

Reasoning About a Simulated Printer Case Investigation with Forensic Lucid

Serguei A. Mokhov Joey Paquet Mourad Debbabi
Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science
Concordia University, Montréal, Québec, Canada,
{mokhov,paquet,debbabi}@encs.concordia.ca

Abstract

In this work we model the ACME (a fictitious company name) “printer case incident” and make its specification in Forensic Lucid, a Lucid- and intensional-logic-based programming language for cyberforensic analysis and event reconstruction specification. The printer case involves a dispute between two parties that was previously solved using the finite-state automata (FSA) approach, and is now re-done in a more usable way in Forensic Lucid. Our simulation is based on the said case modeling by encoding concepts like evidence and the related witness accounts as an evidential statement context in a Forensic Lucid program, which is an input to the transition function that models the possible deductions in the case. We then invoke the transition function (actually its reverse) with the evidential statement context to see if the evidence we encoded agrees with one’s claims and then attempt to reconstruct the sequence of events that may explain the claim or disprove it.

Keywords: cybercrime investigation modeling, intensional logic and programming, cyberforensics, Forensic Lucid, finite-state automata

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Problem Statement	2
1.2	Proposed Solution	2
1.2.1	Intensional Logic	2
1.2.2	Approach Overview	3
2	Background and Related Work	3
2.1	Intensional Logic and Programming	3
2.2	Lucid Overview	4
2.3	Forensic Lucid	5
2.3.1	Language Characteristics	6
2.3.2	Context of Evaluation	6
2.3.3	Transition Function	8
2.3.4	Generic Observation Sequences	9
2.3.5	Primitive Operators	9
2.3.6	Forensic Operators	9
3	Modeling Printer Case in Forensic Lucid	10
3.1	ACME Manufacturing Printing Case	10
3.2	Sample Forensic Lucid Specification	11
4	Conclusion	13

5 Future Work**15****List of Figures**

1	1D Example of Tag-Value Contextual Pairs	4
2	2D Example of Tag-Value Contextual Pairs	4
3	Handling Duration of an Observed Property in the Context	8

Listings

1	Intensional Storyboard Expression	7
2	Observation Sequence With Duration	7
3	The <code>combine</code> Operator	9
4	The <code>product</code> Operator	10
5	Developing the Pinter Case: “main”	12
6	“Transition Function” ψ in Forensic Lucid for the ACME Printing Case	13
7	“Inverse Transition Function” Ψ^{-1} in Forensic Lucid for the ACME Printing Case	14

1 Introduction**1.1 Problem Statement**

The very first formal approach to cyberforensic analysis and event reconstruction appeared in two papers [7, 6] by Gladyshev et al. that relies on the finite-state automata (FSA) and their transformation and operation to model evidence, witnesses, stories told by witnesses, and their possible evaluation for the purposes of claim validation and event reconstruction. One of the examples the papers present is the use-case for the proposed technique – the “ACME Printer Case Investigation”. See [7] for the corresponding formalization using the FSA by Gladyshev and the proof-of-concept LISP implementation. We aim at the same case to model and implement it using Forensic Lucid, which paves a way to be more friendly and usable in the actual investigator’s work and serve as a basis to further development in the area.

1.2 Proposed Solution

We show the intensional approach to the problem is an asset in the field of cyberforensics as it is promising to be more practical and usable than the plain FSA and LISP. Since Lucid was originally designed and used to prove correctness of programming languages [2, 3, 30, 1], and is based on the temporal logic, functional and data-flow languages its implementation to backtracking in proving or disproving the evidential statements and claims in the investigation process as a evaluation of an expression that either evaluates to *true* or *false* given all the facts in the formally specified context. We will also try to retain the generality of the approach vs. building a problem-specific FSA in the FSA approach that can suffer a state explosion problem.

1.2.1 Intensional Logic

From the logic perspective, it was shown one can model computations (the basic unit in the finite state machines in [7, 6]) as logic [10]. When armed with contexts as first-class values and

a demand-driven model adopted in the implementation of the Lucid-family of languages [25, 23, 22, 32, 26, 27] that limits the scope of evaluation in a given set of that constrains the scope of evaluation in a given set of dimensions, we come to the intensional logic and the corresponding programming artifact. In the essence, we model our forensic computation unit in the intensional logic and implement it in practice within an intensional programming platform [24, 25, 12]. We project a lot of potential for this work to be successful, beneficial, and usable for cyberforensics investigation as well as simulation and intensional programming communities.

1.2.2 Approach Overview

Based on the parameters and terms defined in the works of Gladyshev [7, 6], we have various pieces of evidence and witnesses telling their own “stories” of an incident. The goal is to put them together to make the description of the incident as precise as possible. To show that a certain claim may be true, the investigator has to show that there are some explanations of evidence that agree with the claim. To disprove the claim, the investigator has to show there is no explanation of evidence that agree with the claim [7].

The authors of the FSA approach did a proof-of-concept implementation of the proposed algorithms in CMU Common LISP [7] that we target to improve the usability of by re-writing it in a Lucid dialect, that we call Forensic Lucid (with a near-future possibility to construct a data-flow graph-based [5, 20] IDE for the investigator to use and train novice investigators as an expert system).

In this particular work we focus on the specification of the mentioned sample investigation case in Forensic Lucid while illustrating relates fundamental concepts, operators, and application of context-oriented case modeling and evaluation. Common LISP, unlike Lucid, entirely lacks contexts build into its logic, syntax, and semantics, thereby making the implementation of the cases more clumsy and inefficient (i.e. highly sequential). Our system [24, 25, 22, 12, 9] (not discussed here) offers distributed demand-driven evaluation of Lucid programs in a more efficient way and is more general than LISP’s compiler and run-time environment.

