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Abstract: Security challenges, risks, and assaults related to the Internet of Things (IoT) have been highlighted as a potential and challenging study field. As a result, a forensics approach for detecting IoT-related crime will become necessary in the future. Forensics investigators, on the other hand, face several obstacles as a result of the Internet of Things.

These include the vast amount and diversity of information available, as well as the blurred borders between networks, with private networks progressively blending into public networks. We wanted to investigate and expand the link to help with digital investigations of IoT devices and to address new issues in digital forensics. Concerning IoT devices, we stress numerous measures for digital forensics. Furthermore, the integration of a large number of objects in IoT forensic interest, as well as the relevance of recognised and gathered devices, complicates IoT forensics. This paper's goal is to propose a framework and security threats for IoT forensics.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of a very complex and hard area of the Internet of Things – IoT – resulted from recent improvements in sensing capabilities and networking of electrical items. Using several standardised communication protocols, all gadgets in this idea are connected to the Internet. These IoT devices are frequently operated remotely in a fairly straightforward manner.

The number of networked gadgets is increasing, and are becoming increasingly frequently the target of numerous assailants. Standardized protocols and IoT devices are used in IoT equipment. There is a big market for commercial firmware and software. the number of flaws that are exploited by hackers and cybercriminals.” Typically, hackers will attempt to launch a DDoS assault on IoT devices to paralyse key infrastructure.

Hackers are a serious threat to every company, regardless of its size or industry. The attackers are attempting to disrupt or hinder the target organization's everyday operations by targeting various assets. The attackers' main goal is to use every tactic they can to exploit available weaknesses in the victims' electronic equipment. Because the current security measures aren't 100 percent effective, exploitation is still conceivable. The danger dynamic is quite high, with new vulnerabilities or exploits being revealed on a regular, if not hourly, basis.

Infrastructures, processes, and even everyday life are all under threat. Hackers
perform exploitation on IoT devices and utilise them as a portal to deeper layers of a network, gathering sensitive information, altering or deleting data, or destroying the entire system. Thingbots, RFID, Wearables, Smart Plugs, Traffic Lights, Cameras, Automobiles, Airplanes, Digital Locks, Pacemakers, Rifles, Digital Weapons, Thermostats, and other electronic devices are among the most common targets for hackers. The issue occurs owing to the employment of sophisticated technological gadgets and processes, which give the attacker the potential of masking the identity.

When it comes into contact with IoT devices, the procedure gets more complicated. The presence of such equipment in a network design facilitates the attacker's task. Analysis of such crimes after they occur is critical as a line of defence to prevent recurrence and establish suitable protective measures. The most important piece of a large puzzle is digital evidence, which assists the investigator in drawing appropriate conclusions about the suspected crime. The admissibility of a judicial case is also ensured by collecting proper and viable digital evidence, especially in cyber-related offences.

The most serious concern emerges when hackers get access to sensitive information such as credit card numbers, health information, or system passwords. The attackers can use this information to commit identity theft or other cybercrimes, which are far more difficult to uncover than ordinary criminal operations. Investigators can use network forensic procedures, protocols, and tools that have already been created. Unfortunately, due to the complex and heterogeneous nature of IoT devices, these techniques are insufficient to conduct a reliable analysis. This is why, to acquire an effective and productive digital investigative process and to gather even deteriorating digital evidence with accuracy and speed, a great deal of attention is necessary for this field.

To conduct a digital forensic analysis of an IoT device, it is necessary to first understand the features of these devices, as well as their responses to security breaches. Furthermore, the presence of a practically endless number of IoT devices from diverse manufacturers in networked infrastructures makes digital inquiry more difficult. Furthermore, the data produced by IoT devices are personal and large in volume, necessitating prompt analysis to properly identify dangers throughout the forensic phase. Analyzing such sensitive and large amounts of data promptly is a difficult undertaking in and of itself.

