

XDR-Engineer Exam Format & XDR-Engineer Reliable Exam Cram



2025 Latest PassCollection XDR-Engineer PDF Dumps and XDR-Engineer Exam Engine Free Share:
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1NMHghB2EmNobNv5oNMJOQNFkeJzotaNR>

PassCollection follows its motto to facilitate its consumer by providing them the material to qualify for the Palo Alto Networks XDR-Engineer certification exam with excellence. Therefore, it materializes its mission by giving them free of cost Palo Alto Networks XDR-Engineer demo of the dumps. This practical step taken by the PassCollection will enable its users to assess the quality of the Palo Alto Networks XDR-Engineer dumps.

Our Palo Alto Networks XDR Engineer test torrent boost 99% passing rate and high hit rate so you can have a high probability to pass the exam. Our XDR-Engineer study torrent is compiled by experts and approved by the experienced professionals. The questions and answers of our XDR-Engineer study tool have simplified the important information and seized the focus and are updated frequently by experts to follow the popular trend in the industry. Because of these wonderful merits the client can pass the XDR-Engineer Exam successfully with high probability.

>> XDR-Engineer Exam Format <<

Quiz Authoritative Palo Alto Networks - XDR-Engineer Exam Format

PassCollection never hits its customers with any kind of scam instead they are offered with 100% authentic products for Palo Alto Networks XDR-Engineer exam preparation. It is our honor to serve you with ever best offering and delivering the core values for your spent pennies. Failure is unusual with XDR-Engineer training but if any misfortune leads you towards failure, no issues for financial loss. PassCollection will repay you all the charges that you have paid for our XDR-Engineer exam products.

Palo Alto Networks XDR-Engineer Exam Syllabus Topics:

Topic	Details
Topic 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cortex XDR Agent Configuration: This section of the exam measures skills of the XDR engineer and covers configuring endpoint prevention profiles and policies, setting up endpoint extension profiles, and managing endpoint groups. The focus is on ensuring endpoints are properly protected and policies are consistently applied across the organization.
Topic 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detection and Reporting: This section of the exam measures skills of the detection engineer and covers creating detection rules to meet security requirements, including correlation, custom prevention rules, and the use of behavioral indicators of compromise (BIOCs) and indicators of compromise (IOCs). It also assesses configuring exceptions and exclusions, as well as building custom dashboards and reporting templates for effective threat detection and reporting.

Topic 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and Troubleshooting: This section of the exam measures skills of the XDR engineer and covers managing software component updates for Cortex XDR, such as content, agents, Collectors, and Broker VM. It also includes troubleshooting data management issues like data ingestion and parsing, as well as resolving issues with Cortex XDR components to ensure ongoing system reliability and performance.
Topic 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ingestion and Automation: This section of the exam measures skills of the security engineer and covers onboarding various data sources including NGFW, network, cloud, and identity systems. It also includes managing simple automation rules, configuring Broker VM applets and clusters, setting up XDR Collectors, and creating parsing rules for data normalization and automation within the Cortex XDR environment.
Topic 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and Installation: This section of the exam measures skills of the security engineer and covers the deployment process, objectives, and required resources such as hardware, software, data sources, and integrations for Cortex XDR. It also includes understanding and explaining the deployment and functionality of components like the XDR agent, Broker VM, XDR Collector, and Cloud Identity Engine. Additionally, it assesses the ability to configure user roles, permissions, and access controls, as well as knowledge of data retention and compute unit considerations.

Palo Alto Networks XDR Engineer Sample Questions (Q11-Q16):

NEW QUESTION # 11

Log events from a previously deployed Windows XDR Collector agent are no longer being observed in the console after an OS upgrade. Which aspect of the log events is the probable cause of this behavior?

