== Initial discussion email ==

AM:Regarding our last meeting isn't best to setup what are the milestones the group want to achieve before jumping to create content?

MC: I would agree with Alberto, and would also suggest that if we are going forward with the workshop, then the milestones should take that into consideration.

DB: Mark/Alberto, I agree that was the consensus from the last CG call. Do either of you want to take the pen and draft some 2013 CG milestones, including support for the proposed workshop, that we can iterate in prep for discussion next weeks CG?

DB: Version 3 of the infographic - http://www.w3.org/community/socbizcg/wiki/File:Slide2.jpg

AB: Reacting to the phrase below, " ... including support for the proposed workshop...", and for the benefit of those who were not on the call yesterday, I voiced, and continue to have, strong skepticism about the goals and value of a workshop.

AB: My reasons:

AB: The W3C already sponsored 1 workshop and multiple Incubator / Community groups. A white paper was written, as well as other less formal documents.

MC: To the best of my knowledge, there has never been a workshop focused on Social Business. If you are referring to the W3C workshop on the future of social networking, then I would submit the focus was entirely different. As for the incubator group, I would once again submit that the focus was different. The Jam is the only exercise that I am aware of that focused exclusively on the concept of social business, and although it was a great start, I believe the proposed workshop will serve to take the effort of this group in a direction that is needed if we are to fully understand what the needs and thoughts are of the broader community

JM: Dunno on the history, but I agree we should identify who the target audience clearly is and what the expected call to action for them should be.

MC: Agreed. It would be helpful if you could identify the specific changes you would recommend for the Goals and Scope section.

AB: I perceive the primary public social tool vendors (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) have little interest to standardize the underlying social technologies (e.g., how to exchange profile info) – because the value of their companies is based on keeping that information locked up.

MC: I would not see this as a reason to not standardize. Rather I would submit that as we see more and more companies delivering tools to enable social business, we will see the need for standardization grow independent of Facebook and Twitter. Those organizations are already in some respects becoming in some respects long in the tooth and loosing favor with the younger generations for their personal social needs, and their services are ripe for the picking of software companies who wish to deliver tools that enable a more business focused approach to social.

JM:I think also we are talking consumer space vs enterprise space. Right now, the enterprise space is actively interested in a solution here as what out there ( think Yammer, SF Chatter ) are either lacking adoption and/or not solving the problem space effectively. Part of this is probably the messaging and use-cases, which it sounds like this group can be a catalyst in defining.

MC: Agree again. My response to Anne was to highlight that many think of social as only applicable to consumer. Our group is ostensibly looking at enterprise. Facebook and Twitter have some value – especially in terms of analytics such as what we are doing with HANA, but from a social business standpoint, I am less concerned with their initial participation (disclaimer – SAP and Facebook have had a longstanding relationship) and more concerned with businesses trying to harness social in the enterprise for enterprise cost/efficiency/revenue benefits. My thinking is that If the messaging is correct, and if Facebook/Twitter see a trend that they can leverage, then they will also participate.

AB: A separate set of independent geeks – mostly in Silicon Valley and Portland, Oregon areas – are working on creating independent tools. Those folks apparently want to hack away more-or-less independently.

MC: I would submit that from an enterprise perspective, the last thing we want are independent geeks left the control this space. Creating a Social Business requires tools that are reliable, supported, and interoperable.

JM:The independent tools may gain limited adoption in the consumer or low end of the SMB market, but interoperability is the name of the game for anyone of reasonable size. I think telling a story around OpenSocial ( once that story firms up ) sounds like a reasonable leverage point there.

MC: Concur. Many are working to move OpenSocial to a more mature standards organization footing with a greater focus on enterprise requirements. The standard itself is gaining traction, and it is clear to me that W3C needs to identify what the relationship between the Social Web and Social Business using OpenSocial should be.

AM : Agree. I belong to a group of alfa users of a tool called Hojoki. The development team don't care about standards. They just use it as a reference, they out all the effort on multiple system integration.

AB: Work on security mechanisms, privacy, identity, etc is already underway in other working groups.

MC: True. But how does that negate the need for the workshop?

AM : I may be missing a point here. If this group wants to develop standards we need members with technical expertise. If we don't have its necessary to recruit. On the other hand this changes significantly the scope of the group. The idea is to develop standards about interoperability of systems using social interaction? That's an interesting challenge. Does this group wants to assume this responsibility, or wants to be in the business layer?

AB: I hear several voices on this team enthusiastically promoting a workshop. Sorry to be a wet blanket and a naysayer, but I am not all clear what the focus nor value would be in holding another workshop. I do not agree " support for the proposed workshop " is a foregone conclusion.

MC: Hmm. It would be helpful if you identified the specific objectives of the workshop you disagree with.

AB: Although IBM and perhaps others are apparently willing to provide some financial support (Yay for those companies!) – my concern is what the W3C would invest (via time and people), what would the W3C get out, and what happens to W3C reputation for going around in circles on this topic.

MC: Once again, I would submit that Social Business as a specific topic is still rather virgin for the W3C – with the exception of the Jam.

AB: "Social" is a huge topic these days. I, too, am intensely interested in the subject. Yet I do not support moving forward with a workshop at this point, for concerns given above. To change my mind I would need to see A) clear objectives; B) convincing evidence that key players would participate.

MC: It would be helpful if you identified the specific objectives in the draft you disagree with.

JM: What I'm hearing here is a concern for having the target audience and call to action defined better before we move towards a workshop. I guess my question is where do we stand in regards to that at this point?