2 Background and Related Work

To remain stand-alone and self-sufficient in this work we recite some material in part that we extend from, or, deemed otherwise relevant works, such as previously presented posters, works-in-progress, and conference papers [15, 19, 16, 18, 17, 13] and other related cited works for the benefit of the readers.

2.1 Intensional Logic and Programming

Definitions Intensional programming is based on intensional (or, in other words, multidimensional) logics, which, in turn, are based on Natural Language Understanding (aspects, such as, time, belief, situation, direction, etc.). Intensional programming brings in *dimensions* and *context* to programs (e.g. space and time in physics or chemistry). Intensional logic adds dimensions to logical expressions; thus, a non-intensional logic can be seen as a constant or a snapshot in all possible dimensions. *Intensions are dimensions* at which a certain statement is true or false (or has some other than a Boolean value). *Intensional operators* are operators that allow us to navigate within these dimensions [21].

An Example of Using Temporal Intensional Logic Temporal intensional logic is an extension of temporal logic that allows to specify the time in the future or in the past [21].

1. E_1 := it is raining **here today**

Context: {**place:here, time:today**}

2. E_2 := it was raining **here before(today) = yesterday**

3. E_3 := it is going to rain **at (altitude here + 500 m) after(today) = tomorrow**

The context is a collection of the dimensions, e.g. as in E_1 's **place** and **time** with the corresponding tag values of **here** and **today**. If we fix **here** to **City1** and assume it is a *constant*. In the month of March, 2011, with granularity of day, for every day, we can evaluate E_1 to either *true* or *false*, as shown in Figure 1. If one starts varying the **here** dimension (which

Tags days in March:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	...
Values (raining?):	F	F	T	T	T	F	F	F	T	...

Figure 1: 1D Example of Tag-Value Contextual Pairs

could even be broken down to X, Y, Z), one gets a two-dimensional (or 4D) evaluation of E_1 , as shown in Figure 2. Even with these toy examples we can immediately illustrate the hierarchical

Place/Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	...
City1	F	F	T	T	T	F	F	F	T	...
City2	F	F	F	F	T	T	T	F	F	...
City3	F	T	T	T	T	F	F	F	F	...

Figure 2: 2D Example of Tag-Value Contextual Pairs

notion of the dimensions in the context: so far the place and time we treated as atomic values fixed at days and cities. In some cases, we need finer subdivisions of the context evaluation, where e.g. time can become fixed at hour, minute, second and finer values, and so is the place broken down into boroughs, regions, streets, etc. and finally the X, Y, Z coordinates in the Euclidean space with the values of millimeters or finer. This notion becomes more apparent and important in Forensic Lucid for evidence composition where the temporal components can be e.g. log entries and other registered events and observations from multiple sources.

2.2 Lucid Overview

Lucid [2, 3, 30, 1, 4] is a dataflow intensional and functional programming language. In fact, it is a family of languages that are built upon intensional logic (which in turn can be understood as a multidimensional generalization of temporal logic) promoting context-aware demand-driven parallel computation model [18]. A program written in some Lucid dialect is an expression that may have subexpressions that need to be evaluated at certain *context*. Given the set of dimensions $D = \{dim_i\}$ in which an expression varies, and a corresponding set of indexes, or, *tags*, defined as placeholders over each dimension, the context is represented as a set of $\langle dim_i : tag_i \rangle$ mappings. Each variable in Lucid, called often a *stream*, is evaluated in that defined context that may also evolve using context operators [23, 32, 29, 31].

The first generic version of Lucid, the General Intensional Programming Language (GIPL) [21], defines two basic operators @ and # to navigate (switch and query) in the context space \mathcal{P} . The GIPL is the first¹ generic programming language of all intensional languages, defined by the means of only two intensional operators @ and #. It has been proven that other intensional programming languages of the Lucid family can be translated into the GIPL [21].

JLucid, Objective Lucid, and JOOIP JLucid [12, 8] was a first attempt on intensional arrays and “free Java functions” in the GIPSY. The approach used the Lucid language as the driving main computation, where Java methods were peripheral and could be invoked from the Lucid part, but not the other way around. This was the first instance of hybrid programming within the GIPSY. The semantics of this approach was not completely defined, plus, it was only one-sided view (Lucid-to-Java) of the problem. JLucid did not support objects of any kind, but introduced the wrapper class idea for the free Java methods. Objective Lucid [12, 11] was a logical extension of the JLucid language mentioned in the previous section that inherited all of the JLucid’s features and introduced Java objects to be available for use by Lucid. Objective Lucid expanded the notion of the Java object (a collection of members of different types) to the array (a collection of members of the same type) and first introduced the dot-notation in the syntax and operational semantics in GIPSY. Like in JLucid, Objective Lucid’s focus was on the Lucid part being the “main” program and did not allow Java to call intensional functions or use intensional constructs from within a Java class. Objective Lucid was the first in GIPSY to introduce the more complete operational semantics of the hybrid OO intensional language. JOOIP [33] greatly complements Objective Lucid by allowing Java to call the intensional language constructs closing the gap and making JOOIP a complete hybrid OO intensional programming language within the GIPSY environment. JOOIP’s semantics further refines in a greater detail the operational semantics rules of Lucid and Objective Lucid in the attempt to make them complete. We eliminate the OO-related aspects from this work as well as some others to conserve space and instead focus on the context hierarchies, syntax, and semantics.