It is considered that it is not difficult to come across potential proof of a crime in networked devices. The availability of extensive network logs, numerous chat logs, predictable emails, and social networking chats supports the assertion. The proprietary data formats, protocols, and physical interfaces that come across the technique of evidence extraction, on the other hand, inquire about challenges in IoT. Because of the immature security procedures available to guard against possible attacks, IoT devices are significantly more vulnerable and susceptible to networks.

2. INTERRELATED OBLIGATION

Although much work has been done in digital forensics, the volume of work done in IoT forensics has been quite restricted as of the date of authoring this article. There are a few works in cloud forensics that have parallels with IoT digital forensic. In this
part, we will look at some of the most current developments in IoT forensics.

Numerous issues and ways to IoT forensics in reference. The IoT network has been segmented into three zones: internal network, middle layer, and external network. They've also proposed a Next-Best-Thing Triage (NBT) Model to go along with the three-zone method. Their suggested device is said to function as a beacon for emergency responders. It also improves the efficiency and efficacy of IoT-related research.

The difficulties that digital forensics encounter in IoT. The authors developed a digital investigation deployment paradigm in a cloud computing environment. The study includes a broad review, potential solutions, and a system structure. They have not, however, proposed a mechanism for implementing their suggestion.

IoT security enhancement in terms of forensics. The writers have demonstrated the distinctions between conventional inquiry and the present forensic investigation situation. Some limitations for IoT forensics research for smart devices were discovered. In addition, the authors predicted mobility forensics trends based on smart device advances. Their idea highlights the importance of sensor-based activities and data collection. Their suggested model has not been applied or evaluated in real-world settings.

The obstacles and prospects in the realm of IoT security and forensics. They have reviewed significant security and forensics topics for the security and forensics difficulties briefly. They concentrated on the difficulties of privacy, security, and forensics in the IoT ecosystem.

The issues of IoT forensics on the Internet of Anything age. In this IoT context, they have noted issues in data capture (both logical and physical), extraction, and analysis of data. To explore and design a support system for digital investigations and address increasing issues in digital forensics, the authors recommended a mix of cloud-native forensics and client-side forensics (Forensics for companion devices). They advocated the creation of digital forensic standards that may be used in court.

3. IoT SECURITY THREATS

The security threat is a complicated system that includes interdependent components necessary to complete the operation of the system under study. It may include both living and non-living entities and items that are linked and function together. To the best of our knowledge, there are no security threats for IoT forensics.

The provided ecology, however, is not comprehensive and may require additional exploration. Our primary goal is to identify and enumerate the many components and potential techniques of evidence collecting for investigating an IoT-based crime.
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Figure 1. Security, Threats, and Digital Forensic
In Figure 1 Manifest’s Security Threats in for IoT. Four stacks are shown in parallel. In the first stack it is the Perception layer. The physical layer, which contains a sensor for perceiving and receiving information about the surroundings, is the perception layer. It detects some physical factors or recognises other intelligent items in the environment. (ii) The network layer is in charge of connecting smart objects, network devices, and servers.

The IoT perception layer influences the integrity of data read by sensors; it provides a method to safeguard the integrity of system data to enable correct analytics and processing. We concentrated on threat models in which insiders alter physical features about which data is gathered and communicated, fooling sensors into interpreting incorrect data. As a first step toward solving the problem, we created a framework that combines Ethereum blockchain with edge computing to run checks and ensure the integrity of incoming sensor data before it is analysed, processed, and stored.

The Network Layer Threat. The network layer is thought to include all network activities and their effects. The use of the internet, smart devices, data storage, data collection or retrieval, security and privacy problems, prospective use of social media, and privacy concerns are initially Evaluated by collecting and analysing operation logs and gathering suspicious evidence from them. It is also feasible to gather time-based information, such as the start and finish time of an occurrence. It is vital to collect the source and destination addresses, as well as any malicious programming information, at the network layer.

