

Comparing Prosecution Computer Forensics with Management Computer Forensics

Prosecution Forensics	Management Forensics
The use of specialized techniques and software to retrieve evidence of computer use.	Using specialized techniques and software to understand and monitor computer use.
Focuses backward in time.	Focuses forward in time.
Attempts to develop a history of the sex offender's use.	Is primarily focused on monitoring and managing future use of the computer, but obtains treatment and supervision related information about past usage.
Is relatively easy to defeat.	Is more difficult to defeat.
Primarily used for prosecuting new offenses.	Primarily used for managing and supervising convicted offenders.
Provides evidence for removing offender from the community.	Provides enhanced public safety for offenders living in the community.
Used on "defendants".	Used on Probationers and Parolees.
Computer is seized and bitstream imaged then analyzed for historical use.	Computer is examined live for historical use and software is installed to monitor future use.
Chain of evidence and level of proof is strict.	Chain of evidence and level of proof is more flexible.

Traditional methods of computer forensics provide excellent prosecutorial evidence. They are not, however, well suited to managing sex offenders in the community. We cannot seize offenders' work computers for simple monitoring purposes, nor can we routinely remove computers from offenders' homes for monitoring. Even if we could remove offenders' computers, local forensic labs cannot handle the volume of monitoring tasks presented by the current probation/parole sex offender caseloads. Moreover, as our offenders increase their computer sophistication and anti-forensic software becomes progressively more available on the web, traditionally based computer forensics will become easier to defeat.

Management forensics establishes a new and modified approach to sex offenders' computers and Internet use. This approach focuses on managing future computer use and has resulted in higher levels of sex offender containment, increased supervising officer satisfaction, and timely offender revocation for inappropriate computer use. Perhaps equally important, it is low cost and supervising officers can quickly and easily manage offenders' computers without burdening local forensic laboratories.