2.3 Forensic Lucid

This section summarizes concepts and considerations in the design of the Forensic Lucid language, large portions of which were studied in the earlier work [17, 18]. The end goal of the language design is to define its constructs to concisely express cyberforensic evidence as a context of evaluations, which can be the initial state of the case (e.g. initial printer state when purchased from the manufacturer, see Section 3), towards what we have actually observed (as corresponding to the final state in the Gladyshev’s FSM) (e.g. when an investigator finds the printer with two queue entries ($B_{deleted}, B_{deleted}$)). One of the evaluation engines (a topic of another work) of the implementing system [24] is designed to backtrace intermediate results to provide the corresponding event reconstruction path if it exists. The result of the expression in its basic form is either *true* or *false*, i.e. “guilty” or “not guilty” given the evidential evaluation context per explanation with the backtrace(s). There can be multiple backtraces, that correspond to the explanation of the evidence (or lack thereof) [18].

¹The second is Lucx [32, 23, 31], and third is TransLucid [26]

2.3.1 Language Characteristics

We use Forensic Lucid to model the evidential statements and other expressions representing the evidence and observations as context. An execution trace of a running Forensic Lucid program is designed to expose the possibility of the proposed claim with the events that lead to a conclusion. Forensic Lucid capitalizes its design by aggregating the features of multiple Lucid dialects mentioned earlier needed for these tasks along with its own extensions [18].

The addition of the context calculus from Lucx (stands for “Lucid enriched with context” that promotes contexts as first-class values) for operators on simple contexts and context sets (`union`, `intersection`, etc.) are used to manipulate complex hierarchical context spaces in Forensic Lucid. Additionally, Forensic Lucid inherits many of the properties of Objective Lucid and JOOIP (Java-embedded Object-Oriented Intensional Programming language) for the arrays and structural representation of data for modeling the case data structures such as events, observations, and groupings and correlation of the related data, and so on [18]. Hierarchical contexts in Forensic Lucid also follow the example of MARFL [14] using a dot operator and by overloading both `@` and `#` to accept different types as their arguments.

The syntax and the operational semantics of Forensic Lucid were primarily maintained to be compatible with the basic Lucx and GIPL [18]. This helpful (but not absolutely necessary) when complying with the compiler and the runtime subsystems within the implementing system, the General Intensional Programming System (GIPSY) [25, 24]. The translation rules or equivalent are to be provided when implementing the language compiler within GIPSY, and such that the run-time environment (General Education Engine, or GEE) can execute it with minimal changes to GEE’s implementation.

2.3.2 Context of Evaluation

Forensic Lucid provides an ability to encode the “stories” told by the evidence and witnesses. This constitutes the primary context of evaluation. The “return value” of the evaluation is a collection of backtraces (may be empty), which contain the “paths of truth”. If a given trace contains all truths values, it’s an explanation of a story. If there is no such a path, i.e. the trace, there is no enough supporting evidence of the entire claim to be true [18].

In its simplest form, the context can be expressed as integers or strings, to which we attribute some meaning or description. E.g. “1” means printer state “x”, etc. The context spaces are finite and can be navigated through in all directions of the along dimension indexes, potentially allowing negative tags in our tag sets of dimensions. Our contexts can also be a finite set of symbolic labels and their values that can be internally enumerated [18]. The symbolic approach is naturally more appropriate for humans and we have a machinery to so in Lucx’s implementation in GIPSY [29].

We define streams of observations *os* as our fundamental context units, that can be a simple context or a context set. In fact, in Forensic Lucid we are defining higher-level dimensions and lower-level dimensions. The highest-level one is the *evidential statement es*, which is a finite unordered set of observation sequences *os*. The *observation sequence os* is a finite *ordered* set of observations *o*. The *observation o* is an “eyewitness” of a particular property along with the duration of the observation. As in the Gladyshev’s FSA [6, 7] that we model after, the basic observations are tuples of (P, min, opt) in their generic form. The observations in this form, specifically, the property *P*, can be exploded further into Lucx’s context set and further into an atomic simple context [31, 23, 29]. (Actually *P* can be any arbitrary expression *E*). Context switching between different observations is done naturally with the traditional Lucid `@` context switching operator [18].

Consider some conceptual expression of a storyboard in Listing 1 where anything in [. . .] represents a story, i.e. the context of evaluation. `foo` can be evaluated at multiple contexts (stories), producing a collection of final results (e.g. *true* or *false*) for each story as well as a collection of traces.

```
foo @
{
  [ final observed event, possible initial observed event ],
  [
    [
      ]
    ]
  ]
}
```

Listing 1: Intensional Storyboard Expression

While the [. . .] notation here may be confusing with respect to the notation of [dimension:tag] in traditional Lucid and more specifically in Lucx [31, 29, 23], it is in fact a simple syntactical extension to allow higher-level groups of contexts where this syntactical sugar is later translated to the baseline context constructs. The tentative notation of { [. . .] , . . . , [. . .] } implies a notion similar to the notion of the “context set” in [31, 29] except with the syntactical sugar mentioned earlier where we allow syntactical grouping of properties, observations, observation sequences, and evidential statements as our context sets.

