM discovery, validation, and prioritization. It supports predictive analysis and long-term risk reduction.

## Discovery Phase

### External Attack Surface Management (EASM)

- **Level 1:** No external exposure identification process exists. Internet-facing assets are unmanaged and often unknown.

- **Level 2:** External assets are periodically reviewed using manual tools or third-party scans, but results are incomplete or unactioned.
- **Level 3:** External attack surface scanning occurs regularly and includes domains, IPs, and exposed services. Ownership is assigned.
- **Level 4:** External exposures are continuously monitored with alerting and integration into CTEM workflows.
- **Level 5:** EASM is fully integrated with asset management, risk scoring, and threat intelligence to prioritize risks in real time.

## Asset Discovery & Attribution

- **Level 1:** Assets are unknown or tracked only through outdated documentation.
- **Level 2:** Periodic scans or inventory exports identify some assets, but attribution is manual and inconsistent.
- **Level 3:** A baseline inventory is maintained with attribution to business owners or functions. Used during CTEM activities.
- **Level 4:** Asset discovery is automated and includes tagging for environment, criticality, and owner. Inventory feeds CTEM tooling.
- **Level 5:** Discovery is dynamic and reconciles across cloud, on-prem, mobile, and ephemeral environments. Attribution is validated through workflows.

## Vulnerability Detection

- **Level 1:** Vulnerabilities are not regularly assessed. Detection is triggered only by incidents or compliance audits.
- **Level 2:** Scanning tools are used sporadically, with limited coverage or no follow-up analysis.
- **Level 3:** Regular vulnerability scans are performed across major systems. Results are analyzed and included in CTEM scoping.
- **Level 4:** Vulnerability detection is continuous, risk-informed, and includes integration with threat intel and exploitability models.
- **Level 5:** Detection prioritizes zero-day readiness, configuration flaws, and aligns with threat actor TTPs. CTEM receives enriched data streams.

## Internal Exposure Mapping

- **Level 1:** There is no formal process for mapping exposures within internal systems or infrastructure.
- **Level 2:** Some teams maintain internal asset or system maps, but they are incomplete and rarely consulted.
- **Level 3:** Exposure mapping is performed during CTEM cycles and includes internal apps, configurations, and weak controls.
- **Level 4:** Exposure data is correlated across systems and environments. Mapping includes lateral movement potential.

- **Level 5:** Internal exposures are mapped continuously with asset interdependencies, user privileges, and system configurations visualized.

## Identity & Access Exposure Detection

- **Level 1:** Identity-based exposures are not assessed. Privileged access and misconfigurations go unnoticed.
- **Level 2:** Identity reviews are performed sporadically, often during audit cycles, with inconsistent coverage.
- **Level 3:** IAM assessments are part of regular CTEM discovery, including privileged accounts and stale credentials.
- **Level 4:** CTEM integrates identity threat detection (e.g., role creep, privilege escalation paths) into prioritization.
- **Level 5:** Identity exposure detection is continuous and risk-scored. It is correlated with attack paths and threat actor behaviors.

## Third-Party & Supply Chain Discovery

- **Level 1:** Dependencies on third-party systems are undocumented. CTEM does not consider vendor or partner risks.
- **Level 2:** Some vendor assets are known, but there is no structured discovery or assessment process.
- **Level 3:** Key third-party relationships are inventoried. CTEM includes discovery scans for major external vendors.
- **Level 4:** Third-party risk is actively monitored. Data from vendor questionnaires, attack surface scans, and SLA reviews inform CTEM.
- **Level 5:** Supply chain discovery includes upstream and downstream risk propagation, including shared service exposure modeling.

## Data Exposure & Privacy Mapping

- **Level 1:** Sensitive data locations are unknown. Exposure reviews do not include data security or privacy considerations.
- **Level 2:** Some teams maintain data flow maps, but they are outdated or incomplete.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes data classification and exposure mapping as part of its scoping and discovery process.
- **Level 4:** Data loss risk and privacy obligations are built into exposure prioritization. Discovery tools validate sensitive data locations.
- **Level 5:** Data exposure risk is continuously mapped, monitored, and correlated with business impact and legal/regulatory posture.

## Prioritization Phase

### Business Impact Modeling & Asset Criticality

- **Level 1:** Business value is not considered during exposure review. All systems are treated equally.
- **Level 2:** Some systems are known to be critical, but this is based on informal knowledge, not documented impact modeling.
- **Level 3:** Critical systems and their business impact are documented. CTEM uses this input to inform exposure prioritization.
- **Level 4:** Impact modeling incorporates financial, operational, and customer outcomes. Asset criticality is regularly updated.
- **Level 5:** Business impact is dynamically assessed and embedded into scoring models. Prioritization reflects real-time business risks.

### Threat Intelligence Correlation

- **Level 1:** CTEM activities occur in isolation from threat intelligence. No correlation to known actors or campaigns.
- **Level 2:** Security teams sometimes consult threat reports manually, but there is no structured correlation to exposures.
- **Level 3:** Threat intelligence is applied during prioritization and includes known exploits and attacker behavior mapping.
- **Level 4:** Threat feeds are integrated into CTEM tooling. Prioritization adjusts based on active campaigns and threat actor TTPs.
- **Level 5:** CTEM leverages intelligence to predict likely targets and preemptively escalate critical exposures before exploitation.

### Exposure Risk Scoring Model

- **Level 1:** There is no structured method for ranking exposures. Prioritization is ad hoc.
- **Level 2:** Exposures are sorted using severity only (e.g., CVSS), without factoring in asset value or likelihood of exploitation.
- **Level 3:** CTEM uses a defined scoring model that includes impact, exploitability, and compensating controls.
- **Level 4:** Risk scores are enriched with threat intel, business impact, and exposure maturity data. Weighting is documented.
- **Level 5:** Scoring is adaptive and continuously updated using telemetry, historical patterns, and organizational risk posture.

### Attack Path Analysis & Blast Radius Estimation

- **Level 1:** Attack chains and lateral movement are not considered in prioritization. Exposures are reviewed in isolation.

- **Level 2:** Some manual reviews consider chaining possibilities, but results are inconsistent.
- **Level 3:** Common attack paths are identified during CTEM cycles. Exposures are prioritized based on downstream risk.
- **Level 4:** Tools model attack paths and estimate blast radius. Mapping includes privilege escalation and pivot points.
- **Level 5:** Attack path data is integrated with real-time asset telemetry and threat modeling for proactive prioritization.

## Campaign & Cluster Analysis

- **Level 1:** CTEM does not recognize linked threats or coordinated attack campaigns.
- **Level 2:** Analysts occasionally identify related activity, but findings are not documented or reused.
- **Level 3:** Campaign-level analysis is performed using historical and real-time threat data. Similar exposures are grouped.
- **Level 4:** Exposures are clustered by threat actor behavior, infrastructure, or payload similarities.
- **Level 5:** CTEM uses pattern detection and clustering analytics to elevate priority of coordinated, multi-vector threats.

## Adversary-in-the-Middle Prioritization

- **Level 1:** No consideration is given to adversary behavior or their likely goals.
- **Level 2:** Some threat actor tactics are known, but not tied to CTEM activities.
- **Level 3:** Exposure prioritization considers known adversary capabilities and target preferences.
- **Level 4:** CTEM incorporates adversary emulation and predictive modeling into prioritization logic.
- **Level 5:** Prioritization reflects adversary intent, campaign stage, and likelihood of targeting specific business assets.

## Threat Actor Profiling

- **Level 1:** Threat actor profiles are not maintained or considered. Exposure decisions lack context.
- **Level 2:** Some profiles exist, but are high-level and disconnected from CTEM operations.
- **Level 3:** Threat actor profiles are created and mapped to relevant exposures.
- **Level 4:** Profiles are actively maintained and linked to industry verticals, geographies, and attack methods.
- **Level 5:** Threat actor data feeds predictive analytics to anticipate exposure risk across the attack lifecycle.

## Validation Phase

### Control Effectiveness Testing

- **Level 1:** Controls are assumed to be working but never tested. Exposure reduction is based on unverified configurations.
- **Level 2:** Manual checks are performed occasionally, but without a structured or repeatable process.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes planned testing of specific controls related to high-risk exposures.
- **Level 4:** Control testing is automated and scoped to cover attack paths and security zones.
- **Level 5:** Control testing is adaptive, risk-driven, and continuously validated as part of the CTEM lifecycle.

### Remediation Validation

- **Level 1:** CTEM does not verify whether exposures are remediated successfully.
- **Level 2:** Teams may mark exposures as fixed without formal validation or confirmation.
- **Level 3:** Post-remediation testing confirms closure of prioritized exposures.
- **Level 4:** Remediation is validated using repeat scans or exploit testing. Feedback is logged.
- **Level 5:** Validation is automated and includes regression checks across similar environments or asset classes.

### Proof-of-Exploit Feasibility

- **Level 1:** Exposure impact is assumed. No attempt is made to validate exploit paths.
- **Level 2:** Exploit feasibility is occasionally researched using public sources but not formally tested.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes controlled exploitation to demonstrate risk and support prioritization.
- **Level 4:** Exploit feasibility is tested in safe environments with business impact modeling.
- **Level 5:** Feasibility analysis is automated and linked to exposure scoring and threat actor profiling.

