

# TecTrends Reporter™

Web 2.0  
TecTrends Staff

October 2007  
Report #165176

# TecTrends Reporter™

## Web 2.0

### Table of Contents:

Synopsis: Web 2.0

Prepare to Merge

Web 2.0 Catching On Quickly with B-to-B Marketers

Is Web 2.0 Safe?

Investing in Web 2.0

Web 2.0 Goes Corporate

Attack of the Giant Web 2.0 Lies!

Amid the Rush to Web 2.0, Some Words of Warning

User Revolt at Dig.com Shows Risks of Web 2.0

Bubble 2.0?

Techs Turn to Web 2.0

Listing of Web 2.0-Related Companies

## **Synopsis: Web 2.0**

The term "Web 2.0" is the name some Internet observers and analysts use to designate the next generation of Internet utilization, one based on collaboration and other modes of user-centric content creation. Proponents of this concept cite such emerging features of the Internet as: shared and Web-delivered data including syndication services (RSS); social networking (using sites such as MySpace); user-driven media (for example, YouTube); content aggregation; podcasting; and open, user-maintained reference materials (for example wikis such as Wikipedia).

This term for the next generation of Web functionality follows the widely accepted convention used by software developers to indicate version upgrades and incremental improvements to systems and applications upon their release or introduction to the marketplace. The first number indicates the version (or "generation") of the release; the number following the decimal indicates incremental enhancements to that second version. Therefore, "Web 2.0" implies aggregate, universal enhancements to the whole of existing Internet technologies and their utilization.

Exploring the legendary history of the Web 2.0 concept, Dale Dougherty, vice president of technology consulting firm O'Reilly Media, is credited with coining the term Web 2.0 in 2004 during a brainstorming session with a conference producer. The circumstances and parentage of the term's birth, by enterprises with a stake in its acceptance and subsequent use, are also those of all subsequent Web 2.0 controversy.

During that fateful planning session, participants noted that the Internet had not crashed due to overload, as had been predicted in the mid-1990s by Bob Metcalfe, inventor of ethernet, the most popular and widely used local area network technology. Rather, it had thrived, with novel sites and uses emerging regularly. Further, conferees observed, the commercial websites that had survived the collapse of the dot-com marketplace seemed to share common traits such as user collaboration and information sharing.

Skeptics say questions about the actual existence of Web 2.0 merit examination. Even the name is the object of much controversy, even scorn, because of its origin as a marketing term. The World Wide Web itself is not an application, they would argue, nor is there an official group or body authorizing or designating versions of the Web. While the Internet and related technologies, including Web-compliant applications, must adhere to formalized data standards, the universe of parts that comprise the Web is not necessarily subject to any external supervisory authority.

Critics of the term Web 2.0 also contend that it is essentially meaningless, or that it means whatever its proponents decide they want it to mean. Proponents' motivation, skeptics say, is to convince the media and investors that they are creating something fundamentally new, rather than continuing to develop and use well-established technologies. Therefore, skeptics conclude, one may correctly say that Web 2.0 actually refers to the evolution of Web users' behavior and the subsequent response

by Web content providers. From the skeptics' perspective, Web 2.0 can only be a catchy buzzword, not an actual technology. As validation, they cite the millions of dollars invested in ostensible Web 2.0 companies and the lack of tangible results or benefits, likening its rise to the Dot-com boom of the late '90s. As a result, regardless of one's position on the matter, Web 2.0's single greatest product to date has been controversy.

Though the exact parameters of Web 2.0 remain nebulous, O'Reilly Media at the very least defends the designation, saying its adoption and subsequent use by the media and marketplace happened "because it does capture the widespread sense that there's something qualitatively different about today's Web."

Unlike the static first-generation Internet, its supporters contend, the transition to Web 2.0 offers a variety of benefits. For example, in a Web 2.0 world, websites become both sources of content and genuine computing platforms serving applications to users of information rather than being isolated silos of information. Equally importantly, the Web itself emerges as a decentralized, egalitarian social platform, with its own community of values such as open communication, decreased reliance on authority, and open reutilization of content (file sharing). In this sense, it embodies "the market as a conversation." Through redundant utilization, linking and tracking, content also becomes more organized and categorized, making the universe of all ideas more accessible to everyone, not just data-mining gurus who breathe Boolean operators. In addition, by virtue of Web 2.0's emphasis on definition-by-use—the market as a conversation—a new more vibrant Web economy can emerge, adding significantly to the economic value of the Web, with its own potential for geometric growth as a consequence of the scalar nature of communities

Of course, skeptics argue that such points merely validate their accusations of marketing hype. Purported Web 2.0 sites merely fulfill customer demands; no technological breakthroughs or innovations are apparent. The battle over the meaning and reality of Web 2.0 is far from settled. "The next generation of the Internet" remains either an opaque enigma, involving conventional wisdom about which little is known, or a transparent cipher about which there is little to know.