The Gladyshev’s concept of a generic observation sequence [7] can be expanded into the context stream using the *min* and *opt* values, where they will translate into index values. Thus, $obs = (A, 3, 0)(B, 2, 0)$ expands the property labels *A* and *B* into a finite stream of five indexed elements: *AAABB*. Thus, a Forensic Lucid fragment in Listing 2 would return the third *A* of the *AAABB* context stream in the observation portion of *o*. Therefore, possible evaluations to check for the properties can be as shown in Figure 3 [18].

```
// Give me observed property at index 2 in the observation sequence obs
o @.obs 2
where
  // Higher-level dimension in the form of (P,min,opt)
  observation o;
  // Equivalent to writing = { A, A, A, B, B };
  // Equivalent to writing = A fby A fby A fby B fby B fby eod;
  observation sequence obs = (A,3,0)(B,2,0);
  where
    // Properties A and B are arrays of computations
    // or any Expressions
    A = [c1,c2,c3,c4];
    B = E;
    . . .
  end;
end;
```

Listing 2: Observation Sequence With Duration

The property values of *A* and *B* can be anything that context calculus allows or even more generally any arbitrary *E* allowing to encode all kinds of case knowledge. The **observation sequence** is a finite **ordered** context tag set [29] that allows an integral “duration” of a given tag property. This may seem like we allow duplicate tag values that are unsound in the classical Lucid semantics; however, we find our way around it with the implicit tag index. The semantics of the arrays of computations is not a part of either GIPL or Lucx; however, the arrays are provided by Objective Lucid. We use the notion of the arrays to evaluate multiple computations at the same context. Having an array of computations is conceptually equivalent of running

an a Lucid program under the same context for each array element in a separate instance of the evaluation engine and then the results of those expressions are gathered in one ordered storage within the originating program. Arrays in Forensic Lucid are needed to represent a set of results, or *explanations* of evidential statements, as well as denote some properties of observations. (We explore the notion of arrays in Forensic Lucid much greater detail in another work) [18].

To make equivalence relation with the formal Gladyshev’s FSA approach, computations c_i correspond to the states q and event i that enable the transition. For Forensic Lucid, we define c_i as theoretically any Lucid expression $o = E$ [18].

```
Observed property (context): A A A B B
Sub-dimension index: 0 1 2 3 4

o @.obs 0 = A
o @.obs 1 = A
o @.obs 2 = A
o @.obs 3 = B
o @.obs 4 = B

To get the duration/index position:

o @.obs A = 0 1 2
o @.obs B = 3 4
```

Figure 3: Handling Duration of an Observed Property in the Context

In Figure 3 a possibility is illustrated to query for the sub-dimension indices by raw property where it is present. This produces a finite stream of valid indices that can be used in subsequent expressions, or, alternatively by supplying the index we can get the corresponding raw property at that index. The latter feature is still under investigation of whether it is safe to expose it to Forensic Lucid programmers or make it implicit at all times at the implementation level. This method of indexing was needed to remedy the “problem” of “duplicate tags”: as previously mentioned, observations form the context and allow durations. This means multiple duplicate dimension tags with implied subdimension indexes should be allowed as the semantics of traditional Lucid approaches do not allow duplicate dimension tags. It should be noted however, that the combination of the tag and its index in the stream is still unique and is nicely folded into the traditional Lucid semantics [18].

2.3.3 Transition Function

A transition function (derived from the same notion from the works of Gladyshev et al. [7, 6]) determines how the context of evaluation changes during computation. It represents in part the case’s crime scene modeling. A general issue exists that we have to address is that the transition function ψ is usually problem-specific. In the FSA approach, the transition function is the labeled graph itself [7]. We follow the graph of the case to model our Forensic Lucid equivalent [18].

In general, Lucid has already basic operators to navigate and switch from one context to another, that can be said equivalent to state switching. These operators represent the basic “built-in” transition functions in themselves (the intensional operators such as `@`, `#`, `iseod`, `first`, `next`, `fbv`, `wvr`, `upon`, and `asa` as well as their inverse operators [18]). However, a specific problem being modeled requires more specific transition function than just plain intensional operators. In this case the transition function is a Forensic Lucid function where the matching

state transition modeled through a sequence of intensional operators [18]. In fact, the forensic operators are just pre-defined functions that rely on the traditional and inverse Lucid operators as well as context switching operators that achieve something similar to the transitions [18]. At the implementation level, it is the GEE that actually does the execution of ψ within GIPSY. In fact, the intensional operators of Lucid represent the basic building blocks for ψ and Ψ^{-1} .

2.3.4 Generic Observation Sequences

We adopt a way of modeling generic observation sequences as an equivalent to the `box` operator from the Lucid's context calculus [31, 29] in the dimensional context that defines the space of all possible evaluations. The generic observation sequence context contains observations whose properties' duration is not fixed to the *min* value as in $(P, min, 0)$ as we studied so far. The third position in the observation tuple, *opt* is not 0 in the generic observation and as a result in the containing observation sequence, e.g. $os = (P_1, 1, 2)(P_2, 1, 1)$. Please refer to [7, 6, 18, 17] for more detailed examples of a generic observation sequence [18].

2.3.5 Primitive Operators

The basic set of the classic intensional operators is extended with the similar operators, but inverted in one of their aspects: either negation of trueness or reverse of direction of navigation. Here we provide a definition of these operators alongside with the classical ones (to remind the reader what they do and enlighten the unaware reader). The reverse operators have a restriction that they must work on the bounded streams at the positive infinity. This is not a stringent limitation as the our contexts of observations and evidence in this work are always finite, so they all have the beginning and the end. What we need is an ability to go back in the stream and, perhaps, negate in it with classical-like operators, but reversed [18].

Following the steps in [21], we further represent the definition of the operators via `@` and `#`. Again, there is a mix of classical operators that were previously defined in [21], such as `first`, `next`, `fby`, `wvr`, `upon`, and `asa` as well as the new operators from this work [18].

