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Introduction

- To provide resources and concepts that may be used to protect privacy by reducing the probability of incrimination as a result of computer misuse, be it criminal, civil or otherwise.
Clarifications

• What PDTK is
  – A new type of “toolkit” that provides its users with the knowledge and theory to reduce/remove incrimination risk?

• What PDTK is NOT
  – PDTK is not a suite of tools in the classic sense, rather it is a collection of theories and technologies to get its users on the path of deniability

• The PDTK is NOT Anti-forensics
  – However, there ARE (and always will be) some overlaps between the two
  – Some aspects of PDTK are anti-forensic, but for the most part anti-forensics is anti-alibi and may contradict some of PDTK’s goals
Objectives

• Provide methods to the users to reduce the threat of incrimination
• Bring forward technologies for legitimate uses such as protecting activists and whistleblowers that have most likely been used in the underworld for years
• The PDTK will be focused on not providing a fingerprint to investigators. Those components that cannot be hidden will be “legitimized” by having multiple uses so that they do not point directly to the PDTK.
Strategies

- **Data Generation**
  - Generate “evidence” to provide alibi as well as give the appearance of compromise
    - Creating “deleted” files
    - Leaving compromise residue
    - Replicate data that cannot be removed/controlled across multiple systems

- **Data Tampering**
  - Alter data to be less “incriminating”
  - Alter data to be more “incriminating”

- **Tool Injections**
  - Sony Rootkit
  - Roll a sterile backdoor

- **Anti-Forensics arcs and overlaps**

- **Automation/Scripting Tools**
Tools

- Types of Tools
- New Uses for Old tools
- Legitimizing Tools
Types of Tools

- Forensics tools and books alone are bad
- As a security person...
  - Possessing dozens of security books and a few forensics books is normal
  - Having comprehensive security toolkits with forensics tools is normal, e.g. the BackTrack Linux security distro
New Uses for Old Tools

- Use tools that already exist on your system, and learn how they work (hex editors, dd, etc)
- Fsck checks for an inode’s valid parent, so have two inodes point to each other, and store “data” there
  - A forensics exam that does a fsck of the drive looking for orphaned inodes will miss these two
  - It is possible to hide evidence of a rootkit here in case a forensics exam does uncover it
New Uses for Old Tools (cont.)

- Matt Conover’s “Profiling Rootkits and Malware through Executive Objects”
  - Presented at InterZone West and RSA
- Discussed monitoring of system activity to detect the presence of rootkits on Windows systems
- The technique itself could be used to become a (currently) undetectable rootkit
- Do this now, hide it on your system
  - Maybe by the time a forensics examiner looks on your system, common tools will exist to “uncover” it
Legitimizing Tools

• If you have a forensics tool in your possession, you better have a damn good reason for having it there besides covering your ass
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Distribution

- www.nmrc.org/pub/pdtk
  - Tools, links, theories
  - Use privacy measures when visiting
    - i.e. Don’t Google it
    - Onion Routing (Tor)
    - Public (unmonitored) terminals
    - Secure browsing measures

- Alternative/Diverse distribution methods needed
Caveats
Caveats

- Although the primary focus of the PDTK is to provide privacy measures for the oppressed, it does have the potential for misuse
- Presenting yourself as a dumbass is a bad idea when there is plenty of proof stating otherwise
- Don’t overestimate the capabilities of prying eyes and hide ‘evidence’ too well
- If you are already being investigated, it’s too late
Balancing Act

• If you are a Linux security expert, there should be nothing on your Linux box
  – The plausible deniability should exist on your Windows box, to which you are not an expert
• If you are trying to prove that you are innocent due to someone else hacking your box, the techniques used to hack your box should appear to be beyond your skillset
  – The 0day used to root your system by “that other guy” should not be in a dir on your system called cool_0day_nooneelsehas
Real World Examples
Real World Examples

• These are not real world examples of plausible deniability, but real world examples of forensics and their influence on investigations, indictments, and trials
Real World Example #1

- Child porn case, defendant determined to go to trial as he swears innocence
- Defense expert witness finds a remote-access trojan on the Windows system
- Defense asks Prosecution for details on this file including a binary copy etc
- Prosecution drops the case shortly after, having figured out where the Defense was going
Real World Example #1 Learning Points

- Defendant was not a computer security expert
  - If you attend DefCon, this defense won’t work
- Prosecution only goes to trial if it thinks it will win
- Prosecution Forensics Examiner missed the RAT
  - They are overworked, underpaid, with huge backlogs of cases awaiting attention
Real World Example #2

- Another child porn case. Defendant claims innocence. Accused of trading child porn via IRC.
- Defendant claims seeing “black screens with text” at random intervals
- Defendant was determined to be savvy enough to understand that his system was backdoored/trojaned
- The hacker defense did not stick and defendant was found guilty
Real World Example #2 Learning Points

- Don’t claim stupidity beyond believability
- The hacker defense rarely works and is heavily frowned upon by the judicial system
  - Hacker defense is often trumped by proven capability
Real World Example #3

- State Senator under investigation for fraud, etc in Pennsylvania
- Two system admins in Senator’s office, under orders, start deleting every email related to the investigation
- The system admins are indicted because they (obviously) did not get all the email deleted, including the email to each other talking about the cover-up
Real World Example #4

- US vs. Zezov
- Zezov accused of extortion of Michael Bloomberg (now NYC mayor)
- Found flaws in the financial software used by Bloomberg and propositioned to “fix for cash”
- All emails contact was From: Bloomberg To: Bloomberg
- Defense expert found signs of evidence tampering (specifically the most incriminating evidence)
- Defendant was still convicted on strength of other evidence
Real World Example #4 Learning Points

- Politics change all the rules
- Erratic behavior can be very damaging
- Appearance is everything
- Technical evidence is not always enough
Real World Example #3 Learning Points

- PGP Wipe leaves a fingerprint that forensic investigators used to determine exactly when PGP Wipe was being run, and the wiping started after the FBI investigation but before the confiscation.
- Windows squirrels away copies of email all over the place:
  - Exchange server, local folders, Trash folders, etc etc
- While they didn’t get evidence on the Senator, they at least got the admins, and will probably try to throw the book at them.
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Conclusion
Conclusion

- If you control the bits and bytes on your computer, and know how forensics tools work, you can control the direction of a forensics investigation.

- Forensics data could be direct or circumstantial evidence, but there will be other evidence as well:
  - Data from the machine you popped or the IDS you triggered, affidavit from that guy you bragged to in IRC, etc.

- Instead of trying to get out of it, embrace jury duty (learn the system and people).
(No Jewish questions, please)
Links

- www.nmrc.org/pub/pdtk
  - Remember: Visit privately
- tor.eff.org
- Send pictures of Bruce Potter’s crotch to bruce_crotch@nmrc.org