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Prepare to Merge**

Author: Taft, Darryl K.

Source: eWeek – July 23, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.eweek.com>

Increasingly, companies are merging service-oriented architecture and Web 2.0 technologies. These mash-ups or composites of various services 'within a rich user interface environment' provide companies with a more flexible, faster and cheaper way to solve problems than was available through traditional PC based software. Web 2.0 also changes the way users access applications, allowing them to work collaboratively and to access information in real time. Web 2.0 technologies are shifting the publishing power to users who can generate and publish their own content. Asynchronous JavaScript and XML (AJAX) allows users greater ease in creating such content. This also allows non-developers to build mash-ups that are focused on and friendly to users, though this may present governance and security problems. Nexaweb Technologies is tackling the governance problem by building an enterprise Web 2.0 SOA ecosystem as well as implementing an SOA governance strategy. Also, problems arise in mash-ups when data comes from several sources in incompatible formats. Technologies such as Enterprise Service Buses (ESBs) and lookup services such as Universal Design, Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) can solve many of these problems. Though some large retailers such as Amazon and eBay are already mashing up content and applications, it will probably be 18 to 24 months before mash-ups are widely adopted in mainstream e-commerce sites.

Company Name(s): Nexaweb Technologies Inc.

TecTerm(s): MashUps, Program Development, Web Development, SOA (Service-Oriented Architecture, Web 2.0

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Web 2.0 Catching On Quickly with B-to-B Marketers**

Author: Karpinski, Richard

Source: BtoB – July 16, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.netb2b.com>

Business-to-business (b-to-b) marketers are rapidly adopting Web 2.0 technologies in their marketing strategies. The trend is fueled by the strong user participation in Web 2.0 media, including blogs, RSS feeds, podcasts and Ajax-based websites. In a survey of 68 marketers, 31 percent have launched pilot campaigns, while 28 percent have deployed Web 2.0 marketing on an ad hoc basis. Forty-two percent of the respondents have used Web 2.0 technologies in entire organizations. Among the most popular Web 2.0 media used by marketers are Feedburner RSS feed creator, PingoMatic weblog ping, WordPress blogging, Technorati, and LinkedIn. B-to-b marketers are also employing such tools as Twitter and Pownce to make quick announcements. Other popular Web 2.0 tools include NetVibes, PageFlakes and Facebook. B-to-b marketers can also take advantage of the popularity of video distribution channels and vote-for-content networks such as Digg and Reddit. Other marketing venues include Second Life, a virtual 3D world, and the Apple iPhone. The rapid growth of Web 2.0 marketing has cut short the planning and implementation time for b-to-b marketers. Previously, they had to wait six months before they knew if the plan worked. Now, it takes only three weeks to implement and two weeks more to know if the initiative worked.

Company Name(s): Facebook Inc.; Digg Inc.; FeedBurner; LinkedIn Corp.; NetVibes Ltd.; Pageflakes Ltd.; Technorati, Inc.; WordPress

TecTerm(s): AJAX; Program Development; User Interfaces; Website Design

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Is Web 2.0 Safe?**

Author: McMillan, Robert

Source: PC World – July 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.pcworld.com>