2.3.6 Forensic Operators

The operators presented here are based on the discussion of the combination [7] function and others that form more-than-primitive operations to support the required implementation. The `comb()` operator is realized in the general manner in Forensic Lucid for combining analogies of multiple partitioned runs (MPRs) [7], which in our case are higher-level contexts, in the new language's dimension types [18].

- `combine` corresponds to the *comb* function described earlier. It is defined in Listing 3.

```
/**
 * Append given e to each element of a given
 * stream e under the context of d.
 * @return the resulting combined stream
 */
combine(s, e, d) =
  if iseod s then eod;
  else (first s fby.d e) fby.d combine(next s, e, d);
```

Listing 3: The `combine` Operator

- `product` corresponds to the cross-product of contexts, translated from that of the LISP example and added with context. It is defined in Listing 4.

```

/**
 * Append elements of s2 to element of s1
 * in all possible combinations.
 */
product(s1, s2, d) =
  if iseod s2 then eod;
  else combine(s1, first s2) fby.d product(s1, next s2)

```

Listing 4: The product Operator

3 Modeling Printer Case in Forensic Lucid

3.1 ACME Manufacturing Printing Case

This is one of the cases we re-examine from the Gladyshev’s FSA approach [7].

The local area network at some company called ACME Manufacturing consists of two personal computers and a networked printer. The cost of running the network is shared by its two users Alice (A) and Bob (B). Alice, however, claims that she never uses the printer and should not be paying for the printer consumables. Bob disagrees, he says that he saw Alice collecting printouts. According to the manufacturer, the printer works as follows:

1. *When a print job is received from the user, it is stored in the first unallocated directory entry of the print job directory.*
2. *The printing mechanism scans the print job directory from the beginning and picks the first active job.*
3. *After the job is printed, the corresponding directory entry is marked as “deleted”, but the name of the job owner is preserved.*
4. *The printer can accept only one print job from each user at a time.*
5. *Initially, all directory entries are empty.*

The investigator finds the current state of the printer’s buffer as:

1. *Job From B Deleted*
2. *Job From B Deleted*
3. *Empty*
4. *Empty*
5. *...*

Investigative Analysis If Alice never printed anything, only one directory entry must have been used, because the printer accepts only one print job from each user at a time [7]. However, two directory entries have been used and there are no other users except Alice and Bob. Therefore, it must be the case that both Alice and Bob submitted their print jobs in the same time frame. The trace of Alice’s print job was overwritten by Bob’s subsequent print jobs. As a result, a finite state machine is constructed to model the situations as in the FSA [7] to indicate the initial state and other possible states and how to arrive to them when Alice or Bob would have submitted a job and a job would be deleted [7]. The FSM presented in [7] covers the entire case with all possible events and transitions resulted due to those events. It is modeled based on the properties of the investigation, in this case the printer queue’s state according to the manufacturer specifications and the two potential users. The modeling is assumed to be done by the investigator in the case in order to perform a thorough analysis. It also doesn’t really matter how actually it so happened that the Alice’s print job was overwritten by Bob’s subsequent jobs as is not a concern for this case any further. Assume, this behavior is derived from the manufacturer’s specification and the evidence found. The investigator will have to make similar assumptions in the real case [7].

The authors of [7] provided a proof-of-concept implementation of this case in Common LISP (not recited in here) which takes about 6-12 pages of printout depending on the printing options set and column format. Using our proposed solution, we rewrite the example in Forensic Lucid and show the advantages of a much finer conciseness and added benefit of the implicit context-driven expression and evaluation, and parallel evaluation that the LISP implementation lacks entirely.

3.2 Sample Forensic Lucid Specification

The simulated printer case is specified in Forensic Lucid as follows. ψ is implemented in Listing 6. We then provide the implementation of Ψ^{-1} in [18] in Listing 7. Finally, the “main program” is modeled in Listing 5 that sets up the context hierarchy and the invokes Ψ^{-1} . This specification is the translation of the LISP implementation by Gladyshev described earlier [7] and described in this section in semi-structured English.

The “Main Program”

In Listing 5 where the computation begins in our Forensic Lucid example. This is an equivalent of `main()` or program entry point in other mainstream languages. The goal of this fragment is to setup the context of evaluation which is core to the case – the evidential statement `es`. This is the highest level dimension in Lucid terms, and it is hierarchical. This is an unordered list (set) of stories and witness accounts of the incident (themselves known as observation sequences); ordering in the program of them is arbitrary and has an array-like structure. The relevant stories to the incident are that of Alice, the evidence of the printer’s final state as found by the investigator, and the “expert testimony” by the manufacturer of how the printer works. These observation sequences are in turn defined as ordered collections of observations nesting one lever deeper into the context. The printer’s final state dimension `F` is the only observation for the printer found by the investigator, which is an observation of the property of the printer’s queue “Bob’s job deleted last” syntactically written as “B_deleted” as inherited from Gladyshev’s notation. Its duration is nothing special, that it was simply present. The `manuf` observation sequence dictated by the manufacturer’s specification that the printer’s queue state was empty initially for an undetermined period `$` of time when the printer was delivered. These are two observations, followed in time/ Alice’s line (also tow observations) is that from the

beginning Alice did not not any actions signified by the properties P such as “add_B” or “take” (implying the computation “add_A” has never happened (0 duration for the “infinity” i.e. till the investigator examined the printer); which is Alice’s claim. `alice_claim` is a collection of Boolean results for possible explanations or lack thereof for Alice’s claim in this case at the context of all this evidence and as evaluated by `invpsiacme` Ψ^{-1} . If Alice’s claim were to check out; the results would be “true”; “false” otherwise.

```
alice_claim @ es
where
  evidential statement es = [ printer , manuf , alice ];

  observation sequence printer = F;
  observation sequence manuf = [Oempty, $];
  observation sequence alice = [Oalice, F];

  observation F = ('B_deleted', 1, 0);
  observation Oalice = (P_alice, 0, +inf);
  observation Oempty = ('empty', 1, 0);

  // No 'add_A'
  P_alice = unordered {'add_B', 'take'};

  alice_claim = invpsiacme(F, es);
end;
```

