

CloudProtect: A Middleware for Managing Privacy in Cloud Applications

Prosunjit Biswas
UTSA

Abstract

Cloud computing applications have increased significantly in recent years due to improved accessibility, availability and services at reduced costs. Examples of such services include Google Calendar, Microsoft HealthVault, and Yahoo Briefcase. In such services, the service provider provides the storage as well as the web application that utilizes the storage. Despite their benefits however, these services present significant security and privacy risks to their users. Users data is exposed to both outsider and insider attacks, and users dont have any control over the security and privacy management of the data. We propose CloudProtect, a middleware that sits between the client and service provider applications empowering users with the ability to manage their security and privacy needs for these cloud applications. The middleware enables the tradeoff analysis between data privacy, usability, and efficiency. We implemented CloudProtect and adapted it to work with Google Calendar, Google Docs, and Gmail. Our experimental results highlight the feasibility of the approach.

1. Introduction

With the advances of the web and cloud computing technologies, we are undergoing a paradigm shift in how we manage our data and build applications. A variety of enduser applications that let users manage their emails, documents, healthcare data etc., are available today over the cloud. The application-as-a-service model offers numerous advantages to end-users e.g., 24/7 availability, accessibility from anywhere/anytime, lower cost etc. Examples of such services include calendar applications [1], document management applications [2], database as a service applications [7, 8], personal health record services to name a few. These applications are available to users either free of charge or on pay-peruse basis. Instead of acquiring and installing the applications on their machines, users can access them from anywhere at any time simply through a browser based interface. As a result, large volumes of personal and organizational data is migrating to the cloud at an amazing pace.

The fundamental issue is that once the data is stored at the service provider, users do not have any control over how it is used or who accesses it on the service provider side. As a consequence, this lack of mechanisms for enabling end-users to control security of their data at the service-provider is one of the primary limitations to the adoption of cloud applications. Furthermore, the security mechanisms followed by them remain vulnerable to insider attacks. Many surveys [5] have revealed that concerns of security and privacy are the primary barriers to adoption of cloud computing by governmental, healthcare, and financial institutions. Even if the service providers

themselves were fully trusted, since the cloud applications authenticate end-users through login credentials, the data stored within the applications are vulnerable to miscreants who steal such credentials and masquerade as data owners.

In this thesis, we propose an extendible middleware called CloudProtect, the goal of which is to enable user-driven application level data to be stored on the service provider side in encrypted form. CloudProtect empowers the end users to add an extra layer of protection to their own data. To limit such overheads, CloudProtect maintains a policy that dictates which data is stored in plaintext and which is stored encrypted at the server. Such a policy, learnt from user interaction with the application, supports a tradeoff between costs/overhead incurred and the amount of (duration for which) sensitive data is exposed in plain text to the server. The policies learnt by CloudProtect are based on user-specified parameters that capture the degree of tolerance a user has to increased overheads as well as to potential information breach and are, furthermore, subject to human-override. Additionally, CloudProtect facilitates key management and secure sharing of encrypted data.

Contribution

1. We propose CloudProtect, a middleware framework that mediates between users and the cloud applications providers to enable privacy management services. The framework includes a data model and function model for describing the cloud applications and a policy model for expressing confidentiality policies.
2. CloudProtect enables the automatic tradeoff of privacy, usability, and efficiency. Privacy is measured in terms of the number privacy violations, usability by the number of interruptions, and efficiency through the cost associated with the executions of operations on transformed objects. Given the set of objects that have been stored so far in the database, the tradeoff is achieved by generalizing/relaxing the policies so that the number of interruptions and/or costs associated with the operations are below some thresholds.