MC: Once again, I would point to the draft workshop call for participation. We identify at a general level who we want to participate, but if you have thoughts on specific organizations or types of organizations we should include, then please suggest them. In terms of the call for action, I would welcome your thoughts on what might be missing or off topic in the Topics for position papers list in the call for participation.

== Request to Create Discussion Thread ==

MC: As always I highly value your opinion so will anxiously look forward to your input.

MC: For all, the thread is becoming somewhat unmanageable. I suggest we create separate discussion threads – e.g. role of the group, group activities going forward, purpose/audience of the workshop, group activity relationship to social web/social activities, group relationship to W3C/Non W3C standards (not necessarily all inclusive, but I hate using .etc as it is the sign of a lazy writer).

MC: I do want to address one topic that was raised, and that was with respect to standards development. I did not mean to, nor would I support, any standards development in this group. Rather I see our role with respect to standards as one where we can flesh out the block diagram via the workshop and make solid recommendations to W3C/Other standards bodies for the standards we believe need to be developed to make social business inter- and intra-enterprise ready.

== role of the group ==

The SBCG is not a standards development organization. The SBCG can make solid recommendations to W3C/Other standards bodies for the standards we believe need to be developed/enhanced to make social business inter- and intra-enterprise ready. Exploring high value transactions and related business scenarios is one way that the SBCG can identify and create standards recommendations [[purpose/audience of the workshop]]--[[User:Dbuddenb|Don Buddenbaum]] 21:35, 15 November 2012 (UTC)

== group activities going forward ==

== purpose/audience of the workshop ==

Given that our charter is '''The mission of the Social Business Community Group is to gather practical, business oriented, use cases focused on high value transactions to influence and improve existing social standards in order to foster the growth and adoption of social standards in enterprise solutions.''' - I submit that one of our audiences is those with enterprise focus who can help us define the right set of high value transactions. I think the notion of high value transactions is a little bit vague. We drafted/proposed the info-graphic [http://www.w3.org/community/socbizcg/wiki/File:Slide2.jpg] as a straw man for describing high value transactions as being the intersection of core business functions supporting key usage scenarios. [http://www.w3.org/community/socbizcg/wiki/images/e/ee/Core\_business\_and\_use\_case.jpg] .This definition gives us a way to articulate our target. I propose exploring requirements for the realization of these target scenarios through standards based social business technologies as our purpose. This would identify a second audience as being standards organizations who would align their standards with the requirements we identify. An updated block architecture could be one of many realizations of this work. --[[User:Dbuddenb|Don Buddenbaum]] 21:28, 15 November 2012 (UTC)

[This part was edited by Alberto Manuel Process Sphere]

Before start reading this section, one of the inputs for the workshop is the W3C position on this for guidance, that I think is missing and the group can be heading to wrong direction.

'''Introduction:'''

We are somehow in the middle of a new transformation movement regarding the possibilities that are being offered to organizations to interact with all the stakeholders involved (customers, workers, government agencies, etc). Technology (communication networks and software) continue to offer new possibilities to accomplish daily tasks, work, connecting artifacts, people and business processes. There is increasing awareness and demand that we are rapidly entering in a world in which everyone and everything is, will be or can be connected, to a point that people enter in the networks without formal permission as some interactions of the past are discontinued (for example government agencies force citizens to be digital connected only) . Social Technology is responsible by the change we are engaging with others to work and opening new paths regarding approaches to collaborate and taking work execution out of the enterprise boundaries. The speed and pace of change is raising to many questions and doubts, from the start what is social all about? Is having company account in social networks? Is having the right tool to collaborate? Is understanding people’s connecting patterns? It includes all of this or is much more than this?

'''Workshop audience:'''

'''CIO''' – Despite the fact CIO’s are heading more to a strategic level and are concerned about supporting business strategy, there is still a culture of seeing (or let) CIO’s like an internal service provider that helps business units comply with business requirements based on project agendas and priorities. With all this new technologies approaches and possibilities popping up every day, it’s important that CIO’s constitute their own transformation agenda based on the potential social tools can offer and present and implement an enterprise change program.

'''COO''' – The way a company creates value and differentiate itself from competition comes from how operations are executed. Today we are facing a shift about how people want to collaborate. They want to import / copy the same experience they are used to when they are interacting in their private sphere. If operations / business processes are (yet) made of people it’s important to understand how a COO can drive business transformation using social technology. This also applies for Process owners / managers. Architects – Enterprise architecture encompasses business and technology architecture. With this swirl of change enterprise architecture cannot be anymore a static photograph taken time to time when company strategy changes. Social interaction does not include only technology, if includes understanding how people fits together, how information flows like blood in a human body. Enterprise architecture must also adapt to the challenges social interaction is bringing to discussion.

'''Marketing managers''' – [some extra context is important here. I am not an expert on Marketing and this is one of the areas where social is mostly consumed]

'''Customer Relationship Managers''' – Independently if enterprise, government organizations or others interact directly or not with end users, there is no going back regarding how connections are driven. Failing to understand how to engage properly with customers under a social approach in a myriad of scenarios (customer inquiries, complain handling, etc) can hurt organizations.

'''Purpose of the workshop:'''

- Understand what is social business and it’s implication and impact in today’s organizations; - Understand where social applies and how it can be used across different organization dimensions; - Get insight about the challenges of the social magnitude when it’s necessary to put every brick / part / organization system together; - What are the existing technologies and supporting standards that can be used under the social paradigm; - What must be done to overcome the difficulties and risk of implementing social technology in an organization.

== group activity relationship to social web/social activities ==

== group relationship to W3C/Non W3C standards ==