Listing 5: Developing the Pinter Case: “main”

Modeling Forward Transition Function ψ

In Listing 6 ψ illustrating the normal flow of operations to model the scene. Which is also a translation from LISP from Gladyshev [7] using Forensic Lucid syntax and operators described in [18]. The function is modeled per manufacturer specification and focuses on the queue of the printer. “A” corresponds to “Alice” and “B” to “Bob” along with their prompted queue actions to add deleted print jobs. The code is a rather straightforward translation of the FSM/LISP code in [7]. `S` is a collection of state properties observed. `c` is a “computation” action to add or take print jobs by the printer’s spooler. `d` is a classical Lucid dimension type along which the computation is happening (there can be multiple dimensions and evaluations going on).

Modeling Inverse Transition Function Ψ^{-1}

In Listing 7 is the inverse Ψ^{-1} backtracking implementation with the purpose of event reconstruction, also translated from LISP to Forensic Lucid like the preceding fragments using the Forensic Lucid operators. It is naturally more complex than ψ due to a possibility of choices (non-determinism) when going back in time so all of them have to be explored. This backtracking, if successful, for any claim, would provide the Gladyshev’s “explanation” of that claim, i.e. the claim attains its meaning and is validated within the provided evidential statement. Ψ^{-1} is based on the traversal from `F` to the initial observation of the printer’s queue as defined in “main”. If such path were to exist, then Alice’s claim would have had an explanation. `pby` (*preceded by*) is the Forensic Lucid inverse operator of classical Lucid’s `fby` (*followed by*). `backtraces` is an array of event backtracing computations identified with variables; their number and definitions depend on the crime scene and are derived from the state machine of Gladyshev.

```

acmepsi(c, s, d) =
  // Add a print job from Alice
  if c == 'add.A' then
    if d1 == 'A' || d2 == 'A' then s;
  else
    if d1 in S then 'A' fby.d d2;
    else
      if d2 in S then d1 fby.d 'A';
      else s;
  // Add a print job from Bob
  else if c == 'add.B' then
    if d1 == 'B' || d2 == 'B' then s;
  else
    if d1 in S then 'B' fby.d d2;
    else
      if d2 in S then d1 fby.d 'B';
      else s;
  // Printer takes the job per manufacturer specification
  else if c == 'take'
    if d1 == 'A' then 'A_deleted' fby.d d2;
  else
    if d1 == 'B' then 'B' fby.d d2;
    else
      if d2 == 'A' then d1 fby.d 'A_deleted';
      else
        if d2 == 'B' then d1 fby.d 'B_deleted';
        else s;
  // Done
  else s fby.d eod;

where
  dimension d;
  S = ['empty', 'A_deleted', 'B_deleted'];
  d1 = first.d s;
  d2 = next.d d1;
end;

```

Listing 6: “Transition Function” ψ in Forensic Lucid for the ACME Printing Case

4 Conclusion

We presented the basic overview of Forensic Lucid, its concepts, ideas, and dedicated purpose – to model, specify, and evaluation digital forensics cases. The process of doing so is significantly simpler and more manageable than the previously proposed FSM model and its common LISP realization. At the same time, the language is founded in more than 30 years research on correctness and soundness of programs and the corresponding mathematical foundations of the Lucid language, which is a significant factor should a Forensic Lucid-based analysis be presented in court. We re-wrote in Forensic Lucid one of the sample cases initial modeled by Gladyshev in the FSM and Common LISP to show the specification is indeed more manageable and comprehensible than the original and fits in two pages in this paper.

We also still realize by looking at the examples the usability aspect is still desired to be improved further for the investigators, especially when modeling ψ and Ψ^{-1} , as a potential limitation, prompting one of the future work items to address it further.

In general, the proposed practical approach in the cyberforensics field can also be used to model and evaluate normal investigation process involving crimes not necessarily associated with information technology. Combined with an expert system (e.g. implemented in CLIPS [28]), it can also be used in training new staff in investigation techniques. The notion of hierarchical contexts as first-class values brings more understanding of the process to the investigators in cybercrime case management tools.

```

invpsiacme(s, d) = backtraces
where
  backtraces = [A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M ];
  where
    A = if d1 == "A_deleted"
        then d2 pby.d "A" pby.d "take" else eod;

    B = if d1 == "B_deleted"
        then d2 pby.d "B" pby.d "take" else eod;

    C = if d2 == "A_deleted" && d1 != "A" && d2 != "B"
        then d1 pby.d "A" pby.d "take" else eod;

    D = if d2 == "B_deleted" && d1 != "A" && d2 != "B"
        then d1 pby.d "B" pby.d "take" else eod;

    E = if d1 in S && d2 in S
        then s pby.d "take" else eod;

    F = if d1 == "A" && d2 != "A"
        then
          [ d2 pby.d "empty" pby.d "add_A",
            d2 pby.d "A_deleted" pby.d "add_A",
            d2 pby.d "B_deleted" pby.d "add_A" ]
        else eod;

    G = if d1 == "B" && d2 != "B"
        then
          [ d2 pby.d "empty" pby.d "add_B",
            d2 pby.d "A_deleted" pby.d "add_B",
            d2 pby.d "B_deleted" pby.d "add_B" ]
        else eod;

    H = if d1 == "B" && d2 == "A"
        then
          [ d1 pby.d "empty" pby.d "add_A",
            d1 pby.d "A_deleted" pby.d "add_A",
            d1 pby.d "B_deleted" pby.d "add_A" ]
        else eod;

    I = if d1 == "A" && d2 == "B"
        then
          [ d1 pby.d "empty" pby.d "add_B",
            d1 pby.d "A_deleted" pby.d "add_B",
            d1 pby.d "B_deleted" pby.d "add_B" ]
        else eod;

    J = if d1 == "A" || d2 == "A"
        then s pby.d "add_A" else eod;

    K = if d1 == "A" && d2 == "A"
        then s pby.d "add_B" else eod;

    L = if d1 == "B" && d2 == "A"
        then s pby.d "add_A" else eod;

    M = if d1 == "B" || d2 == "B"
        then s pby.d "add_B" else eod;

  where
    dimension d;
    S = ["empty", "A_deleted", "B_deleted"];
    d1 = first.d s;
    d2 = next.d d1;
  end;