2. Related Work

CloudProtect is related to recently proposed system Silverline [4] that also aimed to support encrypting user data in cloud applications. Silverline introduced the concept of functional encryption wherein the system identifies all data items that can be encrypted in a manner that is transparent to the application. It uses dynamic program analysis to identify functionally encryptable data in a cloud-based application and proposes an encryption key assignment and sharing solution that enables people

Another closely related work is the technical report presented in [6]. Like CloudProtect, this report considers a middleware based approach for providing privacy management in cloud applications. The middleware is implemented as a proxy that can process both HTTP and HTTPS requests. Sharing the encryption keys is also performed via email messages that cannot be accessed by the cloud application servers. In addition to randomized encryption for strong protection, deterministic encryption is used to support search on the encrypted data, with lesser security. This work however differs from CloudProtect in a number of ways. (1) It does not abstract out the data and the functionality of the cloud applications into a general framework, which can be adapted for any application. (2) It does not provide an expressive policy-based data encryption mechanism such as




Figure 1. Cloud Protect Framework

CloudProtect, which can be used to selectively encrypt the data. All data is encrypted without considering the implication in terms of efficiency. (3) Encryption naturally increases the computation and communication overheads of the cloud applications. Unlike CloudProtect where these overheads can be reduced though policy rebalancing, this approach does not address this problem. The PrivatePond system [2] considers the problem of outsourcing storage and search to an untrusted server. Like CloudProtect, the search engine functionality of the server is preserved. The main idea is that search can be carried out using a secured index. A simple indexable representation of data is presented. For the security analysis two attack models are considered; one attack is on a single indexable representation 9

3. Proposed Method

As mentioned before, the goal of CloudProtect is to enable users to selectively decide how to protect their data through transformations, and alert the users through interruptions when certain operations cannot be queried out or incur high cost due to some transformations. Deciding how data is to be transformed (or not be transformed) is achieved through privacy policies. Anytime the representation of a data item is changed to enable the execution of an operation, an exception to the policy is generated. These exceptions correspond to the privacy violations and increase proportionally with the interruptions.

The CloudProtect framework shown in 1 involves three entities: user, cloud application (web client, web server, DB), and privacy middleware. Figure 3.1 depicts the high-level design of the framework. The user interacts with the web server through the web client, implemented as a web browser application, to store and retrieve data from the DB. The Privacy Middleware performs the tasks of encrypting the data to store on the server and decrypting the data retrieved from the server according to the user policies. The life-cycle of the framework comprises three phases: initialization, operational, and policy rebalancing. In the following, each of these phases is described in details.

3.1 Initialization Phase

The initialization phase includes the registration of the cloud applications to be serviced by CloudProtect, the definition of confidentiality policies, and setting up system parameters. Each application that is supported in CloudProtect needs to be registered one time, during which, the data model and the function model are created and stored in the local storage. Using the data model, a user can define confidentiality policies or just use the default policy of encrypting everything strongly.

3.1.1 Data Model

We take an object oriented approach to modeling the user data in an application. The data object is defined by a set of attributes and each data item is an instance of this object. More formally, let us model the data stored at the database as a set of n multidimensional objects, (o_1, o_2, \dots, o_n) , where each object o_i is a tuple of k attributes $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k\}$. Each attribute A_i is defined as a tuple of the form $\langle name, value, type \rangle$. We denote the set of these attributes by $o.A$ where $|o.A| = n, n \geq 1$. The attribute name $A_i.name$ and the attribute type $A_i.type$ are determined by the server and the attribute value $A_i.value$ is the user or system data (to be made more precise below). The attribute name $A_i.name$ is the unique identifier of the attribute. The attribute type $A_i.type$ can be a simple data type such as string, integer, double, and boolean, or a complex data type such as text file, image file, video file, and sound file. For instance, in Google Calendar, there is an object corresponding to every event and its fields such as what, when, and where, comprise the set of attributes. Similarly, in Google Docs, a file can be the object o and the file content, the creation date and the author, the attributes of the object o .

3.1.2 Functional Model

We model a cloud application services/functionality as a set of m functions F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m , which operate on a subset of the object attributes. F is similar in spirit to a method in object oriented programming, which needs to be instantiated with specific parameters at runtime. Given an instantiation of a function F and a set of objects $\{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_n\}$ on which F is applied to, there is a concept of dependence between F and the objects. We say that F depends on an object o , iff F is operated on at least one attribute of o . Hence, the normal execution of F depends on the particular representations of the dependent attributes in o . On Google Calendar for example, the successful execution of the function search on where depends only on how this attribute is transformed not the others like what and description.

