



The Virtual Twin:

A Socialization Agent for Peer-to-Peer Networks

Alexandre Gachet, University of Hawaii at Manoa, USA
Pius Haettenschwiler, University of Fribourg, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

As peer-to-peer computing finally reaches a critical mass, it triggers changes in the IT landscape that traditional network infrastructures, based on centralized, client/server topologies, cannot manage. Consequently, the ad hoc, self-organized, and loosely controlled nature of peer-to-peer networks needs to be supported by a new coordination layer representing the interests of the user. In order to define this new abstraction layer, this paper introduces the concept of the virtual twin — a kind of anthropomorphic representation of the networked person with whom the user can identify and feel comfortable. We discuss the inner structure of the virtual twin, first in an intuitive and informal way with an emphasis on its social aspect, then in a more detailed way with the analysis of its main components.

Keywords: communications infrastructure; network topology; social impacts; user-centered design

INTRODUCTION

After many years of theoretical discussions and technical experimentations, peer-to-peer computing finally reached a decent level of acceptance and a critical mass (Wagner, 2003). The answer to many *why now?* questions is technology and money, and that is true here. On the one hand, technological advances allowed Internet access providers to bring low-cost, high bandwidth, and constant Internet connections within everyone's reach through

DSL and/or cable subscriptions. Coupled with cheap WiFi appliances and a growing amount of wireless hotspots in public areas such as airports, hotels, parks, squares, coffee shops, fast food (Brewin, 2003b; Fleishman, 2003), airborne (Disabatino, 2003) or on the train (Brewin, 2003a), these Internet connections give computer users a new sense of mobility, virtual presence, and location awareness. On the other hand, peer-to-peer collaborative software (i.e., Groove) or controversial file exchange tools (i.e., Napster or Kazaa) suddenly brought

the possibilities of decentralized computing to the attention of many eager users of the network.

Interestingly enough, the advent of peer-to-peer technologies on a larger scale triggered changes in the IT landscape that were not necessarily foreseen. For example, the well-known characteristics of traditional client/server architectures (i.e., simplicity, security, centralized authority, clear connection status¹, replication, backup, and load balancing) are gradually being replaced by a set of features that turn the networks into groupings with fuzzy and unpredictable boundaries, as follows:

- Groups of users are formed today in an ad hoc fashion (i.e., informally and on-the-fly).
- In the new real-time economy, more and more relationships are established among individuals of different organizations, rather than of the same organization. This type of collaboration in which large numbers of geographically dispersed people quickly self-organize in a peer-to-peer network to deal with a problem or opportunity is called *swarming* (Melymuka, 2003).
- The centralized control of the almighty system administrator is replaced with new authorization mechanisms based on spontaneous invitations or “friend-of-a-friend” standards.
- Newer distributed technologies supporting these kinds of groupings are increasingly dynamic, self-forming, self-managed, and self-healing.

In many ways, these characteristics free users from many constraints related to system configuration and management. However, peer-to-peer technologies also weaken the sense of control that users previously had on their networked transactions,

as it becomes more difficult to know precisely who is connected with whom, when, how long, and for what exact purpose. As a result, users come with newer questions: Who manages the knowledge that I put into a network available environment? Who takes care of my personal objectives in the overall community? Who checks that my preferences are respected during interactions? Who supervises my communications with other users? As a matter of fact, the concepts of identity, reputation, reciprocity, cooperation, boundaries, and social networking are growing more and more important in order to avoid being the target of free riders (Rheingold, 2002). In other words, the actors of traditional client/server networks trust the system administrator, who represents the central authority screening the network activity, punishing those who do not stick to the rules. It is crucial to know who or what replaces this role in a distributed, decentralized system.