```

Listing 7: “Inverse Transition Function” Ψ^{-1} in Forensic Lucid for the ACME Printing Case

5 Future Work

- Formally prove equivalence to the FSA approach.
- Adapt/re-implement a graphical UI based on the data-flow graph tool [5] to simplify Forensic Lucid programming further for not very tech-savvy investigators by making it visual. The listings provided are not very difficult to read and quite manageable to comprehend, but any visual aid is always an improvement.
- Refine the semantics of Lucid's context sets and their operators to be more sound, including Box and Range.
- Explore and exploit the notion of credibility factors of the evidence and witnesses fully.
- Release a full standard Forensic Lucid specification.

Acknowledgments

This research work was funded by NSERC and the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science of Concordia University, Montreal, Canada. We would also like to acknowledge the reviewers who took time to do a constructive quality review of this work. Thanks to Andrei Soeanu for presenting this work at ICDF2C 2011 on behalf of the authors.

References

- [1] E. A. Ashcroft, A. A. Faustini, R. Jagannathan, and W. W. Wadge. *Multidimensional Programming*. Oxford University Press, London, Feb. 1995. ISBN: 978-0195075977.
- [2] E. A. Ashcroft and W. W. Wadge. Lucid – a formal system for writing and proving programs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 5(3), 1976.
- [3] E. A. Ashcroft and W. W. Wadge. Erratum: Lucid – a formal system for writing and proving programs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6(1):200, 1977.
- [4] E. A. Ashcroft and W. W. Wadge. Lucid, a nonprocedural language with iteration. *Communications of the ACM*, 20(7):519–526, July 1977.
- [5] Y. Ding. Automated translation between graphical and textual representations of intensional programs in the GIPSY. Master's thesis, Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, June 2004. <http://newton.cs.concordia.ca/~paquet/filetransfer/publications/theses/DingYiminMSc2004.pdf>.
- [6] P. Gladyshev. Finite state machine analysis of a blackmail investigation. *International Journal of Digital Evidence*, 4(1), 2005.
- [7] P. Gladyshev and A. Patel. Finite state machine approach to digital event reconstruction. *Digital Investigation Journal*, 2(1), 2004.
- [8] P. Grogono, S. Mokhov, and J. Paquet. Towards JLucid, Lucid with embedded Java functions in the GIPSY. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Programming Languages and Compilers (PLC 2005)*, pages 15–21. CSREA Press, June 2005.
- [9] Y. Ji. Scalability evaluation of the GIPSY runtime system. Master's thesis, Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, Mar. 2011.
- [10] R. Lalement. *Computation as Logic*. Prentice Hall, 1993. C.A.R. Hoare Series Editor. English translation from French by John Plaice.

