Web 2.010 - Social Network "Make Difference Together" with Pragmatic Description of Projects in the Standard of European Commission's Framework Programme

Alexander Zelitchenko
(Larnaca, Cyprus
zelitchenk@yahoo.com)

Abstract: The article outlines the social network aiming to join participants, who are looking for partners in some social project rather than partners for simple chatting or for any other forms of informal communication. Standard semiformal language with formal syntax and informal unlimited vocabulary for the pragmatic description of the projects in such social network, is proposed. This language is elaborated on base of Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) standards of preparing proposals.

Keywords: FP7, Social networks, Pragmatic Web, W2.0, Language of presentation of pragmatic description
Categories: H.1.0, H.4.3, H.5.2, H.5.3

1 Introduction: Social Communication and Social Doing

Almost all modern popular social networks aims first facilitating social *communication* and exchange of information; and only few of them (e.g. The Point, http://www.thepoint.com/) have as their primary aim facilitating common *action*. Of course, sometimes (as, for example, in case of Wikipedia) the exchange of information results in the production of new valuable product. However, besides specialized open source networks, which realize specific project, there are almost no Social Networks focusing on networking of collaborators and organizing the teams, which will realize the ideas of participants. Nevertheless, such networks will inevitably appear.

The logics of development of Internet consists in the creation on base of humankind the huge social being with the system of informational processes, which may be called "a collective mind". In course of development, this mind becomes more and more powerful creating more and more mental abilities. The ability to operate with the meaning (Semantic Web) is one of the steps in this development. The ability to act purposefully is another step, not less important. In fact, many groups in Social Networks want to act in cooperative manner facilitating individual abilities of group's members, but the lack of techniques of operationalization of common activity effectively frustrates this need. Moreover, perhaps it is difficult to name the social network, which does not need this kind of instruments and which would reject to implement them. Sta.rtUp.biz (http://sta.rtup.biz/), E.Factor http://www.efactor.com/), LinkedIn (http://www.linkedin.com/) are just some names from this list of potential users of this technology.

Thus, we need today the instruments, which allow organize a collective activity in the framework of Internet. Elaboration of such instruments will designate the emergence of social networks of next generations – the ones, which allow to join effectively the efforts of many potential collaborators with common interests and to supplement mutually their competences. The demand in this sort of social networks is quite obvious not only from both people and organisations, which are looking for partners, but also from funding agencies that are looking for best investment opportunities.

I called this kind of "acting social networks" "Web 2.010", or "Make Difference Together" (MDT). This paper outlines the main features of MDT and sketches some principles of their realization.

2 The Place of MDT among Other Approaches to the Description of Activity

One of the central tasks of MDTs is the transformation of the "pure idea" into the detailed project that may be practically realized. Too often, an initiator of some project limits himself by the very brief elaboration of his idea only omitting many crucially important moments and creating impression of rawness that diminishes the number of his potential collaborators. Such briefness is quite natural because an elaborated description even of middle-scale project may easily reach the size of hundred pages and demands many months of efforts to prepare. However, the participation even of rather few collaborators, who cooperates one with others for example in a wiki-styled manner may reduce this figure crucially. MDT aims to create the infrastructure for such collaboration, which must initiate the cooperation in the realization of project. The principles of interaction in course of such collaboration are described in the section of 3.2.

The means of detailed description of project, which includes, for example, the working plan, the team of participants with their competences and responsibilities, the management system, the resources that must be attracted and so on, constitute the essential part of MDT's instruments. The principles of MDT's "ontology" of description of project occupies the intermediate position between the two current approaches to the describing project, represented by already mentioned "The Point", on the one hand, and "Description of Project" (DOAP, http://trac.usefulinc.com/doap), on the other. The ontology of DOAP that deals with description of open source projects provide an example of formal system, which focuses on machine-readable data and hence intends to construct completely formal descriptions in RDF. Thus, DOAP limits itself by rather fragmentary descriptions of the whole entity as any open source project is. In other words, DOAP reflects only relatively small part of complete description of open source project, which may be easily formalized, leaving the rest ("un-formalized") part of description out of own framework. The descriptions of the projects in the system like "The Point", on the contrary, describe projects in completely informal manner. Such descriptions are enough for many projects, but not for the projects with the complex structure, including elaborating plan. MDT aims to bridge these two approaches basing on semiformal description of complex projects, which originates the scopes of

organization development, project management or virtual organisation integration (for example, [Putnik, 06]). In particular, good example of such semiformal structure of description of projects may be found in the documents of European Commission's Framework Program (e.g. [CORDIS-a, n.d.]). And although MDT relates to the broader class of collective activities than ones described in Framework Program, the general structure of description may be represented on this example.

