

Reproducibility of Digital Evidence in Forensic Investigations

By Lei Pan and Lynn Batten

Presented At

The Digital Forensic Research Conference **DFRWS 2005 USA** New Orleans, LA (Aug 17th - 19th)

DFRWS is dedicated to the sharing of knowledge and ideas about digital forensics research. Ever since it organized the first open workshop devoted to digital forensics in 2001, DFRWS continues to bring academics and practitioners together in an informal environment. As a non-profit, volunteer organization, DFRWS sponsors technical working groups, annual conferences and challenges to help drive the direction of research and development.

http:/dfrws.org

Reproducibility of Digital Evidence in Forensic Investigations

•

Lei Pan and Lynn M. Batten

{ln,lmbatten}@deakin.edu.au

School of IT, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia

August 19, 2005

DFRWS, New Orleans, LA, 2005 - p. 1/21

Content of this Talk

Introduction

- Reproducibility
- Existing forensic system models
- Our new model
- A forensic investigation example
- Analysis of example cases
- Conclusions

Introduction

Digital investigation is to use "scientifically derived and proven methods toward the preservation, collection, validation, identification, analysis, interpretation, documentation and presentation of digital evidence... " (Palmer, 2001)

Reproducibility

- Reproducibility is the ability to achieve a consistent level of quality throughout the process, no matter how many times it is repeated under the same conditions.
- "Reproducibility of experimental notions allows to express and to test experimentally falsifiable hypotheses concerning the equality and repetition of the corresponding result values."

(http://en.wikipedia.org/)

About Abstraction Layers

- Abstraction layers can be introduced to cluster similar things together.
- Abstraction layers can be introduced in all forms of digital data, and also in the tools and systems used to store or transmit them.

The Hadley Model

- The Hadley model defines input as writing data and output as reading data.
- "All input and output is the translation and transport of data." (Gerber and Leeson, 2004)
- Each layer represents a physical location of data.

Carrier's Model (Carrier, 2003)



- Each layer represents a set of formats of digital sequences.
- Abstraction layers are chosen according to the different situations and requirements.

Time-stamps

- Hosmer (Hosmer, 2002) recognizes the importance of the time synchronization between digital entities in a digital investigation.
- Ideally, secure auditable time stamps assure accuracy, authentication, integrity, non-repudiation and accountability.

A New Model

- 1. Setting up abstraction layers
- 2. Assigning 'read' and 'write' operations
- 3. Time-stamping all operations

Setting up Abstraction Layers

We use:

- the same structure of single layer as Carrier does.
- four key points to establish abstraction layers in a system (similar to Gerber and Leeson's).
 - a) Create a layer only when necessary.
 - b) Each layer represents a location or function.
 - c) Each layer represents existing components based on input-output.
 - d) The number of layers should be carefully chosen.

Assigning Operations

- A 'read' operation is denoted pictorially as an arrow starting from the layer in which the digital sequence resides and pointing towards the layer to which the content of the sequence is extracted.
- A 'write' operation is represented as an arrow starting from the layer upon which the digital sequence resides and pointing to the layer on which the sequence is finally stored.

Time-stamping

- Trusted time-stamps are obtained, recorded and applied during the entire investigative process.
- A 'read' operation is time-stamped at the beginning of a command to read information; a 'write' operation is time-stamped at the conclusion of the 'write' operation.
- If a 'read' fails to start due to data synchronization, then we delay it until the 'write' finishes.

Situations Affecting Reproducibility

- Write-After-Read (WAR) means a 'write' operation changes the content in what we 'read' before.
- Write-After-Write (WAW) operation happens after a previous 'write' operation. So the content of the previous write is erased.

A Digital Investigative Example

- Target: Linux 2.6 host named pie with an IDE drive (with two ext2 partitions) and a CD-RW
- Software Tools: cfdisk, lsof, dd, nc, mkisofs, cdrecord
- Environment: LAN connection and a file server bee
- Task: Collecting evidence from the hard disk of pie

Disk Usage Information

Suspicious files are identified at /home/tunna/.pic/hidden/. The disk usage information is displayed by executing cfdisk.

- Filesystem Used Available Use% Mounted /dev/hda1 3810876 5314868 42% / /dev/hda2 26041508 36914748 42% /home
- An additional requirement is that we are not allowed to power off the target host.

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda2 of=/home/image.dd bs=1024 \ count=26041508

This naïve approach attempts to image the first 26 million blocks (of size 1KB) of the 2nd partition of the target disk.

۲

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda2 of=/home/image.dd bs=1024 \setminus count=26041508

Application Program

File System Layer

Media Management Layer



۲

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda2 of=/home/image.dd bs=1024 \setminus count=26041508

Application Program dd (2) File System Layer (1) /home/image.dd (2) Media Management Layer /dev/hda2

WAR on the 2nd partition.

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda2 of=/tmp/image1.dd bs=1024 \setminus

count=700000; mkisofs -o /tmp/image1.iso /tmp/image.dd; \

cdrecord -v speed=4 dev=0,0,0 -data /tmp/image1.iso

This is to convert disk image file into iso image and then to burn it on the CD.

۲

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda2 of=/tmp/image1.dd bs=1024 \
count=700000; mkisofs -o /tmp/image1.iso /tmp/image.dd; \
cdrecord -v speed=4 dev=0,0,0 -data /tmp/image1.iso



۲

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda2 of=/tmp/image1.dd bs=1024 \
count=700000; mkisofs -o /tmp/image1.iso /tmp/image.dd; \
cdrecord -v speed=4 dev=0,0,0 -data /tmp/image1.iso

WAW on the hard drive and its 1st partition.

jo@bee \$> nc -I -p 1234 > /mnt/hdb1/hda.dd

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda I nc bee 1234

This uses the netcat program to transfer the disk image across the LAN, where bee is a trusted file server.

۲

۲

jo@bee \$> nc -l -p 1234 > /mnt/hdb1/hda.dd

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda I nc bee 1234

jo@bee \$> nc -I -p 1234 > /mnt/hdb1/hda.dd

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda I nc bee 1234

The Linux kernel blocks 'read' operations on pipes and nc blocks 'read' operations on port 1234 until 'writes' are done. Therefore, 'reads' finish after 'writes'.

۲

۲

jo@bee \$> nc -I -p 1234 > /mnt/hdb1/hda.dd

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda I nc bee 1234

۲

jo@bee \$> nc -I -p 1234 > /mnt/hdb1/hda.dd

pie #> dd if=/dev/hda I nc bee 1234

No WAR, nor WAW.

Analysis of the Example

- Carrier's model only supports a single program's behavior.
- The Hadley model couldn't distinguish the legitimate actions from the inappropriate ones with respect to reproducibility.

Conclusions

- Our model is generic, well-scaled and highly compatible with all functions what current digital systems provide.
- The results of the example cases highlight the importance of the order of operations to the reproducibility of the investigation process.

References

- Carrier, B. (2003). Defining Digital Forensic Examination and Analysis Tools Using Abstraction Layers. *International Journal of Digital Evidence*, 1.
- Gerber, M. and Leeson, J. (2004). Formalization of computer input and output: the Hadley model. *Digital Investigation*, 1:214 224.
- Hosmer, C. (2002). Proving the Integrity of Digital Evidence with Time. *International Journal of Digital Evidence*, 1.
- Palmer, G. (2001). A Road Map for Digital Forensic Research. Technical Report DTR T0010 -01, Digital Forensic Research Workshop.