### Breach & Attack Simulation (BAS) Integration

- **Level 1:** BAS tools are not used or integrated with CTEM activities.
- **Level 2:** BAS is used manually and outside the CTEM process.
- **Level 3:** CTEM leverages BAS tools to simulate real-world attacks against critical exposures.
- **Level 4:** BAS scenarios are aligned with active campaigns and validate defensive posture.

- **Level 5:** BAS continuously feeds CTEM validation cycles with exposure insights and control performance data.

## Red Team / Purple Team Operations

- **Level 1:** No offensive testing is performed. Red or purple teams are not present or engaged.
- **Level 2:** Occasional red team exercises occur, but their results are siloed from CTEM.
- **Level 3:** CTEM incorporates red/purple team findings to validate detection and response gaps.
- **Level 4:** Team operations are structured around CTEM priorities and conducted across varied business units.
- **Level 5:** Continuous purple teaming feeds exposure validation and improvement cycles across technical and human layers.

## Zero Trust Control Validation

- **Level 1:** Zero Trust principles are not adopted or tested.
- **Level 2:** Some micro segmentation or identity policies exist, but effectiveness is not validated.
- **Level 3:** CTEM tests Zero Trust controls for exposure minimization.
- **Level 4:** Validation includes enforcement logic, policy bypass checks, and integration with identity data.
- **Level 5:** Zero Trust validation is dynamic and contextual, adapting as access changes across users, systems, and time.

## Feedback Loops to Threat Detection & Response

- **Level 1:** No lessons from CTEM are shared with detection or response functions.
- **Level 2:** Some findings are manually communicated to detection teams post-facto.
- **Level 3:** Detection rules and alerting logic are updated based on CTEM validation cycles.
- **Level 4:** Feedback loops are built into planning and escalation workflows. Detection evolves with threat landscape.
- **Level 5:** CTEM insights are automatically correlated with alerts and detection logic across the kill chain.

## Detection Engineering Feedback Loop

- **Level 1:** No coordination exists between CTEM and detection engineering.
- **Level 2:** Detection engineers are occasionally informed of exposures, but integration is informal.
- **Level 3:** Detection engineering adapts to CTEM-identified gaps in logic or telemetry coverage.
- **Level 4:** CTEM validation triggers threat hunt or detection signature creation.

- **Level 5:** Detection engineering evolves in real time, aligned to CTEM-validated exposures and exploit tactics.

## Mobilization Phase

### Remediation Orchestration & Automation

- **Level 1:** Remediation tasks are handled manually with no formal coordination.
- **Level 2:** Some exposures are assigned to technical teams via email or ticketing, but timelines and ownership are inconsistent.
- **Level 3:** CTEM uses a structured remediation workflow with defined SLAs and integration into ITSM or SOAR systems.
- **Level 4:** Automation supports remediation actions based on validated exposure data and asset grouping.
- **Level 5:** Remediation is dynamically orchestrated with prioritization logic, business context, and rollback validation.

### Compensating Controls & Containment Actions

- **Level 1:** No compensating controls are implemented. Unpatched or unmitigated exposures remain open.
- **Level 2:** Manual, temporary fixes are occasionally applied without formal review.
- **Level 3:** CTEM triggers compensating controls (e.g., firewall rules, access restrictions) for deferred or complex remediation cases.
- **Level 4:** Controls are cataloged and tracked, with impact measured and reviewed.
- **Level 5:** Controls are dynamically applied, validated, and integrated into continuous risk posture analysis.

### Risk Acceptance & Governance Oversight

- **Level 1:** Risk acceptance is informal or undocumented.
- **Level 2:** Some exceptions are manually tracked, but there is no consistent governance.
- **Level 3:** Risk acceptance is documented, time-bound, and aligned with governance processes.
- **Level 4:** CTEM exposures trigger structured risk acceptance workflows with business and security review.
- **Level 5:** Accepted risks are automatically flagged for re-review, trend analysis, and governance escalation.

### Incident Response Handoff (if needed)

- **Level 1:** There is no process to escalate validated exposures to incident response.

- **Level 2:** Teams communicate manually during severe events but without predefined procedures.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes criteria for triggering IR handoff, including lateral movement indicators or active exploitation.
- **Level 4:** IR handoff is automated based on exposure validation and threat intelligence correlation.
- **Level 5:** Handoffs are dynamically prioritized and include prepopulated incident context and response recommendations.

## Executive Reporting & Risk Communication

- **Level 1:** No CTEM reporting is produced for leadership.
- **Level 2:** Exposure summaries are shared occasionally but lack business alignment.
- **Level 3:** CTEM generates scheduled reports with metrics tied to business risk and exposure trends.
- **Level 4:** Reporting is dynamic and tailored by stakeholder role and business function.
- **Level 5:** Communication is interactive and real-time, with dashboards aligned to KPIs, risk appetite, and strategic planning.

## Risk Trend Analysis & Reporting Automation

- **Level 1:** No trend analysis or exposure reporting is performed.
- **Level 2:** Teams occasionally create manual reports using static data.
- **Level 3:** CTEM reporting includes trending of exposure types, resolution velocity, and affected systems.
- **Level 4:** Reporting is automated and integrated with BI tools. Trends drive remediation prioritization.
- **Level 5:** Trend insights feed predictive models and are reviewed by both technical and executive audiences.

## CTEM Adaptation & Continuous Learning

- **Level 1:** CTEM processes are static and unchanged regardless of outcome.
- **Level 2:** Teams occasionally reflect on past cycles, but changes are ad hoc.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes structured after-action reviews and updates based on lessons learned.
- **Level 4:** Feedback loops trigger updates to tooling, scope, risk models, and engagement workflows.
- **Level 5:** CTEM processes are continuously refined based on evolving threat landscape, incident learnings, and business drivers.

# Use Cases

The following use cases are provided to help contextualize how organizations might encounter and address different capability areas during their CTEM journey. Each scenario illustrates a real-world problem, followed by representative actions that an organization might take depending on its current maturity level. These are intended as illustrative narratives to support internal discussions, assessment readiness, and strategic improvement planning.

## Scoping

### Use Case: Identifying Crown Jewels in a Distributed Business Model

**Domain:** Business Context & Crown Jewel Identification

**Scenario:**

A global consumer services company is modernizing its architecture, with lines of business deploying SaaS platforms, containerized microservices, and regional customer data lakes. When launching a CTEM initiative, the team quickly realizes there is no single authoritative view of which systems are most critical to operations or regulatory compliance. The security team must determine how to identify and document crown jewel assets across dozens of independently managed environments.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** Business teams are unaware of CTEM goals. No formal identification of crown jewels occurs. CTEM scoping relies on security staff intuition or past incidents.
- **Level 2:** Individual teams name their own “critical assets,” but without consistent criteria. Documentation is limited or outdated.
- **Level 3:** A formal process is launched to identify crown jewels through interviews and impact-based criteria. Each business unit designates their top systems for confidentiality, availability, and integrity concerns.
- **Level 4:** Business impact assessments are integrated with asset inventories and exposure mapping. Identified crown jewels are tagged and linked to CTEM scoring logic.
- **Level 5:** Crown jewel identification is adaptive and updated continuously. Executive leadership validates the prioritization model. Changes in architecture or risk profile trigger automatic re-evaluation.

**Outcome:**

Organizations with higher CTEM maturity avoid blind spots in exposure prioritization. By aligning CTEM scoping to real business impact, they ensure that the most critical systems receive focused attention during risk modeling, validation, and mobilization. This also improves trust with business stakeholders and executive sponsors.

## Use Case: Aligning CTEM Scope to Evolving Threat Trends

**Domain:** Threat Landscape Alignment

**Scenario:**

A financial services firm has recently expanded into mobile-first offerings and embedded payment services. Despite investing in CTEM tooling, the organization continues to rely on outdated vulnerability feeds and patch compliance reports to scope exposure. When a new wave of ransomware variants starts exploiting previously “low severity” cloud misconfigurations, the CTEM team struggles to justify shifting priorities. Executives ask why emerging risks weren’t flagged earlier.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** The CTEM program relies on outdated CVE sources and patch notices. No analysis of threat actor behavior or trending techniques is used to shape scope or urgency.
- **Level 2:** The team tracks high-level threat reports (e.g., from government CERTs or news alerts) but lacks structured alignment with CTEM activities. Adjustments are reactive and inconsistent.
- **Level 3:** External threat intelligence is reviewed regularly and mapped to asset types. Common adversary behaviors are used to influence CTEM prioritization cycles.
- **Level 4:** Threat landscape data is systematically correlated with exposure types, known controls, and validated CTEM output. Scoping is adjusted based on industry threat trends.
- **Level 5:** Threat modeling is continuous and dynamic. Intelligence feeds directly into prioritization logic and playbooks. The organization anticipates changes in adversary tactics and adapts CTEM efforts proactively.

**Outcome:**

Organizations with mature threat landscape alignment reduce their chances of being surprised by adversary innovations. They focus efforts where risk is growing—not just where compliance mandates dictate. This leads to earlier detection of emerging attack paths, better resource alignment, and improved executive confidence in the CTEM program’s relevance and foresight.