The emergence of peer-to-peer technologies also impacts the representation of the individuals in the network. The virtual counterpart of a person in a traditional network is usually called a client, defined by one or several well-defined roles and by precise capabilities managed on the server. The advent of peer-to-peer computing and wireless networking now inspires the vision of “mobile devices [that] will broadcast *clouds of personal data* to invisible monitors all around us as we move from place to place” (Rheingold, 2002, p. xviii). The “clouds of data” image gives a good idea of the blurred boundaries of an individual’s virtual representation in a peer-to-peer network. The “invisible monitors all around us” vividly expresses the fact that we are losing awareness of our connections. Even stronger, the person is referred to as a “personal area network,” an inter-

connected network of devices worn or carried by the user (Zimmermann, 1996). Identifying an individual as a personal area network certainly opens new opportunities on the technical level, but it also is much more intimidating and less intuitive for the user.

Even if it is not exclusively related to peer-to-peer computing, the recent surge of identity theft cases clearly shows how the real-world and virtual identities of individuals are decoupled in today's widely networked environment. With 27.3 million Americans victims of identity theft in the last five years, and 9.9 million people joining this list in just the last 12 months² (Rupley, 2003), identity theft is considered as the fastest-growing crime in the United States (Chang, 2003).

We contend that the main problem lies in the fact that newer distributed technologies provide a distributed infrastructure allowing system designers to build dynamic and distributed computer systems. However, an infrastructure is not enough to deal with the specifics of a social network and to answer the previously mentioned questions. These specifics need to be managed by a different coordination layer. What we need is a new, anthropomorphic representation of the networked person, whom the user can identify with and feel comfortable with. To define this new abstraction layer, we introduce a new concept called the *virtual twin*. We believe that this concept can enable and promote the design of human-friendly, secure, dynamic, and social peer-to-peer systems, enhancing the inherent qualities of modern technologies without limiting the freedom of the developers. It can also lead to a new language that will allow system designers, architects, programmers, and end-users to communicate about decentralized models. More formally, it can be the basis of new methodologies able to solve problems and develop

systems that satisfy the users' requirements.


The remainder of this paper introduces the inner structure of the virtual twin, first in an intuitive and informal way with an emphasis on its social aspect, then in a more detailed way with the analysis of its main components. Many ideas, concepts, and components presented in this article have been implemented (or are in the process of being implemented) in an open-source project named DicodeSS (<http://www.dicodeSS.org>). In a nutshell, DicodeSS is a software framework for developing distributed cooperative decision support systems (DSS). It helps various actors active in the same LAN or WLAN to cooperate during decision-making activities. The main purpose of this software framework is to help build DSS for mission-critical, decision-making situations happening in highly decentralized environments, where traditional network appliances may be missing or strongly restricted. To reach that goal, the software framework takes advantage of the capabilities of modern computer devices to build ad hoc, peer-to-peer networks without relying on external network infrastructures.

THE VIRTUAL TWIN

Informal Presentation

From a conceptual point of view, a virtual twin can be seen as the alter ego of a user, living on the network instead of in the real world. Modern IT systems become natural extensions of the users' capabilities. The virtual twin precisely personifies this extension. The three main components of a virtual twin are (a) its working memory, (b) its network capabilities, and (c) its computing capabilities (Figure 1).

Figure 1. High level view of two virtual twins



Together, these three components build a working environment. A careful development, taking into account the specific requirements of these components, can lead to distributed systems able to build coherent social networks. The components will be described in detail in the coming sections of this paper and are only informally introduced here.

It is easy to draw a simple parallel between a user and its corresponding virtual twin. While the human user manages

his or her knowledge in the part of the brain called memory, the human's virtual twin manages a formalized version of this knowledge in a part of the network called working memory. Then, while the user employs his or her cognitive abilities to think, the virtual twin uses the available computing power to process data, to infer new information, and to provide specialized services to other virtual twins. Finally, while the user takes advantage of various verbal and non-verbal communication mechanisms to socially interact with peers, the user's virtual twin uses the available network capabilities to interact with other virtual twins. From the user's point of view, the virtual twin hides the specifics of the underlying distributed architecture. In other words, the virtual twin of a user manages the interests of the user on the user's behalf.

