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ABSTRACT

A web service composition is integrating the data from the multiple data provider depends upon the user request. The objective of this investigation is to integrate data from multiple data providers. In the existing system, Daas is used for enabling fast access on data resources on the web. This reveals that sensitive information. In this work, Daas is extended to preserve the privacy information and a formal privacy model in order to extend Daas descriptions with privacy capabilities. PCM algorithm is used for compatibility checking. This provides security for the user’s privacy information.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Web services have recently emerged as a popular medium for data publishing and sharing on the Web. A web service is a software function provided at a network address over the web or the cloud, it is a service that is "always on" as in the concept of utility computing. Thereby providing a well-documented, platform independent and interoperable method of interacting with their data. Daas (Data-as-a-Service) Services where services correspond to calls over the data sources. Daas eliminates redundancy and reduces associated expenditures by accommodating vital data in a single location, allowing data use and/or modification by multiple users via a single update point. Initially used in Web mashups, the Daas strategy is often used by commercial organizations. Data as a information is stored in the cloud and is accessible by a wide range of systems and devices. Data services can enable the data to be accessed and/or updated by multiple users while ensuring a single point for updates. Potential drawbacks to data services include server downtime from the data service provider, data loss in the event of a disaster, and the security of the data, both in its stored location and in the transmission of the data among users.

The Daas approach delivers the following benefits: a) Agility: Because data is easily accessible, customers can take immediate action and do not require an in-depth understanding of actual data. b) Affordability: Providers can construct a outsource in the presentation layer, which helps build highly affordable user interfaces and allows more feasible presentation layer change requests. c) Data quality: Data accessibility is controlled through data services, which improves data quality, as there is a single update point.

1.2 Web service composition

A Web service is a method of communication between two electronic devices over a network. It is a software function provided at a network address over the Web with the service always on as in the concept of utility computing. The W3C defines a Web service generally as a software system designed to support interoperable machine-to-machine interaction over a network. The W3C Web Services Architecture Working Group defined a Web Services Architecture, requiring a specific implementation of a "Web service." figure 1 shows the web service composition

Fig. 1: Web service composition
Other systems interact with the Web service in a manner prescribed by its description using SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) messages, typically conveyed using HTTP with an XML serialization in conjunction with other Web-related standards. Most Web services do not adopt this complex architecture. Many organizations use multiple software systems for management. Different software systems often need to exchange data with each other, and a Web service is a method of communication that allows two software systems to exchange data over the internet.

The software system that requests 82 data is called a service requester, whereas the software system that would process the request and provide the data is called a service provider. Different software might be built using. Web services architecture: the service provider sends a WSDL file to UDDI. The service requester contacts UDDI to find out who is the provider for the data it needs, and then it contacts the service provider using the SOAP protocol. The service provider validates the service request and sends structured data in an XML file, using the SOAP protocol. This XML file would be validated again by the service requester using an XSD file. A directory called UDDI (Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration) defines which software system should be contacted for which type of data. So when one software system needs one particular report/data, it would go to the UDDI and find out which another system it can contact for receiving that data. Once the software system finds out which another system it should contact, it would then contact that system using a special protocol called SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol). The service provider system would, first of all, validate the data request by referring to the WSDL file, and then process the request and send the data under the SOAP protocol.

2. FORMAL PRIVACY MODEL

2.1 Specification of privacy model

In order to define an expressive model of privacy for web services, it is necessary first to examine the nature of data and to formally describe what we mean by privacy so that can argue that we protect such private data. In this case, the term privacy relates to the right of an entity to determine why, for whom, and for how long some information should be released. Due to the privacy subjectivity, each service has to identify which data are considered as private (noted as rs). If S provides some private data, then a set of privacy requirements applies to rs, and if S collects some private data rs, then a set of privacy policies also applies to rs.

2.2 Rule for privacy

A privacy rule Ri is defined by a tuple (Ti, Di, Gi) where Ti is the topic of Ri giving the privacy facet. For instance, the topic can describe 3 purposes, recipient, or retention. Purpose topic states the intent for which a given private data rs (collected or provided by S) will be used; the recipient topic mentions if and to whom rs can be revealed the retention topic specifies until when rs is stored by a third-party service. Then, for each topic Ti, a set Di defines the value domain of the topic. The definition of Di is based on an ontology domain. For example, we consider the privacy rule Ri that corresponds to the topic T1 = recipient and the domain Di = {public, government, private-lab, research-lab, hospital, university}. To define Gi = {total, partial} as a granularity indicator, which states whether or not the data in rs, to which Ri applies, represent the totality of the service input or output. In this paper, for the sake of simplicity, we only consider the case where Gi = total.4 The definition of privacy rules, called Rule Set (RS), is described independently of any private data.

2.3 Privacy assertion

The application of a rule Ri = (Ti, Di, Gi) to private data rs is a privacy assertion noted as A (Ri, rs) = pf. S specifies its privacy concerns for rs through A(Ri, rs). For example, let consider rs = DoB and R1 which corresponds to the topic Ti = recipient and the domain D1. A privacy assertion applied to rs = DoB through R1, which states that rs will be shared with government agencies and research-lab.