The network type, routing information, attack vectors, specifics of the current firewall, details of the existing network architecture, and equipment can all be provided Support layer threats has two modules which are Data tampering is the purposeful modification (destruction, manipulation, or alteration) of data via unauthorised channels. Data can be in one of two states: in transit or at rest. In both circumstances, data might be intercepted and tampered with. Data transport is important to digital communications.

For instance, if data packets are sent unencrypted, a hacker can intercept the packet, alter its contents, and change its destination address. A system application can suffer a security breach when data is at rest, and an unauthorised intruder can deploy malicious code that corrupts the data or underlying computer code. In both cases, the infiltration is malevolent, and the consequences for the data are invariably disastrous. It is one of the most serious security concerns that any application, programme, or organisation may face.

Along with unauthorized access, Many IoT devices come with default passwords that allow users to access the software environments included within the devices. Attackers with lists of default IoT passwords can exploit them to obtain unauthorised access to a device and its network if users do not update these passwords, which many do not do.

The last layer is the Application layer, which ensures data integrity, confidentiality, and authenticity. The application layer protocols define the application interface with the lower layer protocols for data transmission over the network. Ports are used by application-layer protocols to facilitate process-to-process communications. Among the application layer protocols are HTTP, CoAP, web socket, MQTT, XMPP, DDS, and AMQP.
4. IoT DISPUTATIVE STAIRCASE

In Figure 2 depicts the stages required for digital forensics and subsequent issues in an IoT scenario. We are stressing the functions of end devices (sensors or smart equipment) and the difficulties in assessing their security. As discussed in earlier parts of this article, forensic methods designed to analyse traditional computers or edge devices can be employed to some extent in the case of IoT systems. Activity analysis in such devices is extremely challenging since only a limited amount of information is kept owing to the low processing capacity in end devices.

A search and seizure is an essential part of any forensic inquiry. The most difficult component is identifying IoT or smart devices in a network or IoT environment because they are physically on the nanoscale or microscopic size and are passively automated. Evidence of cybercrime is difficult to acquire in the case of IoT devices that are part of bigger networks, due to a lack of equipment and professional expertise, as well as faulty or insufficient documentation.

When an attack occurs, hackers employ all of their talents to cover their tracks and conceal their identity. To gain some proof of the illegal activities, The forensic investigator should attempt to study the logs, which are important in this procedure. In addition, a global perspective of the target system, attack technique, and likely attacker motive is required.

The preservation of the entire digital crime scene is the most difficult task for forensics in the Internet of Things contexts. It is not an easy process to gather data from a highly dynamic environment that has heterogeneous hardware and software architectures as well as changing resources (computing power, memory, storage space). When certain devices are turned off, all logs are destroyed, making the job of a forensic investigator nearly difficult.

Another extremely difficult issue is the lack of adequate tools for setting up A to Z crime scenes and preserving information received from sensors. The massive volume of data, including often needless data, is also interfering with preservation capacity. Hackers are now employing the most effective abilities and technologies to conceal their identities. Because of this log, they are not being updated and are displaying a fictitious route or identity. Most IoT nodes do not save any metadata, including time information, making determining the origin of evidence difficult for investigators. The correlation of pieces of evidence acquired from multiple IoT devices becomes very difficult in the event of changed data or missing temporal data.
In a Conclusion, if all five forensics stages are successful in gathering and collecting evidence, then conducting a proper crime scene presentation will be simple and beneficial.

5. CONCLUSION

A framework for IoT forensics is presented in this paper. The authors introduced the forensic ecosystem that helps investigators in the information gathering process. The steps for the forensic gathering were identified along with probable challenges in acquiring evidence from the crime scene. This work is an overview of the forensic investigation procedure and it should help in producing meaningful evidence in IoT crime. To solve the issues mentioned in this study, future research should focus on developing a framework for IoT forensics based on the correlation of data and metadata from IoT nodes.
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