Deciding if the virtual twin should be considered as a simple agent or not is difficult, given the very broad scope of the field and the numerous definitions of what an agent can be. As explained in the coming sections of this article, we prefer to view virtual twins as a fluctuating population of software components, services, and agents. Traditional agents provide local functionality. Mobile agents are able to move from device to device to provide this local functionality (insourcing). Services provide remote functionality (outsourcing). As explained later, a typical population of virtual twins includes a few generic agents and services, and many specialized agents and services.

This model fosters cooperation and collaboration between the agents and services provided by a virtual twin. In that sense, the virtual twin becomes a kind of knowledge factory. Another parallel can be drawn here: while real-world factories have become natural extensions of the physical

capacities of humans, the virtual twin — as a knowledge factory — becomes a natural and networked extension of its owner's brains. Workers in this virtual factory are represented mostly by agents and services.

The Social Effect

To understand why we call the virtual twin a socialization agent, it is important to understand the ins and outs of social computing. In this section, we introduce social networks and analyze their influence on social software.

Researchers agree on the fact that a social network is composed of individuals and ties (Hanneman, 2001; Wellman & Carrington, 1988). Unlike communities of practice (Wenger, McDermott et al., 2002) or virtual communities (Feld, 1981; Valtersson, 1996), the structure does not play an important role in a social network, even if any individual may have different types of relationships with any other. Individuals mostly socialize around their own individual goals, not around a shared, federating goal. The main characteristics of a social network are its flexible structure, a lack of hierarchy, and weak importance of the emotional dimension (Foucault, Metzger et al., 2002). A good metaphor is the rhizome metaphor, which is a conceptual framework for the generative possibilities of non-hierarchical networks of all kinds on the Internet (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983).

For the purpose of this paper, we hold that only a discriminating factor allows us to differentiate individuals in the social network and individuals in the environment of the social network (Gachet & Brezillon, 2005). There exists different discriminating factors and as many social networks as discriminating factors. A discriminating factor does not imply strong ties among in-

dividuals because there is no shared goal. For example, a discriminating factor is "living in Switzerland," which does not imply a concerted goal for all persons living in Switzerland.

Ties among individuals of a social network can be of different natures: familial ties, lifelong friend ties, marital ties, or business partner ties that are important for people to obtain the fundamentals of identity, affection, and emotional and material support (Rheingold, 2000) (i.e., the recognition of their existence by others). Ties can have a descriptive function in the social network, helping insiders and outsiders to have a better understanding of the network. Ties usually change slowly over time, mostly for exogenous reasons weakly related to the discriminating factor. Functional ties should not be mistaken for roles. The commitment of individuals is superficial, limited to the reasons of the local interaction (Foucault, Metzger et al., 2002). As a consequence, ties are socially oriented like in real life (weak ties), and individuals generally belong to several social networks where they do not play crucial roles.

The computer-supported management of social networks naturally leads to the concept of *social software*. Traditional project-oriented collaboration tools place people into groups in a top-down way. The new trend of social software support the desire of individuals to be pulled into groups to achieve goals, in a bottom-up manner. Social software is likely to come to mean the opposite of what groupware and other project- or organization-oriented collaboration tools were intended to be (Boyd, 2003). This is in strong contrast with the groupware approach, where people are placed into groups defined organizationally or functionally.

Interestingly enough, Boyd (2003) put forth similar arguments about control as per

the peer-to-peer networks vs. client/server systems described previously:

Traditional groupware puts the group, the organization or the project first, and individuals second. As a member of a Lotus Notes group, for example, you are provided specific access to specific sorts of information based on the administrator's settings. It's all about control. (...) Social software reflects the "juice" that arises from people's personal interactions. It's not about control, it's about co-evolution. (Boyd, 2003)

Among the premises of social software, Boyd mentions (1) support for conversational interaction between individuals or groups, (2) support for social feedback (i.e., through digital reputation), and (3) support for social networks (to explicitly create and manage a digital expression of people's personal relationships). As we will see in the coming sections, the three main components of the virtual twin help implement this support in systems going beyond simple group forming networks.