3.1.3 Data Encryption

CloudProtects protection mechanism consists of a library of type-specific transformation techniques. It combines all the applicable rules to derive the appropriate protection level for an attribute of an object. We use a tagging technique similar to that used in XML, to embed the transformed data in the HTTP messages. The tags show where the encrypted data starts and ends in both, an HTTP request and HTTP response. This tagging technique is very useful for segmenting the transformed data embedded in the server-response.

4. Performance

The objectives of the experiments were to measure the performance of CloudProtect as implemented and used for Google Calendar and Google Docs. We measured the computation costs of the middleware in enforcing data confidentiality constraints by encrypting and decrypting data objects, and the associated storage costs. In addition to the basic experiments that compare the storage/computation tradeoffs, we analyzed the two implemented algorithms (deterministic and randomized encryptions) along the following dimensions: scalability, search performance, and content heterogeneity. The scalability experiment investigated the behavior of the middleware in terms of computation cost as the number of objects to encrypt and decrypt increases.

The search performance study focuses on the system performance in terms of query execution over encrypted data. The content heterogeneity experiment explored how the variation in the size of the objects affects the behavior of the middleware. We used real data to drive the experiments on both Google Calendar and Google Docs. For Google Calendar, we generated a number of events, with different sizes, ranging approximately from 1KB to 20KB. For Google Docs, we selected also a number of files of varying types (doc, excel, ppt, pdf, text) and sizes (from 28 KB to 4000 KB). All experiments were executed on a MacBook Pro laptop machine. Since the current implementation of the middleware utilizes only cryptographic algorithms to protect the data, we use the time it takes for encryption and decryption of the data and the extra storage needed by the encryption algorithms as the main metrics for the experimental study.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

Ensuring privacy of data in cloud applications, where service providers are not trusted is challenging. The difficulty stems from the fact that service providers do not provide any support for protecting users data. In this thesis, we propose CloudProtect, a policy-based privacy middleware for supplementing existing cloud applications with a mechanism for protecting users data, without any modification of these applications. CloudProtect is intended to work with a variety of cloud applications where one has no control over the server side functionality beyond what APIs may provide. Such APIs often do not have any support for data confidentiality at all. We take a more pragmatic approach to provisioning data confidentiality in cloud applications - here data may be partially exposed as long as it does not violate the privacy constraints. For example, the requirement that certain attribute values not be exactly determinable can be a privacy constraint. Such an approach, which represents a significant departure from prior work, has numerous advantages. In addition to improved efficiency, limited disclosure allows for value-added services that are key benefits of today's personal data outsourcing services.

References

- [1] Mihir Bellare, Thomas Ristenpart, Phillip Rogaway, and Till Stegers. Formatpreserving encryption. In *Selected Areas in Cryptography*, pages 295312, 2009. Lucas Ballard, Seny Kamara, and Fabian Monrose. Achieving efficient conjunctive
- [2] keyword searches over encrypted data. In *ICICS*, pages 414426, 2005. Mihir Bellare, Alexandra Boldyreva, and Adam O'Neill. Deterministic and efficiently searchable encryption. In *CRYPTO*, pages 535552, 2007.
Hakan Hacigumus, Balakrishna R. Iyer, Chen Li, and Sharad Mehrotra. Executing sql over encrypted data in the database-service-provider model. In *SIGMOD Conference*, pages 216227, 2002.
- [3] Yan-Cheng Chang and Michael Mitzenmacher. Privacy preserving keyword searches on remote encrypted data. In *ACNS*, pages 442455, 2005.
- [4] Hakan Hacigumus, Bijit Hore, Balakrishna R. Iyer, and Sharad Mehrotra. Search on encrypted data. In *Secure Data Management in Decentralized Systems*, pages 383425. 2007.
- [5] Craig Gentry. Fully homomorphic encryption using ideal lattices. In Michael Mitzenmacher, editor, *STOC*, pages 169178. ACM, 2009.
- [6] Krishna P. N. Puttaswamy, Christopher Kruegel, and Ben Y. Zhao. Silverline: Toward data confidentiality in third-party clouds. In *ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, October 2011.