## Use Case: Incomplete Exposure Mapping Leads to Missed Entry Point

**Domain:** Scoping – Exposure Surface Scoping Strategy

**Scenario:**

A global manufacturing company experiences a breach via a misconfigured VPN appliance that was not included in the original CTEM scope. While their vulnerability management and patching efforts focused on known internal systems, externally exposed development tools, admin interfaces, and third-party SaaS connectors had been overlooked. Post-incident analysis revealed that the attack path exploited exposed infrastructure the CTEM program had never tracked.

### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM scoping is undefined or based solely on traditional vulnerability scan targets. Shadow IT, cloud, and third-party systems are ignored.
- **Level 2:** The CTEM team performs limited external scoping, but data is fragmented across tools. Asset visibility varies by business unit or geography.
- **Level 3:** A documented scoping strategy exists, using data from asset inventories, DNS scanning, and external attack surface tools. High-level mapping is reviewed quarterly.
- **Level 4:** Exposure surface definitions are dynamic and updated based on architectural changes, CI/CD deployments, and third-party integrations. Scoping data informs prioritization.
- **Level 5:** Scoping is fully automated and context-aware. Exposure types are tagged by risk level and linked to business criticality. Scoping decisions are validated with real-world attack simulation feedback.

### Outcome:

Organizations with mature exposure surface strategies reduce the likelihood of blind spots in their CTEM efforts. By integrating external and internal discovery into a unified view, they ensure complete risk coverage and enable more accurate threat modeling. This leads to earlier detection of exploitable configurations and better alignment between CTEM scope and actual attack surfaces.

## Use Case: Misaligned Priorities Derail CTEM Initiative

### Domain: Stakeholder Engagement & Objective Setting

#### Scenario:

An enterprise retail company launches a CTEM program driven by the security team. Initial activities focus on asset scanning and exploit validation, but progress stalls when IT operations and development teams push back on the findings and remediation timelines. Business leadership remains unaware of the CTEM effort, and its objectives aren't tied to broader enterprise risk or digital transformation initiatives. Without cross-functional buy-in or shared goals, CTEM becomes siloed and loses momentum.

### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** No formal engagement occurs. CTEM activities are limited to the security team, with unclear objectives and no alignment to business units.
- **Level 2:** Security reaches out to a few technical teams for input, but involvement is inconsistent. CTEM objectives vary across departments and are not formally approved.
- **Level 3:** Key stakeholders from security, IT, and business units are identified. CTEM goals are reviewed jointly and documented. Success metrics are agreed upon.
- **Level 4:** Stakeholder engagement is embedded in CTEM planning cycles. Each capability has named owners across functions. Objectives are risk-informed and reviewed quarterly.
- **Level 5:** CTEM objectives are directly aligned with enterprise risk strategy, compliance posture, and digital initiatives. Stakeholder roles are embedded in program governance. Performance is tracked with shared KPIs.

### Outcome:

Strong stakeholder engagement ensures CTEM efforts are sustainable, prioritized appropriately, and embedded in day-to-day operations. Organizations at higher maturity levels benefit from shared accountability, fewer blockers during mobilization, and better alignment between technical activities and business outcomes.

## Use Case: Infrequent Scanning Misses Time-Sensitive Exposure

### Domain: Frequency & Coverage Planning

#### Scenario:

A healthcare technology company conducting biannual assessments identifies a critical cloud storage bucket exposed to the internet—after it had already been exploited. The exposure occurred due to a misconfiguration pushed during a DevOps sprint six weeks prior. Because CTEM discovery activities were not continuous, and coverage excluded test environments, the organization had no visibility into the issue until it was too late.

### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM-related discovery is ad hoc or triggered only after an incident. Coverage is incomplete and focused on production systems.
- **Level 2:** Periodic assessments are scheduled (e.g., quarterly), but they don't adjust based on business changes, risk level, or asset criticality.
- **Level 3:** Frequency is defined by policy and based on system tier or data classification. Gaps in coverage are documented and tracked for remediation.

- **Level 4:** Coverage and frequency are risk-based and aligned with asset volatility, regulatory requirements, and attack trends. All environments are included in the scope.
- **Level 5:** CTEM frequency and scope are dynamically adjusted based on threat intelligence, system changes, and incident data. Near real-time coverage is achieved through automation and integration with CI/CD pipelines.

#### **Outcome:**

Organizations with well-defined and adaptive frequency and coverage models detect exposures earlier and minimize dwell time. They balance operational overhead with risk reduction, ensuring that highly dynamic or sensitive systems are evaluated more frequently while maintaining a comprehensive, organization-wide CTEM posture.

### Use Case: Missed Compliance Scope Triggers Audit Finding

#### **Domain:** Regulatory & Compliance Scoping

#### **Scenario:**

A fintech company undergoing a PCI-DSS audit discovers that several containerized applications handling cardholder data were not included in its CTEM scope. These assets had been deployed in a cloud environment managed by a third-party development team. While the CTEM program had general scoping procedures, it lacked specific mapping to regulatory boundaries and didn't consistently account for evolving compliance requirements across business units.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** CTEM scoping is unaware of or disconnected from regulatory obligations. Compliance coverage is coincidental or incomplete.
- **Level 2:** CTEM teams are informed of major frameworks (e.g., PCI, HIPAA, GDPR) but lack systematic mapping of regulated systems or data flows.
- **Level 3:** Scoping explicitly includes regulated systems. Compliance requirements are incorporated into exposure discovery and validation planning.
- **Level 4:** Regulatory scope is continuously updated based on audits, policy changes, or system architecture updates. CTEM outputs support compliance reporting.
- **Level 5:** CTEM and compliance teams are fully aligned. Regulatory scoping is integrated into tagging, prioritization logic, and validation cadence. Evidence generation is automated.

#### **Outcome:**

When regulatory scoping is mature, organizations avoid audit surprises and demonstrate strong risk governance. CTEM becomes a key enabler for compliance reporting, control validation, and risk mitigation efforts—supporting both security and legal obligations with minimal redundancy.

## Use Case: CTEM Team Overwhelmed by Competing Priorities

**Domain:** Risk Appetite & Tolerance Definition

**Scenario:**

A large logistics company launches its CTEM initiative but struggles to prioritize exposures. With no clear thresholds for acceptable risk, teams debate endlessly whether to remediate low-likelihood misconfigurations in staging environments or to focus on production-facing application flaws. The result is analysis paralysis—CTEM activities stall, and stakeholders lose confidence in the program's value.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** No risk tolerance or appetite is defined. CTEM decisions are inconsistent and reactive.
- **Level 2:** Risk preferences are assumed based on past behavior or individual leader input. There is no documented alignment.
- **Level 3:** The organization defines formal risk appetite statements and thresholds. CTEM teams use these to inform triage and escalation.
- **Level 4:** Risk tolerance thresholds are integrated into CTEM scoring, reporting, and playbooks. Decisions are documented and aligned across stakeholders.
- **Level 5:** Risk appetite is dynamically managed based on threat environment, business context, and governance inputs. Exceptions are tracked, and tolerances are embedded into automated workflows.

**Outcome:**

Clear risk appetite and tolerance definitions streamline CTEM decision-making and prevent misalignment between teams. Mature organizations focus resources where they matter most, balancing exposure reduction with operational agility and strategic goals.

## Use Case: Unmonitored Digital Expansion Creates CTEM Blind Spots

**Domain:** Business Change Awareness

**Scenario:**

A retail company launches a new mobile loyalty app using a third-party development partner and separate cloud infrastructure. The deployment introduces APIs, external domains, and new data flows that remain outside the CTEM program's discovery and validation processes. Months later, a security review reveals multiple misconfigurations and an unmonitored attack surface. The CTEM team had no visibility into the business expansion and wasn't looped into rollout discussions.

### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM teams are unaware of business changes until long after they occur. There is no monitoring of architectural or operational shifts.
- **Level 2:** Security is occasionally briefed on major initiatives but lacks a consistent process to update CTEM scope or analysis.
- **Level 3:** CTEM is included in project intake or change management processes. Material system or process changes are reviewed for exposure impact.
- **Level 4:** Business change triggers automated alerts or scoping reviews in the CTEM platform. Asset discovery and validation workflows are updated accordingly.
- **Level 5:** CTEM operates as a partner to innovation and transformation teams. All changes in digital services, delivery models, or partner ecosystems are continuously assessed for exposure risk. Impact is modeled proactively.

### Outcome:

Organizations that integrate CTEM into business and technology change processes avoid delays in exposure identification and reduce risk during transformation efforts. Mature programs track change as a source of potential exposure—not just as an operational detail—leading to more timely detection and reduced remediation backlogs.

## Use Case: Incomplete Architecture Mapping Obscures Lateral Movement Risk

**Domain:** Security Architecture & Technology Mapping

### Scenario:

A government agency conducts a CTEM validation exercise targeting its public web services. While externally visible exposures are identified, the assessment fails to account for internal trust relationships and legacy domain controllers accessible from the DMZ. After a red team engagement simulates lateral movement using poorly segmented service accounts, it becomes clear that the CTEM program lacks a full view of architectural dependencies and technology stack interconnections.

### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** The CTEM team works without visibility into system architectures, network flows, or technology stack dependencies. Exposures are evaluated in isolation.
- **Level 2:** Some architectural diagrams exist, but they are outdated or incomplete. Technology stack details are captured manually on request.
- **Level 3:** Security architecture documentation is centrally maintained and regularly updated. CTEM uses this to inform scoping and validation priorities.
- **Level 4:** CTEM integrates with enterprise architecture tooling and configuration management systems. Mapped dependencies inform blast radius estimation and attack path modeling.

- **Level 5:** Architecture and technology mapping is real-time and dynamic. CTEM automatically adjusts scope and prioritization based on observed changes to system design, integrations, and access relationships.

#### **Outcome:**

Mature security architecture and technology mapping ensures CTEM assessments are grounded in real operational risk, not just asset inventories. Organizations can evaluate exposure in context, simulate realistic attack paths, and validate controls across interconnected systems—enhancing overall risk posture visibility and response readiness.

## Discovery

### Use Case: Missed External Asset Becomes Entry Point for Targeted Attack

**Domain:** External Attack Surface Management (EASM)

#### **Scenario:**

A media company is targeted by a hacktivist group exploiting a forgotten subdomain tied to an old marketing campaign. The exposed server contained an outdated content management system with known vulnerabilities. The CTEM team had assumed that external-facing systems were limited to core production environments and hadn't included legacy domains, unmanaged cloud instances, or partner-hosted services in their external mapping efforts.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** No external discovery processes are in place. Internet-facing assets are tracked manually or assumed based on known infrastructure.
- **Level 2:** Basic discovery is conducted using commercial scanners, but results are reviewed infrequently. Subdomains, third-party assets, and IP ranges are incomplete.
- **Level 3:** A defined EASM process is in place using multiple data sources. Known external assets are inventoried and reviewed regularly. Shadow IT is occasionally detected.
- **Level 4:** Continuous external monitoring is integrated with DNS, certificate, and cloud telemetry. Findings are enriched with attribution metadata and aligned to internal ownership.
- **Level 5:** EASM is fully automated, validated by red team emulation, and integrated with the CTEM scope. External risks are prioritized by exploitability, exposure level, and business function.

#### **Outcome:**

Comprehensive and dynamic EASM helps organizations stay ahead of adversaries by reducing blind spots, surfacing forgotten infrastructure, and ensuring that the full digital footprint is part of exposure management. High-maturity programs catch issues before attackers do—especially in fast-changing environments.

## Use Case: Inaccurate Asset Ownership Delays Exposure Remediation

**Domain:** Asset Discovery & Attribution

**Scenario:**

An energy company detects a critical exposure during a routine scan, but no one is sure who owns the system. The IP address falls into a shared range used by multiple internal teams, and the CMDB lacks accurate metadata. As the CTEM team attempts to trace accountability, the asset remains exposed for over a week—during which time the vulnerability is actively being exploited in the wild.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** Asset discovery is informal or reliant on outdated documentation. Ownership and business context are unknown.
- **Level 2:** Some automated discovery occurs, but attribution is inconsistent. Asset data lacks tags or ownership fields.
- **Level 3:** CTEM integrates with asset inventory tools. Ownership is captured for most critical systems. Discovered assets are reconciled periodically.
- **Level 4:** Asset metadata is normalized, enriched, and continuously updated. Ownership, environment, and function are automatically tagged and visible to CTEM workflows.
- **Level 5:** Discovery and attribution are fully integrated across on-prem, cloud, and SaaS. Ownership is enforced via governance processes. Newly discovered assets are immediately routed for inclusion in scoping, validation, and remediation efforts.

**Outcome:**

High-maturity asset discovery and attribution reduce response time and ensure exposures are tied to responsible owners. CTEM efforts become more efficient, less error-prone, and more trusted by stakeholders—enabling rapid decision-making and targeted risk mitigation.

## Use Case: Missed Detection of Critical Vulnerability Due to Scanner Blind Spots

**Domain:** Vulnerability Detection

**Scenario:**

A financial services firm suffers a breach via a critical remote code execution flaw in a web application component. Although the vulnerability was published weeks prior, the scanner configuration excluded that specific tech stack, and no authenticated scanning was configured. The CTEM team had relied on default detection methods without tuning, leading to false confidence that systems were secure.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Vulnerability detection is inconsistent or absent. Scanning is manual or based on default settings.
- **Level 2:** Regular vulnerability scans are conducted, but coverage is incomplete, and detection logic is not tailored to the environment.
- **Level 3:** Vulnerability detection uses multiple scanning tools and includes authenticated, agent-based, and API-integrated methods. Coverage is documented.
- **Level 4:** Detection is context-aware, integrated with asset classification, and tuned for platform-specific risks. Scanning cadence adapts to asset criticality and threat activity.
- **Level 5:** Detection is proactive and includes open-source threat intelligence, exploit prediction scoring, and validation hooks. Detection gaps are tracked and remediated systematically.

#### Outcome:

Mature vulnerability detection ensures organizations don't overlook exploitable flaws. CTEM programs at higher levels of maturity deliver faster, broader, and more accurate visibility into technical debt—reducing dwell time and prioritizing exposures based on both severity and exploitability.

### Use Case: Lateral Movement Enabled by Unmapped Internal Trust Relationships

#### Domain: Internal Exposure Mapping

#### Scenario:

A manufacturing firm's CTEM program successfully detects external-facing vulnerabilities, but during a red team engagement, attackers compromise an internal printer server and pivot through poorly segmented network shares. These internal exposures had not been mapped, as the CTEM process focused only on perimeter assets and known vulnerabilities—ignoring trust relationships, misconfigurations, and excessive internal privileges.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Internal exposure mapping is not performed. Visibility is limited to public-facing or high-profile systems.
- **Level 2:** Some ad hoc internal scanning is conducted, but it does not include privilege relationships, lateral movement paths, or misconfigured internal services.

- **Level 3:** CTEM includes defined internal discovery across key environments. Network shares, admin interfaces, and authentication flows are mapped periodically.
- **Level 4:** Internal mapping is automated and integrates with asset tagging, network telemetry, and identity stores. Exposure data is used to support attack path modeling.
- **Level 5:** Internal exposure surfaces are continuously monitored. Mapping adapts to architectural changes, validates least privilege models, and supports dynamic blast radius estimation.

#### **Outcome:**

Robust internal exposure mapping helps organizations understand how attackers could pivot once inside the network. Mature programs identify unseen risks stemming from configuration drift, privilege escalation, and architectural weaknesses—enabling more comprehensive CTEM coverage and stronger resilience against advanced threats.

### **Use Case: Compromised Service Account Enables Persistent Access**

#### **Domain:** Identity & Access Exposure Detection

#### **Scenario:**

An attacker gains initial access to a retail company's network and uses hardcoded service account credentials found in a repository to move laterally. The service account has excessive permissions and no MFA enforcement. The CTEM program had not included identity-related exposures in its discovery phase, treating IAM as out-of-scope. As a result, exploitable identity weaknesses remained hidden from visibility and remediation workflows.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** Identity-related exposures are not evaluated. CTEM focuses only on infrastructure and software vulnerabilities.
- **Level 2:** Some IAM exposures are identified during incident response, but discovery is manual or dependent on ad hoc reviews.
- **Level 3:** CTEM integrates with IAM systems to discover exposed credentials, stale accounts, excessive privileges, and missing controls. Findings are tracked.
- **Level 4:** Identity exposure detection is automated, correlated with access logs, and includes federation, privileged roles, and lateral movement risks.
- **Level 5:** Identity and access exposure detection is continuous and risk-prioritized. CTEM workflows include IAM validation, support identity hardening efforts, and simulate identity-based attack paths.

#### **Outcome:**

Effective identity and access exposure detection closes one of the most frequently exploited gaps in modern environments. As programs mature, they reduce the likelihood of privilege misuse,

enforce least privilege, and detect IAM misconfigurations before attackers do—turning identity from a liability into a line of defense.

## Use Case: Vendor-Owned System Exposes Sensitive Data via Misconfigured API

**Domain:** Third-Party & Supply Chain Discovery

**Scenario:**

A global insurance company learns through a customer report that sensitive policyholder data is accessible via an API exposed by a third-party claims processor. The API endpoint was deployed as part of a business process outsourcing contract, but had never been reviewed or tested under the CTEM program. The team lacked visibility into externally hosted systems tied to supply chain operations and had no structured way to identify or assess exposures outside the company's direct control.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** Third-party systems and vendor infrastructure are not included in CTEM scoping or discovery.
- **Level 2:** Some vendors are asked about security practices, but CTEM has no discovery or validation capabilities for supply chain exposure.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes known vendor assets and shared services in discovery efforts. External risk ratings or contract language guide inclusion.
- **Level 4:** Discovery integrates with vendor management, cloud telemetry, and threat intelligence to detect exposures tied to third-party systems. High-risk vendors are prioritized for validation.
- **Level 5:** Third-party and supply chain exposure is continuously monitored and risk-scored. CTEM tracks data flows, SLAs, control inheritance, and actively validates security posture of connected systems.

**Outcome:**

High-maturity CTEM programs extend visibility and accountability beyond the enterprise perimeter. By including vendor and partner systems in discovery, organizations better understand where risk exists, reduce blind spots, and ensure third-party relationships don't undermine their overall security posture.