Federalist Model of Cooperation

The concept of the virtual twin is built on top of the federalist model of cooperation (Gachet, 2004). In this peer-to-peer, human-centered model, each user receives a working environment tailored to his or her role(s) and skills, and able to adapt continuously to his or her changing requirements. This working environment contains both the specific knowledge of the user and services provided by the user to other members of the community. Each working environment contains a minimal set of infrastructure services needed to run the distributed infrastructure. These services mostly provide basic functionalities such as services lookup, transactions management,

interprocesses communication, and distributed storage. If the user has the appropriate rights, he or she can invite a new user to join the community. A community can only grow by invitation. This simple scheme based on trust is both natural and intuitive.

Gachet and Haettenschwiler (2003a) show that this federalist model was suitable to create dynamic, self-formed, self-managed, and self-healing³ communities. However, they did not indicate how the model could be implemented successfully and efficiently. The concept of the virtual twin goes one step further in that direction and provides techniques that end-users can use to define their requirements, and that developers can use to implement the corresponding IT systems. The next sections describe the three components of the virtual twin and the functionalities they should provide.

VIRTUAL TWIN'S COMPONENTS

The Working Memory

The working memory is the repository of the virtual twin's knowledge (i.e., the knowledge of the user, stored in the twin's working memory). Each virtual twin possesses its own working memory, and several virtual twins interacting in a distributed environment can share knowledge by accessing other virtual twins' working memories. In that sense, the architecture is perfectly scalable.

The end-users should use this component to describe their data requirements and the privacy and security policy that should be applied to the management of this data. The developers should use this component to implement a distributed data management subsystem⁴ that satisfies the

users' requirements, as well as technical requirements. As examples of technical requirements, we can mention that the data of a specific virtual twin should be broken down into well-defined, independent knowledge units. It should be possible to share, reuse, extend, and combine these units. They should be easily represented and managed in the GUI of the system. They should also have a privacy level such as public, protected, or private.

Value enhancement of the knowledge is a fundamental function of a social network and depends on three criteria: information traceability, information assessment, and peer pricing. First, information traceability is very important in a peer-to-peer network. Even if the knowledge units can be exchanged easily and modified, the identity of the various actors involved in the life cycle of the unit must be retained in its history. Otherwise, there is no incentive for an individual to improve the quality of knowledge units if the individual's contributions are not recognized in the community, or, even worse, if they are misused by others. Moreover, the clearly documented history of a unit life cycle creates a kind of value-added chain at the knowledge level, as it becomes possible to know who changed what in a knowledge unit, when, and for what purpose.

Then, information assessment is necessary to appreciate the perceived value of a knowledge unit in a community. The more the actors use and develop existing knowledge units (through their virtual twins), the more the units become rich in contents. The degree of development of a unit life cycle should be clearly expressed in the system to help users identifying the level of maturity of any given unit.

Finally, peer pricing acts as an incentive for individuals to contribute to the development of knowledge units. Active and

first-class contributors should be rewarded according to a model similar to supply and demand. The more the contributions of a user are retrieved, the more the user is rewarded⁵. Rewards can only be granted if the knowledge units have a price. This price is dictated by the other peers of the community. This kind of return on investment should motivate the contributors to input new knowledge units into the working memory of their virtual twins. Peer pricing is linked closely with peer reputation, a concept that will be described in the next section. Conversely, knowledge units that are outdated, devaluated, and neither used nor developed should be gradually removed from the memory to avoid cluttering the knowledge space. After all, any life cycle ends with the death or destruction of its subject. This aspect also should be accounted for by the working memory.

The Network Capabilities

The network capabilities represent the services needed to bring the distributed, peer-to-peer network up and alive. On the technical level, they group the infrastructure services that need to be implemented by developers to run the distributed system. Examples of infrastructure services include services lookup, transactions management, interprocesses communication, device transparency, and security. On the user level, they group the socialization services needed to turn a basic computer network into a coherent social community. Socialization services should be defined as modules.

