



**Products Claims Testing
Claims Test ADPC0137
IT Renew**

Author: Godfred Badu

Revision 1.0

Date: March 29, 2022

Distribution: Confidential

DISCLAIMER

The Product Claims Test is presented as the outcome of a specific test ran in laboratory environment under controlled conditions. Use of this certified product for the purpose of sanitizing data from devices tested needs to be done so after a risk assessment process. ADISA reserves the right to review the validity of this award upon changes in threat landscape.

LIABILITY

ADISA accepts no liability for any claims resulting from the use of the product tested.

REVISION HISTORY

29.03.2022 Revision 1.0 issued to Matt Mickelson



ADISA Research Centre

Phone: 0044 (1) 1582 361743

Web: www.adisa.global

Web: www.adisarc.com

Registration Number: 07390092

Registered Office: Ground Floor, 5 Kinsbourne Court, Harpenden, AL5 3BL, United Kingdom

Contents

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1.0 | Executive Summary | 4 |
| 2.0 | Test Level 1 Testing Solid State and Magnetic Hard Drives | 5 |
| 2.1 | Methodology. | 5 |
| 3.0 | Test Level 2 Testing Solid State Drive | 6 |
| 3.1 | Methodology. | 6 |
| 5.0 | Summary and Conclusions. | 8 |

CONFIDENTIAL

1.0 Executive Summary

This is a preliminary report detailing the findings in relation to the execution of the ADISA Testing Methodology on Claims Test ADPC0133 submitted by Matt Mickelson of IT Renew in January 2022.

The claims test was carried out in accordance with ADISA Claims Testing (ACT) v1.0 and supporting document ADISA Testing Methodology v1.4, both of which are available from ADISA.

The claim made was:

“The Teraware Digital Asset Disposition Platform version 4.0 can, using Teraware SAS/SATA SSD sanitization method and by following instructions within Teraware User Manual version 3, forensically sanitise the solid state device supplied within this claim overwriting all user data such that it is unrecoverable using techniques aligned to ADISA Risk Levels 1 and 2 as outlined in section 3. Upon successful sanitisation, it produces a Certificate of Sanitisation to validate this.”. ADPC0137

Six devices were submitted as part of this test and these are listed below:

| Device | Test Level |
|--|------------|
| Intel SSD DC S3510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2BB240G6) | 1 and 2 |
| Intel SSD DC S3610 1.6TB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2BX016T4) | 1 and 2 |
| Intel SSD DC S4500 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2KB240G7) | 1 and 2 |
| Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2KB240G8) | 1 and 2 |
| Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB M.2 2280 SATA-SSD (Model SSDSCCKB240G8) | 1 and 2 |
| Toshiba HG6 256GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model THNSNJ256GCSY) | 1 and 2 |

After testing it is confirmed that the IT Renew **claim is true** for the devices tested up to Test Level 1 and 2 results. The device tested was:

- Intel SSD DC S3510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD Model SSDSC2BB240G6
- Intel SSD DC S3610 1.6TB SFF SATA-SSD Model SSDSC2BX016T4
- Intel SSD DC S4500 240GB SFF SATA-SSD Model SSDSC2KB240G7
- Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD Model SSDSC2KB240G8
- Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB M.2 2280 SATA-SSD Model SSDSCCKB240G8
- Toshiba HG6 256GB SFF SATA-SSD Model THNSNJ256GCSY

2.0 Test Level 1 Testing Solid State and Magnetic Hard Drives

2.1 Methodology.

This test phase is designed to evaluate the claim made by recreating an attack by a threat adversary utilising standard COTS forensic tools and techniques.

For each computer hard drive device, the following methodology is performed:

1. The device is connected to a target PC and place in a stable state.
2. The applicant software was configured in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
3. Structured data, the string "ADISA", was written to every logical block address on the hard drive.
4. The device was then imaged using standard imaging techniques to create a base-line forensic image.
5. The device was then erased using the applicant's software in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
6. The device was then analysed use using the following tools to create a second forensic image:
 - a. Standard commercial tools and techniques such as Access Data/FTK, Forensic Explorer and Encase.
7. The two forensic images (Stage 4 and Stage 6) were then compared and contrasted to ensure that all structured data had been removed.
 - a. For this test, there is no tolerance for remnant structured data and the result is a straight Pass or Fail.