## Use Case: Sensitive Customer Data Found in Unsecured Cloud Storage

**Domain:** Data Exposure & Privacy Mapping

**Scenario:**

During an unrelated audit, a multinational e-commerce firm discovers that sensitive customer PII is stored in an open cloud storage bucket linked to a staging environment. The bucket had been created by a development team and was not included in the CTEM scope. No data classification, tagging, or exposure mapping had been performed, and CTEM workflows had not accounted for privacy risk or sensitive data locations.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM does not track or consider sensitive data exposure. Data risk is assumed to be managed by compliance teams.
- **Level 2:** Data exposure issues are identified only after incidents. Privacy risks are not proactively assessed or tied to discovery activities.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes basic mapping of regulated or sensitive data types. Locations are manually reviewed during scoping or validation.
- **Level 4:** Data classification and tagging are integrated into discovery workflows. Exposure mapping identifies unprotected or misconfigured storage and transmission paths.
- **Level 5:** CTEM continuously tracks data exposure risk across structured and unstructured assets. Privacy risk is prioritized, integrated with legal/regulatory frameworks, and triggers real-time response actions.

#### Outcome:

When CTEM integrates data exposure and privacy mapping, organizations can proactively address one of the most reputationally and financially damaging classes of risk. Mature programs detect privacy violations before regulators or attackers do—and reduce both breach impact and compliance risk.

### Use Case: Critical Exposure Left Unaddressed Due to Flat Prioritization Model

**Domain:** Business Impact Modeling & Asset Criticality

#### Scenario:

An exposure in a public-facing application supporting high-revenue clients goes unremediated for weeks, while less impactful issues on development systems are addressed quickly. The CTEM team uses a flat CVSS-based scoring model with no business context, resulting in equal treatment of all exposures regardless of asset importance or functional impact. The delayed remediation leads to exploitation, customer data loss, and regulatory scrutiny.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Exposure prioritization does not consider business impact or asset criticality. All issues are treated equally or by severity score alone.

- **Level 2:** Criticality is inferred informally through tribal knowledge or reactive stakeholder input. Prioritization decisions vary between teams.
- **Level 3:** Assets are categorized based on their business role. CTEM applies defined impact ratings during prioritization, aligned with risk tiers.
- **Level 4:** Business impact data is integrated into exposure scoring. Criticality tags are maintained dynamically and used to triage findings.
- **Level 5:** Prioritization uses real-time business impact modeling, including revenue exposure, compliance relevance, and downstream dependencies. Asset criticality is continuously validated and embedded in decision automation.

### **Outcome:**

Aligning CTEM prioritization with business impact ensures that the most important systems receive attention first. High-maturity programs integrate risk to mission, reputation, and revenue into triage logic—enabling faster, smarter action and reducing the chance of strategic blind spots.

## Use Case: Failure to Prioritize Exploited Vulnerability Leads to Breach

### **Domain:** Threat Intelligence Correlation

### **Scenario:**

A regional bank patches exposures based solely on CVSS scores. A vulnerability in its external authentication system is ranked “medium” and placed in the quarterly backlog. Meanwhile, threat intelligence feeds indicate that the flaw is being actively exploited by a financially motivated threat group. The lack of correlation between exposure data and threat activity means the vulnerability is deprioritized—until it’s used as the entry point for a credential stuffing attack that compromises customer accounts.

### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** No use of threat intelligence in exposure analysis. Prioritization is static and score-based.
- **Level 2:** Ad hoc checks for active exploitation occur, often after external alerts or news reports. TI is not tied into workflows.
- **Level 3:** Threat intelligence feeds are consulted regularly and mapped to exposures. Known exploited vulnerabilities are prioritized.
- **Level 4:** External and internal TI sources are integrated with CTEM tooling. Correlation with CVEs, TTPs, and attacker trends informs dynamic prioritization.
- **Level 5:** CTEM leverages curated, contextual threat intel correlated in real time with exposure data, including actor targeting trends, industry-specific campaigns, and dark web indicators. Prioritization adapts automatically to emerging threat signals.

### **Outcome:**

Integrating threat intelligence into CTEM prioritization ensures exposures are evaluated not just by potential severity, but by real-world likelihood. Organizations at higher maturity detect patterns early, align defenses to attacker behaviors, and minimize risk from targeted campaigns and opportunistic threats alike.

## Use Case: Conflicting Risk Scores Undermine Stakeholder Confidence

**Domain:** Exposure Risk Scoring Model

**Scenario:**

A healthcare company uses different risk scoring models across its vulnerability management, CTEM, and application security teams. The same exposure on a patient data processing system is marked “low risk” by one team and “high priority” by another. This inconsistency leads to delays in remediation, confusion in executive briefings, and erosion of trust in the CTEM program. Teams debate the model rather than act on the risk.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** No defined scoring model exists. Exposure risk is assessed informally or by raw scan outputs.
- **Level 2:** A basic model is used, often based on CVSS, without environmental context or consistent application.
- **Level 3:** A standardized exposure risk scoring model is implemented, incorporating asset importance, exposure type, and exploitability.
- **Level 4:** The model is contextualized using internal threat telemetry, risk appetite, and detection coverage. It is applied consistently across all business units.
- **Level 5:** Exposure risk scoring is dynamic, continuously updated with real-world threat data, compensating controls, and attack path dependencies. The scoring model supports executive reporting and automation.

**Outcome:**

A consistent and contextual risk scoring model enables CTEM to speak a common risk language across technical and business teams. Higher maturity levels support defensible, data-driven prioritization and reduce friction between teams, ensuring effort is aligned with risk to mission.

## Use Case: Isolated Exposure Overlooked as Part of a Larger Attack Path

**Domain:** Attack Path Analysis & Blast Radius Estimation

**Scenario:**

A software firm identifies a misconfigured internal database but considers it low-risk since it is not internet-facing. However, a later penetration test reveals that this system can be reached

through a multi-step attack path involving a vulnerable jump host, weak IAM policy, and lateral movement. The CTEM team had no capability to model chained exposures or estimate potential blast radius, resulting in missed prioritization of a critical attack path.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Exposures are evaluated in isolation. No consideration is given to how attackers might pivot or chain flaws.
- **Level 2:** Attack path modeling is discussed during reviews but not documented or supported by tooling. Blast radius is speculative.
- **Level 3:** Known exposures are mapped to potential lateral movement scenarios. Key assets and privileged access pathways are considered in triage.
- **Level 4:** Automated attack path analysis tools simulate adversary movement and estimate impact zones. Prioritization reflects both direct and downstream risk.
- **Level 5:** Attack path modeling and blast radius estimation are continuous, integrated with threat intel, asset tagging, and validation workflows. CTEM identifies chokepoints, privilege escalations, and systemic risks in real time.

#### Outcome:

Incorporating attack path analysis into CTEM prioritization helps organizations identify exposures that may seem benign individually but are critical when viewed as part of a larger chain. Higher maturity programs minimize risk by breaking kill chains early and addressing exposures with the greatest potential for systemic compromise.

### Use Case: Delayed Response to Exposure Already Targeted in Active Campaign

#### Domain: Campaign & Cluster Analysis

#### Scenario:

A global logistics company experiences a breach when attackers exploit a vulnerability that had been used in a recent campaign targeting similar organizations. Although the CTEM team had identified the exposure weeks earlier, it was not prioritized because no immediate exploit was observed. The team lacked the capability to correlate exposure data with known threat campaigns or TTP clusters, and missed the opportunity to act preemptively based on adversary focus trends.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM teams do not track or consider threat campaigns. Prioritization is based only on technical data.
- **Level 2:** Campaign analysis is reactive, reviewed post-incident or when prompted by external alerts. No proactive alignment with exposure data.
- **Level 3:** Campaigns are tracked and reviewed periodically. CTEM teams correlate known exploited CVEs with industry- or region-specific activity.

- **Level 4:** Exposure data is automatically mapped to active campaigns using external and internal threat intel. Prioritization is adjusted when clustering indicates targeted activity.
- **Level 5:** CTEM integrates campaign and cluster data in real-time with contextual risk scoring. Campaigns are tracked across attack stages, and preemptive mitigation plans are activated when overlap with enterprise exposures is detected.

#### **Outcome:**

Campaign and cluster analysis elevates CTEM from reactive defense to intelligence-led prioritization. High-maturity programs understand adversary targeting patterns and adjust their response before threats materialize—improving preparedness and resilience in the face of coordinated attack activity.

### Use Case: Adversary-in-the-Middle Exposure Deprioritized Due to Lack of Exploit Context

#### **Domain:** Adversary-in-the-Middle Prioritization

#### **Scenario:**

A large professional services firm discovers that several internal services transmit credentials in plaintext over unencrypted protocols. The CTEM team identifies these exposures but ranks them as low priority because there is no public exploit or CVE tied to the behavior. Several weeks later, a red team simulates a local adversary who uses passive sniffing and session hijacking to gain persistent access. Leadership questions why these attack paths were not addressed earlier.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** CTEM does not account for adversary-in-the-middle (AiTM) techniques. Only traditional vulnerabilities are considered in prioritization.
- **Level 2:** AiTM risks are occasionally discussed during security assessments but are not systematically identified or ranked.
- **Level 3:** CTEM incorporates network and authentication exposures (e.g., plaintext protocols, weak certificates) into risk scoring, with AiTM as a risk scenario.
- **Level 4:** CTEM simulates AiTM attack paths in validation phases and correlates exposures (e.g., lack of encryption, spoofable endpoints) with business criticality.
- **Level 5:** AiTM scenarios are modeled continuously as part of attack simulation and threat-informed prioritization. CTEM dynamically adjusts rankings for exposures exploitable via adversary-in-the-middle behavior, even in low-complexity environments.

#### **Outcome:**

By prioritizing exposures vulnerable to adversary-in-the-middle tactics, CTEM programs reduce risk from low-noise, high-impact attacks. Mature implementations detect these issues

proactively, especially in hybrid or segmented environments where trust assumptions can be exploited silently.

## Use Case: Generic Threat Model Misses Targeted Nation-State Risk

**Domain:** Threat Actor Profiling

**Scenario:**

A multinational energy company conducts CTEM prioritization using generic severity and exposure scoring. While this works for common threats, it misses targeting patterns from a known nation-state actor that has previously targeted energy providers in the same region. A lateral movement technique used by that group had been observed in the company's telemetry, but because threat actor behavior was not profiled, the corresponding exposure was not elevated. The result: a delayed response to an attacker already operating within similar environments.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** CTEM processes are blind to attacker motives, tools, or preferences. No adversary context is included in prioritization.
- **Level 2:** Threat actors are discussed informally. Prioritization may reference high-profile groups but lacks structured mapping.
- **Level 3:** Known threat actors relevant to the organization's sector and geography are tracked. CTEM occasionally considers overlaps with exposure types.
- **Level 4:** Threat actor profiles—including TTPs, tools, and infrastructure—are correlated with the organization's known exposures. Prioritization reflects active targeting behaviors.
- **Level 5:** Threat actor profiles are dynamically updated and tied directly to exposure scoring. CTEM uses this intelligence to model adversary capabilities, simulate likely attack paths, and proactively prioritize at-risk systems.

**Outcome:**

Profiling threat actors allows CTEM programs to shift from generic defense to adversary-specific resilience. High maturity teams adapt quickly when targeting shifts and ensure that defenses match real-world adversaries—not theoretical vulnerabilities.

## Validation

### Use Case: Security Control Assumed Effective — Until It Isn't

**Domain:** Control Effectiveness Testing

#### **Scenario:**

A financial institution relies on an endpoint detection and response (EDR) solution to block ransomware execution. During a CTEM validation review, the team assumes EDR coverage is in place and effective across all high-value systems. Months later, a simulated attack reveals that legacy systems were excluded from the EDR deployment group. The ransomware simulation executes without detection, prompting urgent questions about how long the gap existed and whether other controls had been similarly overestimated.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** CTEM assumes controls work as intended. No testing is performed to confirm defensive coverage or efficacy.
- **Level 2:** Testing is ad hoc, typically during audits or red team exercises. Results are not tied to specific exposures or CTEM cycles.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes defined control testing for key security functions. Results inform exposure prioritization and remediation planning.
- **Level 4:** Control testing is continuous and scenario-based. Effectiveness is measured using predefined success criteria and mapped to threat techniques.
- **Level 5:** Control validation is fully integrated with exposure discovery and attack simulation. Results feed back into risk scoring, detection engineering, and control tuning in near real time.

#### **Outcome:**

Control effectiveness testing closes the gap between assumed and actual defense capability. At higher maturity levels, CTEM ensures that security controls are not only deployed—but doing the job they were intended to do, in the exact contexts that matter most.

### Use Case: Patch Deployed, But Vulnerability Still Exploitable

**Domain:** Remediation Validation

#### **Scenario:**

A global manufacturing company deploys a patch for a critical vulnerability affecting its production control systems. The CTEM dashboard shows the exposure as resolved based on ticket closure and software version reporting. However, a later scan reveals the vulnerable component is still accessible on some systems due to failed deployments and misconfigured

rollback policies. The CTEM program had no mechanism to validate whether remediation actions truly eliminated the risk.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Remediation is assumed successful once a task is marked complete. CTEM does not verify whether exposures are resolved.
- **Level 2:** Manual spot checks are conducted post-remediation, often inconsistently and without defined criteria.
- **Level 3:** CTEM workflows include verification steps to ensure fixes were applied and exposures are no longer active.
- **Level 4:** Automated validation methods (e.g., re-scans, probe checks, behavior analysis) confirm that mitigations are both present and effective.
- **Level 5:** Remediation validation is continuous and fully integrated. Feedback from validation influences remediation SLAs, ticket closure, and threat detection tuning.

#### Outcome:

Remediation without validation creates a false sense of security. Mature CTEM programs treat every closed ticket as a hypothesis to be tested—ensuring that exposures are truly resolved, not just administratively marked as such.

### Use Case: Exposure Deprioritized Until Real-World Exploit Confirmed

#### Domain: Proof-of-Exploit Feasibility

#### Scenario:

A healthcare organization identifies an unauthenticated file upload vulnerability in an internal application. CTEM ranks the exposure as “low” due to lack of known public exploits. Weeks later, a red team exercise demonstrates that this exposure can be chained with a misconfigured storage bucket to gain remote code execution. The demonstration shocks stakeholders and triggers an emergency remediation cycle. The organization had no systematic way to test whether exposures were truly exploitable in its environment.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Exploitability is assumed based on severity score or vendor description. No local testing is performed.
- **Level 2:** Some exposures are manually tested when time allows, but results are not documented or used in prioritization.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes structured feasibility testing for high-risk exposures, particularly those lacking patch guidance or public exploits.
- **Level 4:** Exploit feasibility testing is automated or semi-automated, using red team tooling, attack simulations, and custom scripts.

- **Level 5:** Feasibility testing is embedded in CTEM workflows. Exploitability results dynamically inform risk scoring, attack path models, and detection playbooks.

#### **Outcome:**

By testing whether exposures are exploitable in the real-world context of their environment, CTEM programs avoid both overreaction to theoretical risks and underreaction to quietly dangerous flaws. Mature programs use proof-of-exploitability to drive precision, urgency, and alignment across technical and business teams.

### Use Case: Missed Detection of Common TTP Revealed by Simulated Attack

#### **Domain:** Breach & Attack Simulation (BAS) Integration

#### **Scenario:**

A retail company implements endpoint and network security tools but rarely tests them. During a scheduled CTEM exercise, the team runs a BAS scenario simulating credential dumping followed by lateral movement. Despite the tools being configured to detect these tactics, the alerts fail to trigger due to outdated detection rules. The CTEM team realizes this gap only because the BAS tool exposed the failure in a controlled test—not through a real attack.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM does not use BAS. Validation is theoretical or relies on historical incidents.
- **Level 2:** BAS tools are trialed periodically, but results are not integrated into CTEM analysis or risk prioritization.
- **Level 3:** BAS is used to simulate key attack techniques against selected systems, and outcomes inform remediation plans.
- **Level 4:** BAS runs are scheduled regularly and tied to exposure categories (e.g., credential theft, lateral movement). CTEM teams align simulations with current threat models.
- **Level 5:** BAS is continuously integrated into CTEM. Scenarios are threat-informed, mapped to MITRE ATT&CK, and directly inform detection engineering, risk scoring, and control tuning.

#### **Outcome:**

BAS helps CTEM validate not just exposures, but the ability of current defenses to detect and stop realistic attacks. High maturity programs use BAS to test, refine, and optimize their entire exposure management lifecycle—bridging the gap between detection assumptions and adversary behavior.

## Use Case: Exposure Chains Discovered During Exercise Were Never Modeled in CTEM

**Domain:** Red Team / Purple Team Operations

### **Scenario:**

An insurance provider conducts a red team exercise as part of its annual audit. The red team gains domain admin privileges within three days by chaining together five exposures that were individually ranked low or medium by the CTEM team. The exposures had never been modeled together or validated as an attack path. The findings surprise leadership and reveal that CTEM lacked real-world validation of exposure severity and interdependence.

### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** Red and purple team activities are nonexistent. CTEM has no adversarial simulation capability.
- **Level 2:** A red team is brought in occasionally for compliance reasons, but findings are isolated and not integrated into CTEM planning.
- **Level 3:** Red or purple team operations are scoped to validate specific exposure chains. CTEM reviews findings during post-exercise briefings.
- **Level 4:** CTEM actively collaborates with internal or external red/purple teams. Exercises are aligned with active threats, high-risk assets, and validation goals.
- **Level 5:** Red/purple team operations are embedded into CTEM's validation cycle. Results drive detection tuning, risk re-scoring, and program adjustments. Purple team members facilitate real-time knowledge transfer across engineering and security operations.

### **Outcome:**

Red and purple team operations provide reality checks that stress test assumptions and models. When integrated into CTEM, they highlight blind spots and validate whether prioritization decisions hold up against real attacker behavior—driving both technical rigor and strategic improvement.