3 Architecture of MDT

An "atom" of MDT is the record describing the project consisting of two parts: (a) general information about the status of project, and (b) template of the Proposal of Project (PP).

General information about the status of project includes the fields like: (a) the language of PP, (b) the name of author-owner (AO) of project, ID, password, the means of contact, (c) the state of verification of data; (d) the number of participants of different legal status and different levels of involvement, (e) source(s) of funding, (f) state of development of project, (g) levels of confidentiality, etc. Information in these fields may be changed by AO and/or by MDT itself (automatically) and/or Administrator of MDT.

PP is a structured multilevel record - a complex word in special language of pragmatic description (LPD). Multilevel syntax-semantic structure is natural for the human mode of processing information. LPD differs from the completely formal programming languages like Java or markup languages like HTML, since the only upper part of its syntax categories is strictly formalized while the lower levels allow arbitrary "records" including ones without limited "alphabet", e.g. scheme, drawings etc. Thus, from the semiotic point of view the LPD covers several levels of description - from syntax to pragmatic ones. This explains the name "meta-syntax".

3.1 Meta-syntax of LPD

Like most of large texts, PP has multilevel, hierarchical structure, in which the large parts of upper hierarchical levels consist of smaller parts of lower levels, which, in their turn, consists of even smaller parts and so on. Thus, one may see the whole hierarchy of syntax categories, where the categories of lower level disclose the category of upper level. I name such multilayer syntax structure *meta-syntax*. Below I explicate this structure basing mainly on European Commission FP7 standards [Guide, 08].

In accordance with the rules of FP7, the categories of upper level may be introduced as follows:(a) Concept, objectives, methods, (b) Work plan (c) Participants, (d) Organizational structure and Management, (e) Budget, (f) Legal and Ethical Issues

I represent the overall syntax structure in the other article [Zelitchenko, 09]. The following small fragment of syntax tree illustrates the general approach.

<2.WORK PLAN> → <2.1.OVERALL STRATEGY><2.2.WORK PACKAGES (WP) AND DELIVERABLES><risks>

<2.1.OVERALL STRATEGY> → <2.1.1.PRODUCTION>
<2.1.2.DISSEMINATION>
<2.1.1.PRODUCTION>→<schedule><methodology/technology>
<2.1.2.DISSEMINATION>→<2.1.2.1.EXPECTED IMPACTS><how to bring about these impacts><2.1.2.2.SYNERGY WITH OTHER PROJECTS><management of intellectual property>
<2.1.2.1.EXPECTED IMPACTS>→ (<t>)
<2.1.2.2.SYNERGY WITH OTHER PROJECTS>→ (<t>) | [(code project)]

3.2 Principles of partners' collaboration

There are two categories users in MDT: (a) the participants of project with different levels of authority to edit PP, and (b) searchers for project to join. In first category there is sub-category of AOs (or administrators), who originate PP, manage membership in the consortium that realize the project, and grant the different rights to edit PP.

MDT provides options for AOs to create PP, to edit PP personally and to grant to the people of AO's choice the different authorities to edit PP. Thus, in course of realization of the project, PP is transformed from the "pure" proposal into the Announcement of News.

The system of flexible control of confidentiality is absolutely a must for MDT. AO must get option to determine the different levels of acceptability of different parts of PP – from the limited part of participants of project, say, "Management Team only" to everybody. In the same way, the AO grants the different degrees of authority to edit PP.

For the searchers, MDT gives the possibility to see (and to search after the size of MDT become large enough to stop being easily observable) the PPs and to establish the first contact with AOs.

All other interactions between the users come out of the framework of MDT.

4 Issues of Implementation: Security and Legal Issues

MDT cannot be responsible for content of PP and provides information for the users "as it is", but in the case the AO provide verification on the parts information in PP, these parts of information may be marked by the sign of verification.

MDT grants users with different status depending on both their experience of work with MDT and the level of verification the users wanted to provide for MDT. This status may be used by AOs to grant users with different right to access information in PP and to make decision about collaboration with the user. Thus, each user of MDT has the option to reach that level of compromise between confidentiality and attractiveness for other users, which is comfortable for him.

Essential part of MDT is the user agreement, which stipulates the aims of MDT, rights, obligations and potential risks of users, ethical code, legal issues, including the rights on intellectual properties, and so on.