2.2 Test Results.

Test Level 1 Summary Results

Test Level 1 replicated an attack on this device being made by an aggressor with capabilities outlined below.

| Risk Level | Threat Actor and Compromise Methods | Test Level |
|------------|---|------------|
| 1 (Low) | Casual or opportunistic threat actor only able to mount high-level non-invasive and non-destructive software attacks utilising freeware, OS tools and COTS products. Commercial data recovery organisation able to mount non-invasive and non-destructive software attacks and hardware attacks. | 1 |

The Results of Test Level 1.

| Hard Drive/Model | Result |
|--|--------|
| Intel SSD DC S3510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2BB240G6) | PASS |
| Intel SSD DC S3610 1.6TB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2BX016T4) | PASS |
| Intel SSD DC S4500 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2KB240G7) | PASS |
| Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2KB240G8) | PASS |
| Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB M.2 2280 SATA-SSD (Model SSDSCKKB240G8) | PASS |
| Toshiba HG6 256GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model THNSNJ256GCSY) | PASS |

Pass means that the software Teraware v4.0 mitigates the threat posed by the Threat Actors holding the capabilities outlined by Test Level 1 on the tested device and the claim made can be confirmed.

3.0 Test Level 2 Testing Solid State Drive

3.1 Methodology.

This test phase is designed to evaluate the claim made by recreating an attack by a threat adversary utilising standard intrusive/destructive testing tools designed to read data directly off the device at the platter/chip level.

For each computer hard drive device, the following methodology is performed:

1. The device is connected to a target PC and place in a stable state.
2. The applicant software was configured in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
3. If present on the test device the DCO and HPA are removed.
4. Structured data, the string "ADISA", was written to every logical block address on the hard drive.
5. The device was then imaged using standard imaging techniques to create a base-line forensic image.
6. The device was then erased using the applicant's software in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
7. The device was then analysed use the following tools and techniques to create a series of forensic images that are compared and contrasted with the base-line forensic image to ensure that all structured data has been removed. For this test, there is no tolerance for remnant structured data and the result is a straight Pass or Fail.
 - a. Software based forensic tools/techniques such as:
 - i. Standard commercial tools and techniques such as Access Data/FTK, Forensic Explorer and Encase;
 - ii. State of the art data recovery tools such as PC3000 SSD, PC3000 UDMA/SAS;
 - iii. Customer designed data recovery software.
 - b. Hardware/Chip based forensic tools/techniques such as:
 - i. Flash/NAND TSOP/BGA chip readers;
 - ii. State of the art data recovery tools such as PC3000 FLASH, PC3000 SSD and Rusolut;
 - iii. Hardware debugging techniques such as JTAG, I3C and SPI;
 - iv. Customer designed data recovery software/hardware.

3.2 Test Results.

Test Level 2 Summary Results

Test Level 2 replicated an attack on this device being made by an aggressor with capabilities outlined below.

| Risk Level | Threat Actor and Compromise Methods | Test Level |
|---------------|---|------------|
| 2 (Medium) | Commercial computer forensics organisation able to mount both non-invasive/non-destructive and invasive/non-destructive software and hardware attack, utilising COTS products. Commercial data recovery and computer forensics organisation able to mount both non-invasive/non-destructive and invasive/ non-destructive software and hardware attack, utilising both COTS and bespoke utilities. | 2 |

The Results of Test Level 2.

| <i>Hard Drive/Model</i> | <i>Result</i> |
|--|---------------|
| Intel SSD DC S3510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2BB240G6) | PASS |
| Intel SSD DC S3610 1.6TB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2BX016T4) | PASS |
| Intel SSD DC S4500 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2KB240G7) | PASS |
| Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model SSDSC2KB240G8) | PASS |
| Intel SSD D3 S4510 240GB M.2 2280 SATA-SSD (Model SSDSCKKB240G8) | PASS |
| Toshiba HG6 256GB SFF SATA-SSD (Model THNSNJ256GCSY) | PASS |

Pass means that the software Teraware v4.0 mitigates the threat posed by the Threat Actors holding the capabilities outlined by Test Level 2 on the tested device and the claim made can be confirmed.

5.0 Summary and Conclusions.

Claims Test Result: Pass on device tested..

The six devices submitted for testing passed the claims test as all-forensic data recovery techniques up to and including ADISA Test Level 1 and 2 failed to recover any data. The software tested was the Teraware 4.0.

Claims Test Carried Out By: Godfred Badu

Test Facility: ADISA Research Centre



Signature:

Date: 29.03.2022

CONFIDENTIAL