

Unique, Full Length Exams - New Google Security-Operations-Engineer Practice Exam



2026 Latest PassSureExam Security-Operations-Engineer PDF Dumps and Security-Operations-Engineer Exam Engine Free Share: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1f72VX2EsMNK-oTuRh5Uk_kLC8KgHZ3Fe

Sharp tools make good work. Security-Operations-Engineer study material is the best weapon to help you pass the exam. After a survey of the users as many as 99% of the customers who purchased Security-Operations-Engineer study material has successfully passed the exam. The pass rate is the test of a material. Such a high pass rate is sufficient to prove that Security-Operations-Engineer Study Material has a high quality. In order to reflect our sincerity on consumers and the trust of more consumers, we provide a 100% pass rate guarantee for all customers who have purchased Security-Operations-Engineer study materials.

Setting Up for Professional Presentations, So as you see, we are the corporation with ethical code and willing to build mutual trust between our customers, Latest Security-Operations-Engineer dumps exam training resources in PDF format download free try from Google Cloud Certified - Professional Security Operations Engineer (PSOE) Exam Security-Operations-Engineer is the name of Google Cloud Certified - Professional Security Operations Engineer (PSOE) Exam exam dumps which covers all the knowledge points of the real Google Cloud Certified - Professional Security Operations Engineer (PSOE) Exam exam. We will try our best to help our customers get the latest information about study materials, Choosing our Security-Operations-Engineer Exam Torrent is not an end, we are considerate company aiming to make perfect in every aspect. In order to give you a basic understanding Security-Operations-Engineer our various versions, each version offers a free trial, The successful endeavor of any kind of exam not only hinges on the Security-Operations-Engineer effort the exam candidates paid, but the quality of practice materials' usefulness.

>> Security-Operations-Engineer Free Practice <<

Reliable Security-Operations-Engineer Braindumps Pdf - Security-Operations-Engineer Test Questions

As far as the price of Google Security-Operations-Engineer exam practice test questions is concerned, these exam practice test questions are being offered at a discounted price. Get benefits from Google Security-Operations-Engineer exam questions at discounted prices and download them quickly. Best of luck in Security-Operations-Engineer Exam and career!!! Just choose the best Security-Operations-Engineer exam questions format and start Google Security-Operations-Engineer exam preparation without wasting further time.

Google Security-Operations-Engineer Exam Syllabus Topics:

Topic	Details

Topic 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat Hunting: This section of the exam measures the skills of Cyber Threat Hunters and emphasizes proactive identification of threats across cloud and hybrid environments. It tests the ability to create and execute advanced queries, analyze user and network behaviors, and develop hypotheses based on incident data and threat intelligence. Candidates are expected to leverage Google Cloud tools like BigQuery, Logs Explorer, and Google SecOps to discover indicators of compromise (IOCs) and collaborate with incident response teams to uncover hidden or ongoing attacks.
Topic 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Platform Operations: This section of the exam measures the skills of Cloud Security Engineers and covers the configuration and management of security platforms in enterprise environments. It focuses on integrating and optimizing tools such as Security Command Center (SCC), Google SecOps, GTI, and Cloud IDS to improve detection and response capabilities. Candidates are assessed on their ability to configure authentication, authorization, and API access, manage audit logs, and provision identities using Workforce Identity Federation to enhance access control and visibility across cloud systems.
Topic 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detection Engineering: This section of the exam measures the skills of Detection Engineers and focuses on developing and fine-tuning detection mechanisms for risk identification. It involves designing and implementing detection rules, assigning risk values, and leveraging tools like Google SecOps Risk Analytics and SCC for posture management. Candidates learn to utilize threat intelligence for alert scoring, reduce false positives, and improve rule accuracy by integrating contextual and entity-based data, ensuring strong coverage against potential threats.

Google Cloud Certified - Professional Security Operations Engineer (PSOE) Exam Sample Questions (Q17-Q22):

NEW QUESTION # 17

You are managing the integration of Security Command Center (SCC) with downstream tooling.

You need to pull security findings from SCC and import those findings as part of Google Security Operations (SecOps) SOAR actions. You need to configure the connection between SCC and Google SecOps. What should you do?

- A. Create a Pub/Sub topic with a NotificationConfig object and a push subscription for the desired finding types. Grant the Google SecOps service account the appropriate IAM roles to read from this subscription.
- **B. Install the SCC integration from the Google SecOps Marketplace. Grant the SCC API the appropriate IAM roles to integrate with the Google SecOps instance. Configure this integration using a generated API key scoped to the SCC API.**
- C. Install the Google Rapid Response integration from the Google SecOps Marketplace. Gather information about the findings from the appropriate server.
- D. Create a Pub/Sub topic with a NotificationConfig object and a push subscription for the desired finding types. Create a new Google SecOps service account in the Google Cloud project, and grant this service account the appropriate IAM roles to read from this subscription. Export the credentials from IAM and import the credentials into Google SecOps SOAR.