## Use Case: Assumed Zero Trust Enforcement Fails During Validation

**Domain:** Zero Trust Control Validation

### **Scenario:**

A technology firm believes its Zero Trust network segmentation prevents unauthorized lateral movement. During a CTEM validation cycle, a breach and attack simulation reveals that legacy applications are bypassing enforcement through hardcoded IP allow lists. Several business-critical systems remain reachable from untrusted zones. The organization had not validated

whether its Zero Trust assumptions were holding up under actual conditions, leaving a gaping hole in its exposure strategy.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Zero Trust is not implemented or considered in CTEM validation. Flat networks and broad access remain unchecked.
- **Level 2:** Zero Trust principles are discussed in architecture meetings but are not tested or validated. Controls are assumed to be in place.
- **Level 3:** Basic validation is conducted to confirm segmentation boundaries and access controls are functioning. Gaps are remediated manually.
- **Level 4:** Zero Trust enforcement is validated as part of CTEM exposure review. Tests simulate adversary movement across trust boundaries, and results inform prioritization.
- **Level 5:** Zero Trust control validation is continuous and integrated with CTEM discovery, attack simulation, and telemetry. Failures automatically trigger containment workflows and control updates.

#### Outcome:

Zero Trust is only effective when its enforcement is verified. High-maturity CTEM programs ensure that trust boundaries are not theoretical—they are tested, measured, and enforced as part of an active exposure management lifecycle.

### Use Case: CTEM Findings Never Reach Detection Teams, Allowing Repeat Exposure

**Domain:** Feedback Loops to Threat Detection & Response

#### Scenario:

A media company's CTEM program identifies several recurring exposures in cloud-hosted workloads, including misconfigured access policies and use of deprecated APIs. These are logged and addressed locally, but the SOC and threat detection teams remain unaware of the patterns. A subsequent incident shows that no new detection rules were written to catch similar exposures in other environments. Without feedback to detection engineering, CTEM insights failed to strengthen the broader defensive posture.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM operates in isolation. There is no coordination or communication with detection or incident response teams.
- **Level 2:** Occasional meetings or email summaries are shared, but there is no structured feedback mechanism or tracking.

- **Level 3:** CTEM teams provide regular reports of validated exposures and attack simulations to detection teams, influencing detection priorities.
- **Level 4:** A formal feedback loop exists. Detection logic and alerting are updated based on CTEM insights, including common exposure patterns and attack paths.
- **Level 5:** CTEM and threat detection functions are tightly integrated. Exposure validation results directly inform threat modeling, detection tuning, and real-time correlation rules. Feedback is bi-directional and traceable.

#### **Outcome:**

Feedback loops between CTEM and threat detection ensure that exposure insights are not just resolved—but actively anticipated. High-maturity organizations use this alignment to build resilient detection capabilities that evolve alongside the threat landscape and internal exposure realities.

### Use Case: Missed Opportunity to Enrich Detections from CTEM Findings

**Domain:** Detection Engineering Feedback Loop

#### **Scenario:**

A government agency's CTEM program regularly identifies high-risk exposures, including privilege escalation paths and overly permissive identity roles. However, detection engineers rely on third-party threat feeds and static logic rather than integrating internal CTEM data. As a result, new detections lag behind exposure trends. When a critical system is compromised via a previously validated CTEM attack path, post-incident review reveals that no corresponding detection had ever been developed.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** Detection engineering is siloed from CTEM. Exposure insights are not used to develop or refine detection content.
- **Level 2:** Individual analysts occasionally reference CTEM outputs, but there is no structured or repeatable feedback process.
- **Level 3:** CTEM findings are shared with detection engineering on a regular basis, influencing use case development for specific exposure types.
- **Level 4:** CTEM output directly informs the engineering of new detection logic, including signatures, behavior analytics, and machine learning tuning.
- **Level 5:** Detection engineering consumes CTEM insights continuously and programmatically. Feedback is mapped to ATT&CK techniques, linked to specific exposures, and validated against threat simulations.

#### **Outcome:**

By integrating CTEM outputs into detection engineering, organizations reduce detection gaps and accelerate response readiness. Mature CTEM programs don't just find exposures—they teach the environment how to recognize when they're being exploited.

## Mobilization

### Use Case: Manual Remediation Creates Delay and Inconsistency Across Environments

**Domain:** Remediation Orchestration & Automation

**Scenario:**

A multinational logistics provider identifies several high-risk exposures during a CTEM cycle, including a misconfigured authentication setting in cloud-hosted APIs. Remediation guidance is sent to technical teams via email and tracked manually. Due to inconsistent implementation across regions and a lack of centralized orchestration, the issue remains unresolved in several high-traffic environments. A threat actor exploits one of the missed instances weeks later, leading to unauthorized access.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** Remediation is entirely manual, often relying on individual administrators. There is no consistent process or orchestration layer.
- **Level 2:** Some standardized remediation guidance exists, but implementation is decentralized and inconsistently verified.
- **Level 3:** CTEM teams use orchestration tools to deploy remediations for recurring exposure types. Workflows exist for common platforms and are used consistently.
- **Level 4:** Automated remediation workflows are defined, tested, and integrated with CTEM prioritization logic. Rollback, confirmation, and SLA tracking are in place.
- **Level 5:** Remediation orchestration is fully automated across cloud, on-prem, and hybrid environments. Actions are triggered based on CTEM risk scoring and executed with minimal human intervention. Exceptions are tracked and governed centrally.

**Outcome:**

Automated and orchestrated remediation ensures that once exposures are identified, they are swiftly and uniformly addressed across the organization. High maturity enables consistency, speed, and risk-aligned execution that manual processes simply cannot match.

### Use Case: Risk Acknowledged, But No Interim Controls Applied

**Domain:** Compensating Controls & Containment Actions

**Scenario:**

A financial services company discovers a critical exposure in an outdated third-party component embedded in a legacy platform. The vendor will not provide a patch for 60 days. CTEM prioritizes the exposure, but no interim measures are deployed. The system remains fully exposed, and attackers exploit the flaw before remediation is available. After the incident, a review shows no compensating controls were even considered—such as network segmentation or WAF rules.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Exposures without immediate fixes are left unaddressed. No temporary protections are applied.
- **Level 2:** Some manual containment steps are taken (e.g., temporary ACLs or monitoring), but they are ad hoc and undocumented.
- **Level 3:** CTEM workflows include a catalog of compensating controls that can be applied based on exposure type, asset criticality, and business constraints.
- **Level 4:** Containment actions are predefined, centrally governed, and integrated into incident response and CTEM prioritization logic. Controls are monitored for effectiveness.
- **Level 5:** Compensating controls are selected and applied dynamically based on real-time threat, business impact, and exposure scoring. They are tracked, validated, and retired when permanent remediation is complete.

#### Outcome:

Not all exposures can be remediated immediately—but they can be contained. Mature CTEM programs treat compensating controls as first-class risk responses, ensuring that high-risk conditions are mitigated even when permanent solutions take time.

### Use Case: No Visibility Into What Risks Have Been Accepted or Why

#### Domain: Risk Acceptance & Governance Oversight

#### Scenario:

A global services company has multiple business units that handle risk acceptance independently. One division decides not to remediate a known authentication bypass in a legacy system, citing business constraints. The CTEM team is unaware of the acceptance, and the decision is not logged in any central repository. During an audit, regulators request a list of unremediated high-risk exposures and their acceptance rationale—but the data is incomplete and inconsistent.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** Risk acceptance is informal or undocumented. Decisions vary by team or individual, with no governance.

- **Level 2:** Some exposures are marked as accepted in ticketing tools, but there is no clear process or formal oversight.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes structured workflows for risk acceptance, with required documentation, expiration timelines, and business owner approval.
- **Level 4:** Risk acceptance is governed through centralized oversight bodies or risk committees. All exceptions are tracked, reviewed, and periodically re-evaluated.
- **Level 5:** Risk acceptance decisions are integrated into enterprise risk registers. Metrics on accepted vs. remediated exposures are reported to executives, and alignment with risk appetite is continuously evaluated.

#### **Outcome:**

Clear oversight of risk acceptance decisions enables accountability, audit readiness, and alignment with business priorities. At higher maturity, CTEM programs ensure that risk tolerance is not just stated—it is measured, monitored, and enforced.

#### **Use Case: CTEM-Identified Exploit Path Escalates Into Incident with No Coordinated Response**

**Domain:** Incident Response Handoff (if needed)

#### **Scenario:**

During a CTEM validation cycle, a team identifies a high-risk privilege escalation exposure in a production environment. The exposure is flagged as critical, but while awaiting remediation, telemetry indicates potential probing activity targeting the vulnerable component. The CTEM team is unsure when to escalate to the SOC, and no formal handoff occurs. A breach unfolds days later, revealing that early CTEM signals were missed due to unclear ownership and no linkage to incident response protocols.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** CTEM operates entirely separately from incident response. There are no communication pathways or escalation triggers.
- **Level 2:** Informal handoffs occur when CTEM teams suspect an active threat, but processes are undefined and inconsistent.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes criteria for when exposures or activity should be escalated to incident response teams. Manual coordination processes are documented.
- **Level 4:** Formal workflows connect CTEM exposure validation with threat detection and incident response. SLAs and criteria are pre-defined, and all handoffs are logged.
- **Level 5:** CTEM and IR systems are integrated. Exposure risk scores, telemetry, and activity patterns dynamically trigger incident response actions. Handoffs are automated and bidirectional.

#### **Outcome:**

Well-defined handoff mechanisms ensure that CTEM does not operate in isolation from incident response. High-maturity programs turn exposure validation into early warning signals—enabling faster containment and reducing the cost of real-world incidents.