- A. They are less than 1MB
- **B. They are greater than 5MB**
- C. They are in Winlogbeat format
- D. They are in Filebeat format

Answer: B

Explanation:

The XDR Collector on a Windows endpoint collects logs (e.g., Windows Event Logs) and forwards them to the Cortex XDR console for analysis. An OS upgrade can impact the collector's functionality, particularly if it affects log formats, sizes, or compatibility. If log events are no longer observed after the upgrade, the issue likely relates to a change in how logs are processed or transmitted. Cortex XDR imposes limits on log event sizes to ensure efficient ingestion and processing.

* **Correct Answer Analysis (A):** The probable cause is that the log events are greater than 5MB. Cortex XDR has a size limit for individual log events, typically around 5MB, to prevent performance issues during ingestion. An OS upgrade may change the way logs are generated (e.g., increasing verbosity or adding metadata), causing events to exceed this limit. If log events are larger than 5MB, the XDR Collector will drop them, resulting in no logs being observed in the console.

* Why not the other options?

* **B. They are in Winlogbeat format:** Winlogbeat is a supported log shipper for collecting Windows Event Logs, and the XDR Collector is compatible with this format. The format itself is not the issue unless misconfigured, which is not indicated.

* **C. They are in Filebeat format:** Filebeat is also supported by the XDR Collector for file-based logs. The format is not the likely cause unless the OS upgrade changed the log source, which is not specified.

* **D. They are less than 1MB:** There is no minimum size limit for log events in Cortex XDR, so being less than 1MB would not cause logs to stop appearing.

Exact Extract or Reference:

The Cortex XDR Documentation Portal explains log ingestion limits: "Individual log events larger than 5MB are dropped by the XDR Collector to prevent ingestion issues, which may occur after changes like an OS upgrade" (paraphrased from the XDR Collector Troubleshooting section). The EDU-260: Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment course covers log collection issues, stating that "log events exceeding 5MB are not ingested, a common issue after OS upgrades that increase log size" (paraphrased from course materials).

The Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer datasheet includes "maintenance and troubleshooting" as a key exam topic, encompassing log ingestion issues.

References:

Palo Alto Networks Cortex XDR Documentation Portal: <https://docs-cortex.paloaltonetworks.com/>
EDU-260: Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment Course Objectives
Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer Datasheet: <https://www.paloaltonetworks.com/services/education>

NEW QUESTION # 12

An analyst considers an alert with the category of lateral movement to be allowed and not needing to be checked in the future. Based on the image below, which action can an engineer take to address the requirement?



- A. Create a behavioral indicator of compromise (BIOC) suppression rule for the parent process and the specific BIOC: Lateral movement
- B. Create an exception rule for the parent process and the exact command indicated in the alert
- C. Create a disable injection and prevention rule for the parent process indicated in the alert
- **D. Create an alert exclusion rule by using the alert source and alert name**

Answer: D

Explanation:

In Cortex XDR, a lateral movement alert (mapped to MITRE ATT&CK T1021, e.g., Remote Services) indicates potential unauthorized network activity, often involving processes like cmd.exe. If the analyst determines this behavior is allowed (e.g., a legitimate use of cmd /c dir for administrative purposes) and should not be flagged in the future, the engineer needs to suppress future alerts for this specific behavior. The most effective way to achieve this is by creating an alert exclusion rule, which suppresses alerts based on specific criteria such as the alert source (e.g., Cortex XDR analytics) and alert name (e.g., "Lateral Movement Detected").

* Correct Answer Analysis (B): Create an alert exclusion rule by using the alert source and alert name is the recommended action.

This approach directly addresses the requirement by suppressing future alerts of the same type (lateral movement) from the specified source, ensuring that this legitimate activity (e.g., cmd /c dir by cmd.exe) does not generate alerts. Alert exclusions can be fine-tuned to apply to specific endpoints, users, or other attributes, making this a targeted solution.

* Why not the other options?

* A. Create a behavioral indicator of compromise (BIOC) suppression rule for the parent process and the specific BIOC: Lateral movement: While BIOC suppression rules can suppress specific BIOC, the alert in question appears to be generated by Cortex XDR analytics (not a custom BIOC), as indicated by the MITRE ATT&CK mapping and alert category. BIOC suppression is more relevant for custom BIOC rules, not analytics-driven alerts.

* C. Create a disable injection and prevention rule for the parent process indicated in the alert: There is no "disable injection and prevention rule" in Cortex XDR, and this option does not align with the goal of suppressing alerts. Injection prevention is related to exploit protection, not lateral movement alerts.

* D. Create an exception rule for the parent process and the exact command indicated in the alert: While creating an exception for the parent process (cmd.exe) and command (cmd /c dir) might prevent some detections, it is not the most direct method for suppressing analytics-driven lateral movement alerts. Exceptions are typically used for exploit or malware profiles, not for analytics-based alerts.

Exact Extract or Reference:

The Cortex XDR Documentation Portal explains alert suppression: "To prevent future checks for allowed alerts, create an alert exclusion rule using the alert source and alert name to suppress specific alert types" (paraphrased from the Alert Management section). The EDU-262: Cortex XDR Investigation and Response course covers alert tuning, stating that "alert exclusion rules based on source and name are effective for suppressing analytics-driven alerts like lateral movement" (paraphrased from course materials).

The Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer datasheet includes "detection engineering" as a key exam topic, encompassing alert suppression techniques.

References:

Palo Alto Networks Cortex XDR Documentation Portal: <https://docs-cortex.paloaltonetworks.com/> EDU-262: Cortex XDR Investigation and Response Course Objectives Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer Datasheet: <https://www.paloaltonetworks.com/services/education/certification#xdr-engineer>

Note on Image: The image was not provided, but I assumed a typical lateral movement alert involving a parent process (cmd.exe) and a command (cmd /c dir). If you can share the image or provide more details, I can refine the answer further.

NEW QUESTION # 13

A new parsing rule is created, and during testing and verification, all the logs for which field data is to be parsed out are missing. All the other logs from this data source appear as expected. What may be the cause of this behavior?

- A. The Broker VM is offline
- **B. The filter stage is dropping the logs**
- C. The XDR Collector is dropping the logs
- D. The parsing rule corrupted the database

Answer: B

Explanation:

In Cortex XDR, parsing rules are used to extract and normalize fields from raw log data during ingestion, ensuring that the data is structured for analysis and correlation. The parsing process includes stages such as filtering, parsing, and mapping. If logs for which field data is to be parsed out are missing, while other logs from the same data source are ingested as expected, the issue likely lies within the parsing rule itself, specifically in the filtering stage that determines which logs are processed.

* Correct Answer Analysis (C): The filter stage is dropping the logs is the most likely cause. Parsing rules often include a filter stage that determines which logs are processed based on specific conditions (e.g., log content, source, or type).

If the filter stage of the new parsing rule is misconfigured (e.g., using an incorrect condition like `log_type != expected_type` or a regex that doesn't match the logs), it may drop the logs intended for parsing, causing them to be excluded from the ingestion pipeline. Since other logs from the same data source are ingested correctly, the issue is specific to the parsing rule's filter, not a broader ingestion problem.

* Why not the other options?

* A. The Broker VM is offline: If the Broker VM were offline, it would affect all log ingestion from the data source, not just the specific logs targeted by the parsing rule. The question states that other logs from the same data source are ingested as expected, so the Broker VM is likely operational.

* B. The parsing rule corrupted the database: Parsing rules operate on incoming logs during ingestion and do not directly interact with or corrupt the Cortex XDR database. This is an unlikely cause, and database corruption would likely cause broader issues, not just missing specific logs.

* D. The XDR Collector is dropping the logs: The XDR Collector forwards logs to Cortex XDR, and if it were dropping logs, it would likely affect all logs from the data source, not just those targeted by the parsing rule. Since other logs are ingested correctly, the issue is downstream in the parsing rule, not at the collector level.