Answer: B

Explanation:

The proper way to integrate SCC findings into Google SecOps SOAR is to install the SCC integration from the Google SecOps Marketplace. You must grant the SCC API the appropriate IAM roles so that Google SecOps can access the findings, and configure the integration using a generated API key scoped to the SCC API. This approach provides a managed, secure, and supported method for importing SCC findings into SecOps actions.

NEW QUESTION # 18

You are responsible for identifying suspicious activity and security events in your organization's environment.

You discover that some detection rules are generating false positives when the principal.ip field contains one or more IP addresses in the 192.168.2.0/24 subnet. You want to improve these detection rules using the principal.ip repeated field. What should you add to the YARA-L detection rules?

- A. net.ip_in_range_cidr(all \$e.principal.ip, "192.168.2.0/24")
- **B. not net.ip_in_range_cidr(any \$e.principal.ip, "192.168.2.0/24")**
- C. not net.ip_in_range_cidr(all \$e.principal.ip, "192.168.2.0/24")
- D. net.ip_in_range_cidr(any \$e.principal.ip, "192.168.2.0/24")

Answer: B

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed Explanation

The correct solution is Option D. The goal is to exclude events (i.e., stop false positives) when the principal ip field contains any IP from the trusted 192.168.2.0/24 subnet.

The principal.ip field in UDM is a repeated field, meaning it can hold an array of values (e.g., ["1.2.3.4", "192.168.2.5"]). YARA-L provides the any and all quantifiers to handle repeated fields.⁹

* any \$e.principal.ip: This checks if at least one IP in the array meets the condition.

* all \$e.principal.ip: This checks if every IP in the array meets the condition.

The function net.ip_in_range_cidr(...) returns true if an IP is in the specified range.

Therefore, the logic we need is: "do not trigger this rule if any of the IPs in the principal.ip field are in the 192.168.2.0/24 range."

This translates directly to the YARA-L syntax: not net.ip_in_range_cidr(any \$e.principal.ip, "192.168.2.0/24")

* Option B would only find events from that subnet.

* Option A would only find events where all associated IPs are in that subnet.

* Option C is the logical inverse of A and would incorrectly filter out events that might be malicious (e.g., ["1.2.3.4", "192.168.2.5"] would not be excluded because all IPs are not in the range).

Exact Extract from Google Security Operations Documents:

YARA-L 2.0 language syntax > Repeated fields and boolean expressions: When a boolean expression, such as a function call, is applied to a repeated field, you can use the any or all keywords to specify how the expression should be evaluated.¹⁰

* any <repeated_field>: The expression evaluates to true if it is true for at least one of the values in the repeated field.

* all <repeated_field>: The expression evaluates to true only if it is true for all of the values in the repeated field.

Functions > net.ip_in_range_cidr: The net.ip_in_range_cidr function is useful to bind rules to specific parts of the network.¹¹ To exclude all private netblocks as defined in RFC1918, you can add a not to the start of the criteria:

and not (net.ip_in_range_cidr(any \$e.principal.ip, "10.0.0.0/8") or net.ip_in_range_cidr(any \$e.principal.ip, "172.16.0.0/12") or net.ip_in_range_cidr(any \$e.principal.ip, "192.168.0.0/16"))

References:

Google Cloud Documentation: Google Security Operations > Documentation > Detections > YARA-L 2.0 language syntax

Google Cloud Documentation: Google Security Operations > Documentation > Detections > YARA-L 2.0 functions > net.ip_in_range_cidr

NEW QUESTION # 19

A Google Security Operations (SecOps) detection rule is generating frequent false positive alerts. The rule was designed to detect suspicious Cloud Storage enumeration by triggering an alert whenever the storage.

objects.list API operation is called using the api.operation UDM field. However, a legitimate backup automation tool that uses the same API, causing the rule to fire unnecessarily. You need to reduce these false positives from this trusted backup tool while still detecting potentially malicious usage. How should you modify the rule to improve its accuracy?

- A. Adjust the rule severity to low to deprioritize alerts from automation tools.
- B. Convert the rule into a multi-event rule that looks for repeated API calls across multiple buckets.
- C. Add principal.user.email != "backup-bot@fcobaa.com" to the rule condition to exclude the automation account.
- D. Replace api.operation with api.service_name = "storage.googleapis.com" to narrow the detection scope.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed Explanation

The correct solution is Option D. The problem is that a known, trusted principal (the backup tool's service account) is performing a legitimate action (storage.objects.list) that happens to look like the suspicious behavior the rule is designed to catch.