## Use Case: CTEM-Identified Exploit Path Escalates Into Incident with No Coordinated Response

**Domain:** Incident Response Handoff (if needed)

**Scenario:**

During a CTEM validation cycle, a team identifies a high-risk privilege escalation exposure in a production environment. The exposure is flagged as critical, but while awaiting remediation, telemetry indicates potential probing activity targeting the vulnerable component. The CTEM team is unsure when to escalate to the SOC, and no formal handoff occurs. A breach unfolds days later, revealing that early CTEM signals were missed due to unclear ownership and no linkage to incident response protocols.

**Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** CTEM operates entirely separately from incident response. There are no communication pathways or escalation triggers.
- **Level 2:** Informal handoffs occur when CTEM teams suspect an active threat, but processes are undefined and inconsistent.
- **Level 3:** CTEM includes criteria for when exposures or activity should be escalated to incident response teams. Manual coordination processes are documented.
- **Level 4:** Formal workflows connect CTEM exposure validation with threat detection and incident response. SLAs and criteria are pre-defined, and all handoffs are logged.
- **Level 5:** CTEM and IR systems are integrated. Exposure risk scores, telemetry, and activity patterns dynamically trigger incident response actions. Handoffs are automated and bidirectional.

**Outcome:**

Well-defined handoff mechanisms ensure that CTEM does not operate in isolation from incident response. High-maturity programs turn exposure validation into early warning signals—enabling faster containment and reducing the cost of real-world incidents.

## Use Case: CTEM Findings Fail to Influence Leadership Priorities

**Domain:** Executive Reporting & Risk Communication

**Scenario:**

An enterprise manufacturing company runs a mature CTEM program and uncovers repeated high-risk exposures in its operational technology (OT) network. Although the findings are logged and tracked internally, the executive team receives only generic metrics in quarterly risk reports. No CTEM-specific insights are shared, and there is no linkage between exposure risk and strategic business objectives. Funding requests for mitigation projects are deprioritized due to a perceived lack of urgency.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** CTEM operates without formal reporting. Executives are unaware of exposure findings, trends, or risk posture.
- **Level 2:** Ad hoc CTEM summaries are shared when asked, but reports lack context, prioritization, or business relevance.
- **Level 3:** Regular CTEM reporting includes key exposure metrics, risk scores, and high-priority items. Business owners receive tailored updates.
- **Level 4:** Reporting is aligned to business units and includes trend analysis, exposure mapping to crown jewels, and forecasts of remediation impact.
- **Level 5:** Executives receive actionable CTEM briefings tied to strategic objectives, risk appetite, and regulatory expectations. Communications are supported by dashboards, benchmarks, and risk trend narratives.

#### Outcome:

Mature CTEM programs ensure leadership understands not just where exposures exist—but what they mean to business risk. Effective communication builds buy-in, secures resources, and aligns technical risk with organizational priorities.

### Use Case: No Historical View of Exposure Trends to Inform Strategy

**Domain:** Risk Trend Analysis & Reporting Automation

#### Scenario:

A healthcare organization has been running CTEM cycles for over a year but relies on manual spreadsheets and isolated reports to track progress. Leadership asks whether the organization's exposure risk posture is improving over time, but there is no automated trend reporting, no consistent metrics, and no visualizations to support an answer. Without longitudinal data, CTEM findings are treated as snapshots—limiting their influence on strategic planning and investment.

#### Action at Different Maturity Levels:

- **Level 1:** No historical CTEM data is retained. Exposure and remediation status are reviewed in isolation.
- **Level 2:** Some manual effort is made to summarize past exposures, but reporting is inconsistent and lacks trend analysis.

- **Level 3:** Basic trend reports are generated from CTEM tools or spreadsheets to show exposure count and status over time.
- **Level 4:** Automated reporting tracks exposure trends, remediation velocity, and risk levels across business units or asset types.
- **Level 5:** Exposure and risk trends are visualized in dashboards, correlated with business impact, and used to guide strategic planning. Metrics are updated in real time and automatically distributed to stakeholders.

#### **Outcome:**

When CTEM includes automated trend analysis, it evolves from tactical insight to strategic driver. Organizations with high maturity can track progress, benchmark posture, and make data-informed decisions that continuously reduce exposure risk.

### Use Case: CTEM Processes Stagnate Despite Evolving Threat Landscape

#### **Domain:** CTEM Adaptation & Continuous Learning

#### **Scenario:**

A large enterprise implemented CTEM to address critical gaps in vulnerability and threat exposure. While the initial cycles produced valuable insights, processes and priorities have remained unchanged for over a year. New business initiatives, cloud migrations, and emerging threats (e.g., AI-enabled attacks) are not factored into the current CTEM model. As a result, exposure identification becomes less relevant over time, and stakeholder engagement declines.

#### **Action at Different Maturity Levels:**

- **Level 1:** CTEM processes are static. There is no reflection or adjustment cycle to account for new threats, technologies, or lessons learned.
- **Level 2:** Teams conduct informal reviews occasionally, but changes to CTEM scope, tools, or processes are rare and reactive.
- **Level 3:** Post-cycle reviews and retrospectives are held to identify areas for improvement. CTEM activities are periodically adjusted based on results.
- **Level 4:** Feedback mechanisms from CTEM outcomes, stakeholder input, and detection results inform proactive updates to CTEM methodology, tooling, and scoping criteria.
- **Level 5:** CTEM continuously evolves based on threat landscape shifts, business transformation, and validation results. Change management is institutionalized. Lessons learned are codified and drive refinements in real time.

#### **Outcome:**

Continuous learning ensures CTEM remains effective in dynamic environments. Mature programs treat adaptation not as a corrective action, but as a core function—embedding agility, resilience, and long-term effectiveness into exposure management.

## Glossary of Key Terms

- **Adversary-in-the-Middle Prioritization:** A method of prioritizing exposures by evaluating how an attacker might position themselves between systems, identities, or data flows to intercept or manipulate actions.
- **Asset Attribution:** The process of linking discovered technical assets to business units, owners, and functions to provide context for risk and remediation.
- **Attack Path Analysis:** An evaluation of how an attacker might move laterally or escalate privileges through a network to reach high-value targets.
- **Blast Radius:** The potential impact or scope of damage that could occur if a given exposure were exploited by a threat actor.
- **Breach and Attack Simulation (BAS):** Tools or exercises that simulate real-world attacker behavior to test the effectiveness of security controls and detection capabilities.
- **Business Impact Modeling:** The practice of quantifying the effect that compromise or exposure of a system would have on the business, often including financial, operational, or reputational metrics.
- **Crown Jewels:** The organization's most critical assets, systems, or data whose compromise would cause disproportionate business harm.
- **CTEM (Continuous Threat Exposure Management):** A proactive and iterative program that continuously identifies, prioritizes, validates, and mobilizes defenses against potential exposures across an organization's attack surface.
- **Control Effectiveness Testing:** The validation of whether implemented security controls are functioning as intended and providing the required protection.
- **Detection Engineering:** The development and refinement of detection rules, logic, and telemetry to identify malicious behavior or suspicious anomalies in real time.
- **Exposure Risk Scoring:** A quantification model that assigns a risk value to exposures based on exploitability, impact, business context, and threat intelligence.
- **External Attack Surface Management (EASM):** The identification, monitoring, and assessment of internet-facing assets to detect unmanaged or vulnerable systems.
- **Feedback Loop:** A continuous improvement mechanism where findings (e.g., from validation or detection) are fed back into earlier CTEM stages for refinement.
- **Identity & Access Exposure Detection:** The identification of weaknesses in identity systems such as weak credentials, over-permissioned accounts, or misconfigured access controls.
- **Mobilization:** The final phase in CTEM where prioritized and validated findings are turned into action through remediation, containment, governance, or communication.
- **Prioritization:** The process of ranking exposures based on their risk and relevance to business operations and threat activity.
- **Red Team / Purple Team Operations:** Security exercises that simulate real attacker tactics (red) while promoting collaboration with defenders (purple) to improve detection and response.
- **Remediation Validation:** A process that verifies whether applied fixes or mitigations have successfully resolved the identified exposure.
- **Risk Appetite:** The level of risk an organization is willing to accept while pursuing its objectives.

- **Scoping:** The first phase in CTEM that defines what assets, threats, stakeholders, and objectives will be included in the current cycle of exposure management.
- **Security Architecture Mapping:** The process of aligning CTEM efforts with the organization's existing security tools, policies, and architectural frameworks.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** The process of ensuring all relevant business, IT, and security leaders are aligned on CTEM objectives and responsibilities.
- **Third-Party Exposure Discovery:** The identification and evaluation of risks that arise from partners, suppliers, or vendors whose systems interact with your own.
- **Threat Actor Profiling:** The categorization of attackers based on their motivations, capabilities, tactics, and past campaigns to inform prioritization decisions.
- **Threat Intelligence Correlation:** The enrichment of exposure data with external threat feeds or intelligence to understand which exposures are currently being targeted.
- **Validation:** The phase in CTEM where prioritized risks are tested through simulations, red teaming, and control assessments to confirm their exploitability and impact.
- **Zero Trust Control Validation:** The testing and confirmation that zero trust principles—like least privilege, identity verification, and segmentation—are actively preventing exposure exploitation.