However, both legal matters and security ones cannot be absolutized or even simply overestimated. There are many social networks (e.g. New Civilization Network, http://www.newciv.org/), where the users aim first to find co-thinkers and

co-workers for social projects that propose making social benefits rather than personal ones like a money or a fame. The legal status of the projects in such networks is quite different from one in commercial ones. However, the general structure of their projects is the same. Thus, for different applied scopes the different MDTs with different requirements to security matters must be elaborated.

5 Scopes of Applications and Potential Customers

The crucial aspect to evaluate the business potential of any enterprise is the estimation of demand. In case of MDT this demand is quite obvious. For example, today the portal of European Commission FP7 Program CORDIS provides the services "Preparation and Submission of Proposals" [CORDIS-a, n.d.], "Find Project Partners" [CORDIS-b, n.d.] and "Find a Project" [CORDIS-c, n.d.]. MDT is in line with this direction of applied software development providing it with new functionalities. Thus, the first group of potential customers of the systems like MDT is the funding agencies - from transnational agencies like FP7 to local venture capital firms.

The other huge groups of potential customers are social networks and – what is even more important – their participants, which do not find in the present social networks what they are looking for, the partners. The "altruistic" or "philanthropic" networks, which were mentioned in previous section, constitute the important part of potential users of MDT-technology.

6 Conclusion: the Lines of Development

At the present, the idea of MDT is still a "pure idea", which expects the team of collaborators who fill it with "blood and flesh" and initiates the that way of transformation an idea into a project, which MDT itself aims to facilitate. Thus, the present paper is just an announce of idea. Nevertheless, I would like to designate some directions of further development which seems important.

Although the first stages of development of MDT, when the number of projects in MDT do not become unobservable yet, do not demand a powerful searcher, in course of development of MDT, the powerful search system, which allows searching for the ideas/projects in different stage of development and in different fields will become more and more important part of the MDT

There are many other possible lines of development of MDT; all of them are related with introducing new functions. For example, it is possible to add the function of hosting projects' websites and such web services as project's blog, discussion forum etc. However, the most obvious direction of development is the development of LPD itself.

The first, most obvious line of such development is the development of the tree of syntax categories. In presented here version of LPD there are many categories, which may be further structured. For example, it is easy to specify what specific tables must be included in category <5.3.DETAILED BUDGET> in FP7. However, in such development of formal structure of project, the compromise between "external" implementation of structure as it is seen optimal for architect of system, on the one hand, and its "internal" self-development resulted from the system of categories that

were introduced by the users, on the other, must be reached. For example, in different types of MDT, the contents of pre-terminal category <description of relationships between *i*-th and *j*-th organisation's bodies> (4.2) may be quite different: in commercial structures they are naturally much more formal, than between the partners in some philanthropic project.

Thus, instead of elaborating the huge conceptual trees with very specific categories, in some applications is more purposeful to elaborate the special statistical techniques in spirit of content analysis [Holsti, 69] that allow to disclose the system of lower-level constructs in users' free descriptions of the relatively few broad high-level categories, which are determined by the relatively general conceptual tree like one represented in this article.

References

[CORDIS-a, n.d.] Preparation and Submission of Proposals (EPSS) Retrieved April 1, 2009 from http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.FP7SubmitProposalPage

[CORDIS-b, n.d.] Find Project Partners Retrieved April 1, 2009 from http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/partners_en.html

[CORDIS-c, n.d.] Find a Project Retrieved April 1, 2009 from http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/projects_en.html

[Guide, 08] Guide For Applicants Socio-Economic Sciences And The Humanities – Part 8 Collaborative Project, Retrieved October 8, 2008 from http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html

[Holsti, 69] Holsti, O. R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanitie, Addison-Wesley. 1969

[Kerzner, 03] Kerzner, H. Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling, Wiley. 2003

[Morris, 97] Morris, P. The management of projects, Thomas Telford, 1997

[Putnik, 06] Putnik, G., Cunha M.M. (Eds) Knowledge And Technology Management in Virtual Organizations: Issues, Trends, Opportunities and Solutions, Idea Group Publishing, 2006

[Sipser, 97] Sipser, M. Introduction to the Theory of Computation, PWS Publishing, 1997

[Zelitchenko, 08] Zelitchenko, A.: About Vi-Fi ("Visible - Findable") - how to describe and to search sites with standard and universal semantic-pragmatic tree: semantic web as pragmatic web, In Proc. 3rd International Conference on the Pragmatic Web: Innovating the Interactive Society, September 2008, 23-30 http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1479194

[Zelitchenko. 09] Zelitchenko, A.: Social Networks for Integration of Projects in the FP7's Standard, which are Based on the Integral Semantic-Pragmatic Descriptions of Projects, Manuscript accepted by International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing.