Who am I?

- Post-doc researcher with KYPO – academic cloud-based cyber range.
- Ph.D. graduate in flow-based intrusion detection.
- Founder and head of a certified university operational security team.
- Coordinator and designer of hands-on training session at KYPO platform.
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Example of a defence exercise in a cyber range

- Topic: defending critical IT infrastructure with **SCADA/ICS** systems against skilled and coordinated attackers
- Learners play a role of members of emergency security teams.
- Their tasks:
  - Secure their network and services.
  - Investigate possible data exfiltrations.
  - Collaborate with the coordinator, law enforcement agencies and media.
- Schedule:
  - Day 1 – familiarization with the infrastructure and rules; no attacks
  - Day 2 – actual intensive exercise; no breaks
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Exercise scenario

Follows common attack phases:
1. reconnaissance the victim's network
2. exploitation of the unveiled vulnerabilities
3. escalation of privileges on compromised computers and further exploitation
4. completing attackers' mission (e.g., shutdown a control system)
General requirements for a cyber range

- One **sandbox** for each team with exercise network interconnecting all virtual hosts that have to be defended by learners.

- **Monitoring and logging system**
  - Each host in the sandbox sends logs to the central server for further analysis.
  - State of the host's network services is periodically checked and logged.

- **Scoring system**
  - Provides instant feedback to participants during exercise.
  - Penalty and award points are computed automatically from events processed by the logging infrastructure or entered manually.
Cyber defence exercise lifecycle

Lessons Learned From Complex Hands-on Defence Exercises in a Cyber Range
Jan Vykopal, Masaryk University
Lessons learned - preparation

- **Setting learning objectives with respect to the expected readiness of prospective learners**
  - Organizers have limited information about learners' skills before the exercise.
  - Ask for self-assessment or taking part in a test before the exercise.

- **Creating balanced teams**
  - If some learners are experts in one area, distribute them to all teams equally and complement them with experts in another area.

- **Sandbox configuration documents**
  - Continually update specification of systems, network and vulnerabilities.
  - Do not use static documentation, but automation tool such as Ansible.
Lessons learned – dry run

- Adjusting the scoring system based on the dry run might be misleading
  - Expertise and size of the Blue teams participating in the dry run may be different.
  - Think about various conditions and events that may not happen in the execution.
Lessons learned – execution I

- **Level of guidance by organizers**
  - Provide some hints to keep learners in flow and not to get frustrated.
  - The guidance should be provided to all teams equally to preserve fair play.

- **Exercise situational awareness for learners**
  - Might be contradictory to the aim and nature of cyber defence exercise.
  - Provide only a basic indication of the learners’ performance by displaying a real-time total score of all teams on a shared scoreboard.
  - It also fuels participants with stress as well as a competitive mood.
Lessons learned – execution II

- **Exercise situational awareness for organizers**
  - Familiarization period: monitoring the infrastructure enables the White team to provide hints for Blue teams if they unintentionally misconfigure their services.
  - Actual exercise: White team needs to know if some event reported by the Blue teams is a part of the exercise or outage of the infrastructure (cyber range).

- **Automation of the attacks and injects**
  - A need for semi-automated routines that execute attacks and injects in predefined order (=> master’s thesis).
  - A need for a generator of network traffic that can emulate typical users.

- **Service access to the exercise's infrastructure**
  - Clearly define what is it and how to distinguish it from a ordinary traffic and attacks by Red team.
Lesson learned - evaluation

- **Ask learners what they want to know**
  - Prepare a questionnaire that is distributed before the evaluation workshop and tailor the content based on their input.

- **Learning also happens in this phase**
  - Evaluation workshop reveals the exercise scenario and timeline from the perspective of the Red and White team.
  - The only opportunity when the learners can authoritatively learn about attacks.
  - Provide a hand-out with best practices that might be useful in the daily routine.
Conclusions

Exercise lifecycle

Preparation ➔ Dry run ➔ Execution ➔ Evaluation ➔ Repetition

Each phase brought several lessons from educational and technical perspectives.

Follow-up work - two papers accepted for SIGCSE 2018:

- Prerequisite testing of cybersecurity skills
- Timely feedback to learners (just after the exercise)
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