A critical module is the reputation management subsystem. Reputation systems have been made popular by successful Web sites such as eBay. In a nutshell, eBay is an Internet auction site allowing

sellers and potential buyers to exchange goods through an auction system. As a global marketplace, eBay could face a lot of distrust between buyers and sellers if both categories were completely anonymous. By introducing the possibility for each buyer to evaluate the seller (positively, neutrally, or negatively) and each seller to evaluate the buyer, eBay gives each buyer/seller a reputation, as everyone can see how many buyers/sellers appreciated the behavior of a given individual in the past. In the working environment presented in this paper, reputation is not built by direct peer evaluation, but by the number of contributions in high-priced knowledge units (according to the peer pricing criterion described in the previous section). In other words, the reputation of a virtual twin is based on the quality of its knowledge.

The reputation subsystem should be completed by an identity management subsystem. Given that peer-to-peer networks are built on-the-fly without central repositories able to store and retrieve identity information about all the connected users, each virtual twin should be able to broadcast personal data about the corresponding individual. This data, combined with reputation information, shape the personality of the virtual twin.

Yet, another important socialization module should take the form of a collaboration framework fostering reciprocity, awareness, and the preservation of the user's own interests. Unlike the identity management subsystem, which returns generic information about a virtual twin, awareness functions propagate real-time information and answer questions like the following: Is this user present in the network right now? Is the user available, active, cooperating with other users, in a good mood, and so forth? Once again, such con-

textual information enriches the personality of the virtual twin.

The preservation of the user's own interests is also critical in a social network. Even if a social network relies on trust and confidence among its members, a realistic framework needs to account for sources of distrust and conflicts (Gans, Jarke et al., 2001). The fragile equilibrium between trust and distrust can be achieved only if the users feel that their own objectives and interests are respected by the supporting network infrastructure — only then will the users feel comfortable in the network. This last functionality gives each virtual twin its uniqueness in the social community.

The Computing Capabilities

Computing capabilities represent extended services provided by individual virtual twins. The computing capabilities describe the ability of a virtual twin to accomplish high-level tasks for others by exploiting in a transparent way the local functionality, Web services, agent services, and/or the capabilities of other virtual twins. For example, a role responsible for data management could offer a specific data manipulation service, or the role responsible for reporting could offer an extended reporting service. Other examples of specialized services provided by the computing capabilities of a virtual twin include cartography services, directory lookups, news feeds, and the like. In that sense, each virtual twin can be the client *and* the server of other virtual twins. This is an important departure from traditional peer-to-peer systems such as file exchange tools or desktop collaboration software (e.g., Groove.net), which mostly exchange passive data but no active services (called *behavior* in the virtual twin terminology).

In such systems, data exchanges are distributed, but processing is mostly executed locally. The ability given to the virtual twins to share behavior is a much closer model of human interactions and can lead to richer social networks. By analogy, a virtual twin does not ask other virtual twins if it can *give* them something (data exchange), but if it can *do* something for them. This is a kind of outsourcing model for peer-to-peer networks. The computing capabilities of the virtual twin form a distributed application layer on top of the network capabilities.

RELATED WORK

This section puts the virtual twin as a socialization agent in perspective to related projects. David Gelernter from Yale University describes a vision of information technology that goes beyond the Web and the current structure of files and folders to one centered around what he calls *information beams* (Heiss, 2003). An information beam is a flowing stream collecting all the electronic information of the individual's life, including "every electronic document: every email, photo, draft, URL, audio, video, calendar or address note, and so on." Even though the information beam lacks the anthropomorphic expressiveness of the virtual twin and remains more technical in nature, it expresses an integrative approach that proves consistent with the virtual twin concepts of working memory, network capabilities, and computing capabilities. It tries to address the problem that our information systems reflect our machines instead of our lives.