- [11] S. Mokhov and J. Paquet. Objective Lucid – first step in object-oriented intensional programming in the GIPSY. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Programming Languages and Compilers (PLC 2005)*, pages 22–28. CSREA Press, June 2005.
- [12] S. A. Mokhov. Towards hybrid intensional programming with JLucid, Objective Lucid, and General Imperative Compiler Framework in the GIPSY. Master’s thesis, Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, Oct. 2005. ISBN 0494102934; online at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0907.2640>.
- [13] S. A. Mokhov. Encoding forensic multimedia evidence from MARF applications as Forensic Lucid expressions. In T. Sobh, K. Elleithy, and A. Mahmood, editors, *Novel Algorithms and Techniques in Telecommunications and Networking, proceedings of CISSE’08*, pages 413–416, University of Bridgeport, CT, USA, Dec. 2008. Springer. Printed in January 2010.
- [14] S. A. Mokhov. Towards syntax and semantics of hierarchical contexts in multimedia processing applications using MARFL. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual IEEE International Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC)*, pages 1288–1294, Turku, Finland, July 2008. IEEE Computer Society.
- [15] S. A. Mokhov. Enhancing the formal cyberforensic approach with observation modeling with credibility factors and mathematical theory of evidence. [online], also in *login: vol. 34, no. 6, p. 101*, Dec. 2009. Presented at WIPS at USENIX Security’09, <http://www.usenix.org/events/sec09/wips.html>.
- [16] S. A. Mokhov. The role of self-forensics modeling for vehicle crash investigations and event reconstruction simulation. In J. S. Gauthier, editor, *Proceedings of the Huntsville Simulation Conference (HSC’09)*, pages 342–349. SCS, Oct. 2009. Online at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0905.2449>.
- [17] S. A. Mokhov and J. Paquet. Formally specifying and proving operational aspects of Forensic Lucid in Isabelle. Technical Report 2008-1-Ait Mohamed, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, Aug. 2008. In *Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics (TPHOLs2008): Emerging Trends Proceedings*.
- [18] S. A. Mokhov, J. Paquet, and M. Debbabi. Formally specifying operational semantics and language constructs of Forensic Lucid. In O. Göbel, S. Frings, D. Günther, J. Nendon, and D. Schadt, editors, *Proceedings of the IT Incident Management and IT Forensics (IMF’08)*, LNI140, pages 197–216. GI, Sept. 2008.
- [19] S. A. Mokhov, J. Paquet, and M. Debbabi. Towards automated deduction in blackmail case analysis with Forensic Lucid. In J. S. Gauthier, editor, *Proceedings of the Huntsville Simulation Conference (HSC’09)*, pages 326–333. SCS, Oct. 2009. Online at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0906.0049>.
- [20] S. A. Mokhov, J. Paquet, and M. Debbabi. On the need for data flow graph visualization of Forensic Lucid programs and forensic evidence, and their evaluation by GIPSY. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual International Conference on Privacy, Security and Trust (PST), 2011*, pages 120–123. IEEE Computer Society, July 2011. Short paper; full version online at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.5423>.
- [21] J. Paquet. *Scientific Intensional Programming*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, Laval University, Sainte-Foy, Canada, 1999.
- [22] J. Paquet. Distributed eductive execution of hybrid intensional programs. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual IEEE International Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC’09)*, pages 218–224, Seattle, Washington, USA, July 2009. IEEE Computer Society.
- [23] J. Paquet, S. A. Mokhov, and X. Tong. Design and implementation of context calculus in the GIPSY environment. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual IEEE International Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC)*, pages 1278–1283, Turku, Finland, July 2008. IEEE Computer Society.
- [24] J. Paquet, S. A. Mokhov, E. I. Vassev, X. Tong, Y. Ji, A. H. Pourteymour, K. Wan, A. Wu, S. Rabah, B. Han, B. Lu, L. Tao, Y. Ding, C. L. Ren, and The GIPSY Research and Development

- Group. The General Intensional Programming System (GIPSY) project. Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, 2002–2012. <http://newton.cs.concordia.ca/~gipsy/>, last viewed April 2012.
- [25] J. Paquet and A. H. Wu. GIPSY – a platform for the investigation on intensional programming languages. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Programming Languages and Compilers (PLC 2005)*, pages 8–14. CSREA Press, June 2005.
- [26] J. Plaice, B. Mancilla, G. Ditu, and W. W. Wadge. Sequential demand-driven evaluation of eager TransLucid. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual IEEE International Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC)*, pages 1266–1271, Turku, Finland, July 2008. IEEE Computer Society.
- [27] T. Rahilly and J. Plaice. A multithreaded implementation for TransLucid. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual IEEE International Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC)*, pages 1272–1277, Turku, Finland, July 2008. IEEE Computer Society.
- [28] G. Riley. CLIPS: A tool for building expert systems. [online], 2007–2009. <http://clipsrules.sourceforge.net/>, last viewed: October 2009.
- [29] X. Tong. Design and implementation of context calculus in the GIPSY. Master’s thesis, Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, Apr. 2008.
- [30] W. W. Wadge and E. A. Ashcroft. *Lucid, the Dataflow Programming Language*. Academic Press, London, 1985.
- [31] K. Wan. *Lucx: Lucid Enriched with Context*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, 2006.
- [32] K. Wan, V. Alagar, and J. Paquet. Lucx: Lucid enriched with context. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Programming Languages and Compilers (PLC 2005)*, pages 48–14. CSREA Press, June 2005.
- [33] A. Wu, J. Paquet, and S. A. Mokhov. Object-oriented intensional programming: Intensional Java/Lucid classes. In *Proceedings of SERA 2010*, pages 158–167. IEEE Computer Society, 2010. Online at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0909.0764>.

Index

Forensic Lucid

- Context, 6
- Generic Observation Sequences, 9
- Properties, 6
- Transition Function, 8

API

- \$, 11
- alice_claim, 12
- asa, 8
- backtraces, 12
- box, 9
- c, 12
- comb(), 9
- d, 12
- es, 11
- F, 11, 12
- fbv, 8, 12
- first, 8
- intersection, 6
- invpsiacme, 12
- iseod, 8
- main(), 11
- manuf, 11
- next, 8
- observation sequence, 7
- ordered, 7
- pby, 12
- place, 4
- S, 12
- time, 4
- union, 6
- upon, 8
- wvr, 8

Case

- Printer, 10

- Context, 6
- context, 3

dimensions, 3

Forensic Lucid, 1–9, 11–15, 18

- New Operators, 9
- Operators, 9
- and #, 9

Frameworks

- GEE, 6, 9

GEE, 6, 9

Generic Observation Sequences, 9

GIPL, 5–7

GIPSY, 5, 6, 9

intensional

- logic, 3
- operators, 3
- programming, 3

Java, 5

JLucid, 5

JOOIP, 5, 6

LISP, 2, 3, 10, 12

logic

- intensional, 3
- non-intensional, 3
- temporal, 4

Lucid, 1–9, 13

Lucx, 5–7, 9, 15

Operators

- Forensic Lucid, 9

Printer Case, 10

Tensor Lucid, 5–7

Transition Function, 8