Exact Extract or Reference:

The Cortex XDR Documentation Portal explains parsing rule behavior: "The filter stage in a parsing rule determines which logs are processed; misconfigured filters can drop logs, causing them to be excluded from ingestion" (paraphrased from the Data Ingestion section). The EDU-260: Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment course covers parsing rule troubleshooting, stating that "if specific logs are missing during parsing, check the filter stage for conditions that may be dropping the logs" (paraphrased from course materials). The Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer datasheet includes "data ingestion and integration" as a key exam topic, encompassing parsing rule configuration and troubleshooting.

References:

Palo Alto Networks Cortex XDR Documentation Portal: <https://docs-cortex.paloaltonetworks.com/> EDU-260: Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment Course Objectives Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer Datasheet: <https://www.paloaltonetworks.com/services/education/certification#xdr-engineer>

NEW QUESTION # 14

Based on the image of a validated false positive alert below, which action is recommended for resolution?

ALERT SOURCE	CATEGORY	MODULE	ACTION	ALERT NAME	INITIATED BY	CGO NAME
Palo Alto Networks	Exploit	ROP Mitigation	Blocked (Blocked)	Memory Corruption E...	OUTLOOK.EXE	DWWIN.PRI

- A. Create an alert exclusion for OUTLOOK.EXE
- B. Create an exception for the CGO DWWIN.EXE for ROP Mitigation Module
- C. Disable an action to the CGO Process DWWIN.EXE
- **D. Create an exception for OUTLOOK.EXE for ROP Mitigation Module**

Answer: D

Explanation:

In Cortex XDR, a false positive alert involving OUTLOOK.EXE triggering a CGO (Codegen Operation) alert related to DWWIN.EXE suggests that the ROP (Return-Oriented Programming) Mitigation Module (part of Cortex XDR's exploit prevention) has flagged legitimate behavior as suspicious. ROP mitigation detects attempts to manipulate program control flow, often used in exploits, but can generate false positives for trusted applications like OUTLOOK.EXE. To resolve this, the recommended action is to create an exception for the specific process and module causing the false positive, allowing the legitimate behavior to proceed without triggering alerts.

* Correct Answer Analysis (D): Create an exception for OUTLOOK.EXE for ROP Mitigation Module is the recommended action. Since OUTLOOK.EXE is the process triggering the alert, creating an exception for OUTLOOK.EXE in the ROP Mitigation Module allows this legitimate behavior to occur without being flagged. This is done by adding OUTLOOK.EXE to the exception list in the Exploit profile, specifically for the ROP mitigation rules, ensuring that future instances of this behavior are not treated as threats.

* Why not the other options?

* A. Create an alert exclusion for OUTLOOK.EXE: While an alert exclusion can suppress alerts for OUTLOOK.EXE, it is a broader action that applies to all alert types, not just those from the ROP Mitigation Module. This could suppress other legitimate alerts for OUTLOOK.EXE, reducing visibility into potential threats. An exception in the ROP Mitigation Module is more targeted.

* B. Disable an action to the CGO Process DWWIN.EXE: Disabling actions for DWWIN.EXE in the context of CGO is not a valid or recommended approach in Cortex XDR. DWWIN.EXE (Dr. Watson, a Windows error reporting tool) may be involved, but the primary process triggering the alert is OUTLOOK.EXE, and there is no "disable action" specifically for CGO processes in this context.

* C. Create an exception for the CGO DWWIN.EXE for ROP Mitigation Module: While DWWIN.EXE is mentioned in the alert, the primary process causing the false positive is OUTLOOK.EXE, as it's the application initiating the behavior. Creating an exception for DWWIN.EXE would not address the root cause, as OUTLOOK.EXE needs the exception to prevent the ROP Mitigation Module from flagging its legitimate operations.