In this paper, we described the virtual twin as a means to define a coordination layer supporting the needs of peer-to-peer networks beyond basic infrastructure services. Ray Ozzie, CEO of Groove Net-

works and inventor of Lotus Notes, uses the concept of communication-conducive middleware to express a similar idea in the context of the Groove peer-to-peer system. The communication-conducive middleware manages "some of the most important services that must be provided in a manner that doesn't unduly complicate the user conceptual model," including security and privacy, mobility and local operation, universal role-based membership, integral presence management and awareness, and flexible subscriptions and notifications (Ozzie & O'Kelly, 2003, pp. 18-19). From a conceptual perspective, all this functionality can fit into one of the three main components of the virtual twin.

In 2003, Siemens outlined a close cousin of the virtual twin — the *virtual me*. The virtual me can be seen as a personal communications portal that gives the user intelligent and simple-to-use controls on his or her availability (Straton, 2003). It is a "shorthand term for a new generation of convergence technologies that will change the way modern enterprises do business" (Straton, 2003). It offers functionality such as presence management, virtual meetings, cross-devices transparency, authorization, and local operation.

Finally, Petros Maniatis, Intel senior researcher, uses the concept of *mutually suspicious peers*. The idea of mutual suspicions allows the introduction of trust, criticality, and correctness in the assessment of P2P solutions (Martin, 2004).

CONCLUSION

This paper introduced the concept of the virtual twin, a kind of anthropomorphic representation of the networked person, made up of three main components: (1) a working memory, (2) network capabilities,

and (3) computing capabilities. We discussed how this socialization agent can turn primitive distributed infrastructures into social groups promoting features such as knowledge value enhancement, information traceability and assessment, peer pricing, trust, reputation, identity management, and networked behavior.

From a technical perspective, a virtual twin can be seen as a personal operating system managing the interests of a peer through many services and on many devices, whereas a traditional operating system covers the interests of a single device. The virtual twin can hide several forms of distributed processing, such as client/server, master/slave, parallel, or agents subcontracting. It coordinates both the interactions between a user and his or her virtual twin, and those between the twin itself and other virtual twins.

Many ideas, concepts, and components presented in this paper have been implemented (or are in the process of being implemented) in a project helping various actors active in the same LAN or WLAN to cooperate during decision-making activities. This is an open source project in which the scientific community is welcome to participate (<http://www.dicodess.org>).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is partly supported by Swiss NSF grant Nr. PDFR2-104340.

REFERENCES

- Boyd, S. (2003). Are you ready for social software? *Darwin*. Retrieved June 8, 2003, from <http://www.darwinmag.com/read/050103/social.html>
- Brewin, B. (2003a). All aboard with Wi-Fi on VIA Rail Canada. *Computerworld*. Retrieved July 11, 2003, from <http://www.computerworld.com/mobiletopics/mobile/story/0,10801,82940,00.html>
- Brewin, B. (2003b). McDonald's signs on for Wi-Fi in San Francisco area, Singapore. *Computerworld*. Retrieved July 9, 2003, from <http://www.computerworld.com/mobiletopics/mobile/story/0,10801,82839,00.html>
- Chang, R. (2003). Identity theft crackdown promoted. *PCWorld*. Retrieved November 5, 2003, from <http://www.pcworld.com/news/article/0,aid,113282,00.asp>
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *On the line*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Disabatino, J. (2003). AT&T to provide satellites for Connexion by Boeing. *Computerworld*. Retrieved July 14, 2003, from <http://www.computerworld.com/mobiletopics/mobile/technology/story/0,10801,72106,00.html>
- Feld, S. (1981). The focused organization of social ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(10), 15-35.
- Fleishman, G. (2003). Hot spots start to get real. *O'Reilly Network*. Retrieved July 1st, 2003, from http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/wireless/2003/03/06/hot_spots.html
- Foucault, B., Metzger, J.-L., Pignorel, E., & Vaylet, A. (2002). Les réseaux d'entraide entre apprenants dans la e-formation: Nécessité et efficacité? *Education Permanente*, 10(152), 95-105.
- Gachet, A. (2004). *Building model-driven decision support systems with Dicodess*. Zurich: vdf Hochschulvlg.
- Gachet, A., & Brezillon, P. (2005). Organizational structures and decision-making

