Cyber 9/12 Strategy Challenge

Competition Instructions for Oral Presentation

Competition Round Structure

At the beginning of each round, the team and judges will enter the relevant competition session found under "My Agenda" on the virtual event platform (access to the platform will be given shortly before the competition). The timekeeper will not wait for late participants. At the start, the timekeeper will go over the running of the session and circulate the 'Decision Document'[1] to the judges. Judges will have **2 minutes** to read the Document. Teams will then have 10 minutes to present their policy recommendations to the judges. **Teams must highlight one policy response alternative to recommend and explain their reasoning and justification**.

Teams will NOT be permitted to use any presentation aids (e.g. PowerPoint, props or posters) during their oral presentations. When teams are presenting or answering judges' questions, NO outside assistance, including from the team coach, is allowed. Additionally, judges will NOT be allowed to ask questions during the presentations.

The timekeeper will hold up a green sign when the team has five minutes left, a yellow sign when there is one 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 to the teams regarding their policy recommendations.

Once the ten minutes of direct questioning have ended, the timekeeper will send the judges to a "breakout session." There, judges will have 5 minutes to score the team's presentation on the scorecards provided, according to the standards outlined below. Competitors will wait in the "main room." Any questions about scoring should be directed to the timekeeper.

Once the scores have been digitally submitted to the timekeeper, the timekeeper will invite the judges to re-enter the main room to provide feedback to the team (up to 15 minutes).

After the 15 minutes of feedback, the timekeeper will end the virtual meeting.

---

[1] See below on page 3

There is no requirement for the structure or format of presentations, and each team must decide how to best conduct their briefing. However, it is advised to use a 'Bottom Line Up Front' (BLUF) style when structuring your briefing:

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.

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.

1. **Understanding of Cyber Policy**

[4 points] The team demonstrated a comprehensive knowledge of cyber policy issues, accurately identified key stakeholders and applicable instruments/levers

[3 points] The team demonstrated a good knowledge of cyber policy issues, identified appropriate stakeholders and instruments/levers

[2 points] The team demonstrated a general understanding of cyber policy but mis-identified some appropriate stakeholders and instruments/levers

[1 point] The team demonstrated a limited knowledge of cyber policy, stakeholders and instruments/levers

2. **Identification of Key Issues**

[4 points] The team successfully identified and fully responded to all the issues posed by the scenario

[3 points] The team identified and responded to the main issues posed by the scenario

[2 points] The team identified some relevant issues posed by the scenario or partially responded to the main issues identified

[1 point] The team referenced general cyber issues not relevant to the scenario or overly focused on a single issue

3. **Policy Response Option - Analysis and Selected Option**

[4 points] The team's policy response options fully addressed the scenario and clearly articulated trade-offs. The optimal solution was proposed

[3 points] The team's policy response options addressed the main elements of the scenario and articulated some trade-offs. A good solution was proposed

[2 point] The team's policy response options addressed some elements of the scenario and / or there was limited articulation of trade-offs. A solution that had some value was proposed

[1 point] The team's suggested responses were overly narrow or only focused on one element of the scenario. The proposed solution was unlikely to be successful

4. Structure and Communication

[4 points] The team presented with a very clear, logical structure to their analysis and options, clearly communicated with the audience and were exemplary (brevity & accuracy) in their responses to questions

[3 points] The team presented with a logical structure to their analysis and options, communicated relatively well with the audience and gave good answers in response to questions

[2 points] The team presented with an occasionally unclear structure to their analysis and options, occasionally struggled to clearly communicate with the audience and / or occasionally gave unclear answers in response to questions

[1 point] The team's presentation of analysis and options lacked structure, hindering effective communication with the audience and gave unclear answers in response to questions

5. Originality and Creativity

[4 points] The team offered highly effective and innovative solutions to the scenario that go beyond existing canonical literature or best practices

[3 points] The team offered effective, creative solutions to the scenario, grounded in current best-practices and literature

[2 points] The team offered partially effective solutions to the scenario with a degree of creativity, drawing upon some superseded best practice

[1 point] The team offered potentially ineffective solutions to the scenario, without creativity or drawing upon superseded best practice.

<u>Decision Document</u>

Teams will be required to submit a Decision Document accompanying their oral presentation the evening before the Challenge.

The decision document will be a prepared form, maximum of **one single-sided page** in length, outlining the team's 2-4 policy response alternatives, decision process, and recommendations. The teams should note that the document is not intended to summarise every detail of the recommendations, but to help the judges follow the oral presentation. The decision document should be clear and concise as the judges will be given only 2 minutes to read the document before the presentation begins. The decision document does not count toward a team's overall score, but the team with the best decision document will receive the "Best Decision Document" team award.

There are no format restrictions on font, size, margins, or style. Graphs, images, tables, and other graphics are permitted, but count toward the one single-sided page limit. Submissions that exceed the maximum page limit will not be accepted. The deadline for submitting the decision document is **5:00 pm Geneva time (CEST) on 9 April 2025.**

<u>Team Awards</u>

Judges will nominate teams for each of the team awards listed below.

   o *<u>Best Oral Presentation</u>* – Judges should nominate teams who show an advanced mastery of the oral briefing.

   o *<u>Best Teamwork</u>* – Judges should nominate teams who show strong collaborative skills and present a cohesive briefing as a team.

   o *<u>Best Decision Document</u>* – Judges should nominate teams who submit a precise and professional decision document that clearly presents the team's recommendations and justifications.

   o *<u>Most Creative Policy Response Alternative</u>* – Judges should nominate teams who show nuanced and plausible policy response alternatives that also show a high degree of creativity and originality.

If there are any questions or problems, please contact the competition organisers at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy on cyber-competition@gcsp.ch.