The most precise and effective way to reduce these false positives without weakening the rule's ability to catch malicious actors is to create an exception for the trusted principal.

By adding principal.user.email != "backup-bot@fcobaa.com" (or the equivalent principal.user.userid) to the events or condition section of the YARA-L rule, the rule will now only evaluate events where the actor is not the known-good backup bot.

* Option A is incorrect because it just lowers the priority of the false positive; it doesn't stop it from being generated.

* Option B is incorrect because the legitimate tool might also perform repeated calls, leading to the same false positive.

* Option C is incorrect because api.service_name = "storage.googleapis.com" is less specific than api.

operation = "storage.objects.list" and would likely increase the number of false positives by triggering on any storage API call.

Exact Extract from Google Security Operations Documents:

Reduce false positives: When a detection rule generates false positives due to known-benign activity (e.g., from an administrative script or automation tool), the best practice is to add a not condition to the rule to exclude the trusted entity.⁸ You can filter on UDM fields to create exceptions. For example, to prevent a rule from firing on activity from a specific service account, you can add

a condition to the events section such as:

and `$e.principal.userid != "trusted-service-account@project.iam.gserviceaccount.com"` This technique, often called "allow-listing" or "suppression," improves the rule's accuracy by focusing only on unknown or untrusted principals.

References:

Google Cloud Documentation: Google Security Operations > Documentation > Detections > Overview of the YARA-L 2.0 language > Add not conditions to prevent false positives

NEW QUESTION # 20

You scheduled a Google Security Operations (SecOps) report to export results to a BigQuery dataset in your Google Cloud project. The report executes successfully in Google SecOps, but no data appears in the dataset.

You confirmed that the dataset exists. How should you address this export failure?

- A. Grant the user account that scheduled the report the roles/bigquery.dataEditor IAM role on the project.
- **B. Grant the Google SecOps service account the roles/bigquery.dataEditor IAM role on the dataset.**
- C. Grant the Google SecOps service account the roles/iam.serviceAccountUser IAM role to itself.
- D. Set a retention period for the BigQuery export.

Answer: B

Explanation:

This is a standard Identity and Access Management (IAM) permission issue. When Google Security Operations (SecOps) exports data, it uses its own service account (often named service-

<project_number>@gcp-sa-bigquerydatatransfer.iam.gserviceaccount.com or a similar SecOps-specific principal) to perform the write operation. The user account that schedules the report (Option C) is only relevant for the scheduling action, not for the data transfer itself. For the export to succeed, the Google SecOps service account principal must have explicit permission to write data into the target BigQuery dataset.

The predefined IAM role roles/bigquery.dataEditor grants the necessary permissions to create, update, and delete tables and table data within a dataset. By granting this role to the Google SecOps service account on the specific dataset, you authorize the service to write the report results and populate the tables. Option A (serviceAccountUser) is incorrect as it's used for service account impersonation, not for granting data access.

Option B (retention period) is a data lifecycle setting and has no impact on the ability to write new data. The most common cause for this exact scenario—a successful job run with no data appearing—is that the service account lacks the required bigquery.dataEditor permissions on the destination dataset.

(Reference: Google Cloud documentation, "Troubleshoot transfer configurations"; "Control access to resources with IAM"; "BigQuery predefined IAM roles")

NEW QUESTION # 21

Your organization is conducting a penetration test. The CISO has asked you to implement a real-time method to track cases that originate from the penetration test, and clearly differentiate these cases from other security incidents. You need to recommend the most effective and efficient approach to achieve this goal in Google Security Operations (SecOps). What should you do?

- A. Create a dashboard that is connected to the Google SecOps data lake. Use pre-built templates to visualize case status based on the penetration testing IP address range.
- B. Configure a custom alert rule that triggers a high-severity alert for all activity originating from the penetration testing team's source IP addresses and sends a notification for potential critical vulnerabilities. Verify that these alerts are immediately visible in the alert queue.
- **C. Implement case tagging within Google SecOps and apply a unique tag (e.g., PenTest) to all cases related to the penetration test entities. Use this tag for filtering and monitoring.**
- D. Create a custom Google SecOps SOAR playbook that automatically extracts case metadata, including key findings and risk scores, and sends an email summary to the CISO.

Answer: C

Explanation:

The most effective and efficient way is to implement case tagging in Google SecOps and apply a unique tag (e.g., "PenTest") to all cases tied to penetration test activity. Tags allow easy filtering, monitoring, and reporting, ensuring penetration test cases are clearly distinguished from real security incidents without requiring custom dashboards or additional playbooks.