- processes: A multi-level model. *Journal of Decision Systems* [forthcoming].
- Gachet, A., & Haettenschwiler, P. (2003a). A decentralized approach to distributed decision support systems. *Journal of Decision Systems*, 12(2), 141-158.
- Gachet, A., & Haettenschwiler, P. (2003b). A Jini-based software framework for developing distributed cooperative decision support systems. *Software—Practice and Experience*, 33(3), 221-258.
- Gans, G. et al. (2001). Requirements modeling for organization networks: A (dis)trust-based approach. *RE-01 Conference*, Toronto, Canada.
- Hanneman, R.A. (2001). Introduction to social network methods. *University of California*. Retrieved June 22, 2004, from <http://faculty.ucr.edu/~hanneman/SOC157/NETTEXT.PDF>
- Heiss, J.J. (2003). Computer visions: A conversation with David Gelernter. *Sun Developers Network*. Retrieved July 31, 2003, from http://java.sun.com/developer/technicalArticles/Interviews/gelernter_qa.html
- Martin, M. (2004). To P2P or not to P2P? *Newsfactor*. Retrieved January 15, 2004, from http://www.newsfactor.com/story.xhtml?story_title=To_P_P_or_Not_To_P_P_&story_id=22986#story-start
- Melymuka, K. (2003). Meeting of the minds: Technology for business “swarming.” *Computerworld*. Retrieved August 1, 2003, from <http://www.computerworld.com/softwaretopics/software/groupware/story/0,10801,83401,00.html?SKC=groupware-83401>
- Ozzie, R., & O’Kelly, P. (2003). *Collaborative communication, collaboration, and technology: Back to the future*. Beverly, MA: Groove Networks.
- Rheingold, H. (2000). *The virtual community : Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rheingold, H. (2002). *Smart mobs : The next social revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Pub.
- Rupley, S. (2003). Identity theft: The scary truth. *PC Magazine*. Retrieved September 4, 2003, from <http://www.pcmag.com/article2/0,1759,1237481,00.asp>
- Straton, M. (2003). The virtual me, the next step in wireless development. *Computer World*. Retrieved May 19, 2003, from <http://www.computerworld.com/mobiletopics/mobile/story/0,10801,81264,00.html>
- Valtersson, M. (1996). Virtual communities. *Department of Informatics*. Umea, Sweden: Umea University.
- Wagner, M. (2003). From peer to maturity. *Network World*. Retrieved January 13, 2003, from <http://www.nwfusion.com/research/2003/0106peer.html>
- Wellman, B., & Carrington, S.D., (Eds.) (1988). *Social structures: A network approach*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R.A., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Zimmermann, T.G. (1996). Personal area network: Near-field intrabody communication. *IBM Systems Journal* 35(3 & 4).

ENDNOTES

- 1 The connection to a server in a client/server architecture is often a deliberate act. In other words, the user is aware that he or she is passing from a discon-

- nected state (network absence) to a connected state (network presence). However, ad hoc peer-to-peer networks and new pricing schemes based on volume rather than connection time foster the “always-on” paradigm in which the user is not systematically aware of his or her connection state.
- ² Numbers according to the Federal Trade Commission.
- ³ The entire user community is self-formed and self-managed at run-time.
- ⁴ Generic distributed data management requirements have been described in Gachet and Haettenschwiler (2003b).
- ⁵ The exact form of this reward system is an implementation detail.

Alexandre Gachet is a visiting research scholar in the Information Technology Department at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. He holds a diploma and a PhD in computer science from the University of Fribourg, Switzerland. His research interests include the design and implementation of distributed decision support systems using new distributed technologies, with a focus on highly decentralized, self-managed, and self-healing architectures.

Pius Haettenschwiler is an assistant professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland. His research interests include knowledge-based systems (with a focus on the mathematical modeling of business logic), as well as concepts, tools, and frameworks for DSS development. Dr. Haettenschwiler has an extended experience in developing DSS for governmental purposes, such as food security and agricultural policy.