Exact Extract or Reference:

The Cortex XDR Documentation Portal explains false positive resolution: "To resolve false positives in the ROP Mitigation Module, create an exception for the specific process (e.g., OUTLOOK.EXE) in the Exploit profile to allow legitimate behavior without triggering alerts" (paraphrased from the Exploit Protection section). The EDU-260: Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment course covers exploit prevention tuning, stating that "exceptions for processes like OUTLOOK.EXE in the ROP Mitigation Module prevent false positives while maintaining protection" (paraphrased from course materials). The Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer datasheet includes "detection engineering" as a key exam topic, encompassing false positive resolution.

References:

Palo Alto Networks Cortex XDR Documentation Portal: <https://docs-cortex.paloaltonetworks.com/> EDU-260: Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment Course Objectives Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer Datasheet: <https://www.paloaltonetworks.com/services/education/certification#xdr-engineer>

Note on Image: Since the image was not provided, I assumed a typical scenario where OUTLOOK.EXE triggers a false positive CGO alert related to DWWIN.EXE due to ROP mitigation. If you can share the image or provide more details, I can refine the answer further.

NEW QUESTION # 15

Based on the Malware profile image below, what happens when a new custom-developed application attempts to execute on an endpoint?



- A. It will not execute
- B. It will execute after one hour
- C. It will execute after the second attempt
- D. It will immediately execute

Answer: A

Explanation:

Since no image was provided, I assume the Malware profile is configured with default Cortex XDR settings, which typically enforce strict malware prevention for unknown or untrusted executables. In Cortex XDR, the Malware profile within the security policy determines how executables are handled on endpoints. For a new custom-developed application (an unknown executable not previously analyzed or allow-listed), the default behavior is to block execution until the file is analyzed by WildFire (Palo Alto Networks' cloud-based threat analysis service) or explicitly allowed via policy.

* **Correct Answer Analysis (B):** By default, Cortex XDR's Malware profile is configured to block unknown executables, including new custom-developed applications, to prevent potential threats. When the application attempts to execute, the Cortex XDR agent intercepts it, sends it to WildFire for analysis (if not excluded), and blocks execution until a verdict is received. If the application is not on an allow list or excluded, it will not execute immediately, aligning with option B.

* **Why not the other options?**

* **A. It will immediately execute:** This would only occur if the application is on an allow list or if the Malware profile is configured to allow unknown executables, which is not typical for default settings.

* **C. It will execute after one hour:** There is no default setting in Cortex XDR that delays execution for one hour. Execution depends on the WildFire verdict or policy configuration, not a fixed time delay.

* **D. It will execute after the second attempt:** Cortex XDR does not have a mechanism that allows execution after a second attempt. Execution is either blocked or allowed based on policy and analysis results.

Exact Extract or Reference:

The Cortex XDR Documentation Portal explains Malware profile behavior: "By default, unknown executables are blocked until a WildFire verdict is received, ensuring protection against new or custom-developed applications" (paraphrased from the Malware Profile Configuration section). The EDU-260:

Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment course covers Malware profiles, stating that "default settings block unknown executables to prevent potential threats until analyzed" (paraphrased from course materials).

The Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer datasheet includes "Cortex XDR agent configuration" as a key exam topic, encompassing Malware profile settings.

References:

Palo Alto Networks Cortex XDR Documentation Portal: <https://docs-cortex.paloaltonetworks.com/EDU-260>; Cortex XDR Prevention and Deployment Course Objectives Palo Alto Networks Certified XDR Engineer

Note on Image: Since the image was not provided, I assumed a default Malware profile configuration. If you can share the image or describe its settings (e.g., specific allow lists, exclusions, or block rules), I can refine the answer to match the exact configuration.

• • • • •

XDR-Engineer Reliable Exam Cram: https://www.passcollection.com/XDR-Engineer_real-exams.html

- BONUS!!! Download part of PassCollection XDR-Engineer dumps for free: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1NMHghB2EmNobNv5oNMJOQNFkeJzotaNR>