2.4 Privacy requirements PRS

A service S providing some private data rs as its output specifies a set of privacy requirements, denoted as PRS, in terms of usage expectations. 4) Privacy Policy PPS: A service S requesting some private data rs’ (where rs’ = rs referring output data of S) as input specifies its privacy policy, noted PPS, stating how S is going to use rs’.

3. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

Figure 2 shows the system Architecture used for this work. The data sources are provided by DaaS composition. Service registry contains information about all the parameters. DaaS services differ from traditional Web services, in that they are stateless i.e. they only provide information about the current state of the world but do not change that state. When such a service is executed, it accepts from a user an input data of a specified format and returns back to the user some information as an output. Fig 2 summarizes the architecture of this project. While integrating web-based services the user information will be under risk. To avoid this we are providing dynamic security. In order to provide the security in web services composition shown in figure 1. In which information are integrated from distinct web services.

3.1 Modelling service composition and privacy

3.1.1 User module: In this module, Users are having authentication and security to access the detail which is presented in the web service. Before accessing or searching the details user should have the account in that otherwise they should register first.

3.1.2 Privacy-aware service composition: A compatibility matching algorithm to check privacy compatibility between component services within a composition. The compatibility matching is based on a formal privacy model. A matching threshold is set up by services to cater for partial and total privacy compatibility.
3.1.3. Privacy compatibility evaluation: There are more than 100 real Web services. The developer services include services providing online shopping information about the products, their cost, ratings given by other user’s feedback etc. In the following, we evaluate the efficiency and scalability of our compatibility algorithm. For each service deployed in our architecture, we randomly generated PR and PP files regarding its manipulated resources (i.e., inputs and outputs). Assertions in PR and PP were generated randomly and stored in XML files. All services were deployed over an Apache Tomcat 8 server on the Internet. PCM algorithm in Java and run the composition system with and without checking compatibility.

4. PRIVACY AND NEGOTIATION

The proposal of is based on privacy policy lattice which is created for mining privacy preference-service item correlations. Using this lattice, privacy policies can be visualized and privacy negotiation rules can then be generated. The Privacy Advocate approach consists of three main units: the privacy policy evaluation, the signature, and the entities preferences unit. The negotiation focuses on data recipients and purpose only. An extension of P3P is proposed in. It aims at adjusting a pervasive P3P-based negotiation mechanism for a privacy control. It implements a multi-agent negotiation mechanism on top of a pervasive P3P system. The approach proposed in aims at accomplishing privacy-aware access control by adding negotiation protocol and encrypting data under the classified level.

5. PRIVACY COMPATIBILITY MATCHING ALGORITHM

We propose an algorithm (Algorithm 1 below) called PCM (Privacy Compatibility Matching), to check the privacy compatibility of PR and PP. Then, for each rs in Pout ¼ rs in Pin, PCM checks the compatibility of assertions in PRS (related to rs) with the assertion in PPS(related to rs of S) based on the privacy subsumption described above. PCM outputs the set of incompatible assertions couple (InC). PCM matches expectations in PRS to practices in PPS and expectations in PPS to practices in PRS. Two options are possible while matching PRS and PPS. The first option is to require full matching and the second is partial matching.

Indeed, the mediator may opt for the second matching type in the case when some service is willing to sacrifice their privacy constraints. For that purpose, we present a cost model-based solution to enable partial matching. The cost model combines the notions of privacy matching degree and threshold. Due to the large number and heterogeneity of DaaS services, it is not always possible to find policy PPS that fully matches an S’s requirement PRS. The privacy matching degree gives an estimate about the ratio of PRS assertions that match PPS assertions. The privacy matching threshold gives the minimum value allowed for a matching degree. The value of is given by the service and gives an estimate of how much privacy the service is willing to sacrifice.

Algorithm 1: PCM
Input:PRS={(Aj(Ri,rsk)),j<=|PRS|,i<=|RS|,k <=|Pc|},
rskÎPRi∈RS(asssertion of privacy requirements)
input:PPS’={(Aj(Ri,rsk)),j<=|PPS’|,i<=|RS|, k<=|Pp|,rskÎPp,Ri∈RS}(assertion of privacy policy)
output: InC (These to find compatible assertion Couple)
for i=1,i<=|RS|do
for j=1,j<=|PRS|do
for j=1,j<=|PPS’|do
if(Aj(Ri,rsk)∈E
(Aj(Ri,rsk))then Aj(Ri,rsk)
is compatible with Aj(Ri,rsk)
elseInC←(Aj(Ri,rsk)
Then go to step1 End

6. CONCLUSION

This work provided Dynamic privacy model for web services. This model deals with privacy at the DaaS Composition to tackle the incompatibilities between privacy policies and requirements. Further, dynamic privacy must reveal with privacy sensitivity information whenever the privacy attack occur. Although privacy cannot be carelessly negotiated, it is still possible to negotiate
apart of the privacy policy for specific purposes. In any case, privacy policies always reflect the usage of private data as specified or agreed upon by service providers. As a future work, the aim at designing a technique for protecting the composition results from privacy attacks in cloud computing.
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