



The Cyber 9/12 Student Challenge

Competition Instructions for Oral Presentation

Competition Round Structure

At the beginning of each round the team will enter the room and give the timekeeper their “Decision Document” outlining their policy response alternatives. The teams will then have 10 minutes to present their policy recommendations to the panel of judges.

The teams will NOT be permitted to use any presentation aids (e.g., PowerPoint, props, handouts, and posters) during their oral presentations. Additionally, judges will NOT be allowed to ask questions during the presentations.

The timekeeper will hold up a green sign when the team has 5 minutes left, a yellow sign when there is 1 minute remaining, and a red sign when time has expired.

At the conclusion of the team’s presentation, the panel of judges will have 10 minutes to ask direct questions of the teams regarding their policy recommendations.

Once the 10 minutes of direct questioning has expired, the timekeeper will instruct them to leave the room. The judges will have 5 minutes to score the team’s presentation on the scorecards provided, according to the standards outlined below. Any questions about scoring should be directed to the timekeeper. When the scoring period is over the timekeeper will collect the scorecards and Decision Documents.

Once the scorecards have been collected, the timekeeper will invite the team to re-enter the room and the judges will have 10 minutes to provide feedback to the team.

After the 10 minutes of feedback, the timekeeper will ask the team to leave the room. Judges will have a 10 minute break before the next round.





Judging Criteria

Judges will use the following five categories to judge the written and oral briefings. The Decision Document does not count towards a team's overall score, but the team with the best Decision Document will be awarded "Best Decision Document" team award. Please direct any questions regarding judging to the competition director.

Understanding of Cyber Policy

- [4 points] The team demonstrated a superior knowledge of cyber conflict policy issues, accurately named specific actors, and applicable instruments
- [3 points] The team demonstrated a comprehensive knowledge of cyber conflict policy issues, identified appropriate actors, and instruments
- [2 points] The team demonstrated a sufficient knowledge and general understanding of cyber conflict policy
- [1 point] The team demonstrated a limited knowledge of cyber conflict policy issues

Identification of key issues

- [4 points] The team successfully identified and fully responded to critical cyber conflict policy issues posed by the scenario
- [3 points] The team identified and responded to the main policy issues posed by the scenario
- [2 points] The team identified some of the salient cyber conflict policy issues posed by the scenario or failed to respond fully to some of the main policy issues identified
- [1 point] The team referenced few general cyber conflict policy issues and/or focused on issues not associated with the scenario

Analysis of policy response alternatives

- [4 points] The team's suggested policy response alternatives effectively addressed the scenario, and the team thoroughly analyzed the tradeoffs involved with other policy alternatives
- [3 points] The team's suggested policy response alternatives only partially addressed the scenario and/or some sections lacked sufficient analysis or justification
- [2 point] The team's analysis of policy response alternatives is not properly grounded in cyber conflict related theory and/or did not appear to be relevant to the competition scenario
- [1 point] The team's suggested policy response was not properly supported by analysis and/or the team did not appear to analyze other policy response alternatives





Structure and Organization

- [4 points] The team clearly and concisely presented policy response alternatives and fully communicated the analysis supporting their recommended response and all alternatives
- [3 points] The team effectively presented their policy response alternatives and recommended response, but did not fully communicate the analysis of alternatives and/or justification of their recommended response
- [2 points] The team adequately presented their policy response alternatives and recommended response, but the presentation lacked coherent analysis of policy response alternatives
- [1 point] The team’s presentation lacked coherence and conciseness, hindering the effective communication of policy responses to the intended audience

Originality and Creativity

- [4 points] The team offered original, creative, and innovative solutions to the scenario that go beyond existing canonical cyber conflict policy literature
- [3 points] The team exhibited a distinctive approach to the scenario, but largely drew on well-known solutions
- [2 points] The team relied on repeating well-known policy solutions from obvious sources with little adaptation
- [1 point] The team approached the scenario by only drawing on material provided, showing little originality

Overall Impression

- [4 points] One of the best presentations of the competition; demonstrated thorough understanding of the situation with a convincing delivery of the recommendation.
- [3 points] A quality presentation that showed understanding of the situation, but may not have lead coherently to the recommendation.
- [2 points] The team demonstrated a limited understanding of the situation and/or provided infeasible recommendations.
- [1 point] Structurally flawed presentation that misrepresented the situation and/or did not produce policy alternatives.

Decision Document

Teams will be required to submit a “Decision Document” accompanying their oral presentation at the beginning of the competition round. The Decision Document should follow the team’s oral presentation.

The Decision Document will be a prepared form, two single-sided pages (one double-sided page) in





length, outlining the team’s policy response alternatives, decision process, and recommendations. The Decision Document does not count towards a team’s overall score, but the team with the best Decision Document will be awarded “Best Decision Document” team award.

There are no format restrictions on font, size, margins, or style, but graphs, images, tables, and other graphics are **NOT** permitted. Submissions that exceed the maximum page limit will not be accepted.

The following outline is strongly suggested for structuring the Decision Document.

- I. Cyber Policy Question Presented
- II. Proposed Policy Response Alternatives
- III. Analysis and Impact of Policy Response Alternatives
- IV. Justification for Recommended Policy Response Alternative

Team Awards

Judges will nominate teams for each of the team awards listed below. Team awards will be announced at the conclusion of day 1.

- Best Oral Presentation – Judges should nominate teams who show an advanced mastery of the oral briefing. Judges are free to nominate multiple teams
- Best Teamwork – Judges should nominate teams who show strong collaborative skills and present a cohesive briefing as a team. Judges are free to nominate multiple teams
- Best Decision Document – Judges should nominate teams who submit a precise and professional Decision Document that clearly presents the team’s recommendations and justifications. Judges are free to nominate multiple teams
- Most Creative Policy Response Alternative – Judges should nominate teams who show nuanced and plausible policy response alternatives that also show a high degree of creativity and originality. Judges are free to nominate multiple teams.

For any questions about the competition, please contact:

- **Klara Tothova Jordan**, Assistant Director, Cyber Statecraft Initiative, Atlantic Council
T: +1-202-778-4972 | C: +1-703-474-3089 | E: KTothovaJordan@atlanticcouncil.org
- and
- **Aapo Cederberg**, Senior Programme Adviser, Emerging Security Challenges Programme, Geneva Center for Security Policy | T: +41 22 730 9 642 | E: a.cederberg@gcsp.ch