The collaborative nature of the Internet development known as Web 2.0 makes service websites vulnerable to next generation web attacks. An example of these attacks is the Samy worm, a virulent bug that affected the browsers of any user who visited the MySpace profile of the bug's originator. The bug did not harm the computers of MySpace users, but it posed risk to their data online. More and more of these unexpected attacks will occur as more critical information is stored in Web 2.0 applications like Google Calendar and Zoho Office suite. A radical change in the way browsers interact with the Web is needed to address these malicious attacks. If not, the security issues in Web 2.0 will only become worse. There are two major types of web attacks that have security experts worried: cross-site scripting attacks and cross-site request forgeries. There are many kinds of cross-site scripting attacks, but the objective is to make an illegal code run within a victim's browser. In cross-site request forgery attacks, the hacker deceives the website into believing that it is sending information and getting it from a user who has been signed on to the site. To prevent cross-site request forgery attacks, individual users can try using different browsers when accessing Web 2.0 applications that store their important information. Cross-site scripting attacks are tougher to avoid, but it helps to be very careful when clicking certain links. In general, web security standards like the WS\* specifications go along way in addressing Web 2.0 security threats, but many fundamental web specifications, like JavaScript and HTTP, need to be re-evaluated.

TecTerm(s): Cybercrime; Internet Security; Search Engines; Viruses & Worms; Web 2.0

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Investing in Web 2.0**

Author: Ferguson, Renee Boucher

Source: eWeek – June 25, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.eweek.com>

IBM and Microsoft are two of the growing number of companies looking to introduce technology to link consumer-style Web 2.0 capabilities with enterprise solutions. At the Enterprise 2.0 conference in Boston on June 19, IBM launched its version of collaborative web-based technologies. IBM's version is created to access both individual and collective wisdom of professionals so that it can be shared with others in the enterprise world. In addition, IBM announced four separate technology product offerings: Lotus Connections, Lotus Quickr, Info 2.0, and WebSphere Commerce. Lotus Connections is a suite of five exclusive Web 2.0 components created to assist companies in finding subject experts, convene teams around a common point, and access information. Lotus Quickr is an open-standards-based collaboration tool that allows teams both inside and outside a company to work together across different operating systems, working styles, and geographical locations. Info 2.0 is a set of tools created to unlock data and enable business users to create mashups—the repurposing and remix of data into a single website or application. WebSphere Commerce is focused more on retailers looking to increase Internet sales by improving their websites. IBM's news is an initial step in its plans to develop newer web-based technologies, which the company clearly thinks is the way of the future. Meanwhile, Microsoft has similar ideas, as noted in a keynote speech at the Boston conference by Derek Burney, general manager of the SharePoint platform and tools at Microsoft. Burney said that social computing is changing the way businesses work and increasing the effect that people can have within their organizations. Microsoft is seeing evidence of the effect of social computing on its customers as well as on its own internal use of tools such as blogs.

Company Name(s): IBM Corp.; Microsoft Corp.

Product Name(s): Info 2.0; Lotus Connections; Lotus Quickr; WebSphere Commerce Suite

TecTerm(s): Collaborative Software; Enterprise Systems; Groupware; MashUps; Software Suites; Web Development; Web-based Applications; Web 2.0

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Web 2.0 Goes Corporate**

Author: Hildreth, Sue

Source: ComputerWorld – June 4, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.computerworld.com>

Such 'lite' web technologies as wikis and podcasts can be very advantageous for businesses. For instance, if an employee leaves the company, research done and documented on a hard disk can be difficult to find. At Manning & Napier, the problem was solved by having analysts use wikis from Socialtext for sharing and storage of research, commentary, and meeting notes. The wiki is organized into such broad classifications as industry, then subcategories such as healthcare, and then, even more specific subtopics such as problems of the uninsured. The system is peer review enabled, rather than hierarchical, says Jeff Herrman of Manning & Napier. Web 2.0 tools have also been beneficial for Hawaiian Airlines, which decided to consolidate data from its customer service staff in airports, the airline central center, and its website. Duplication was handled through consolidation for easy reference, research, and updating by service staff, and one customer service FAQ was created on a wiki. The Web 2.0 features of Microsoft SharePoint Server 2007 were used to deploy the solution, which puts all the data in a single place. Dabble DB, a web-based collaborative database from Smallthought Systems, was chosen by the Discovery Channel's Educator Network to manage its list of 11,000 education-related events. The solution has saved Discovery Channel about 75 staff hours per week. Other Web 2.0 tools used by The Discovery Channel Educator Network are TypePad from Six Apart, StikiPad's StikiPad for wikis, iLike's GCast for podcasts, Simulat's Vyew live conferencing tool, and Yahoo!'s Flickr photosharing application..

Company Name(s): Smallthought Systems Inc.; Socialtext Inc.; Microsoft Corp.

Product Name(s): Dabble DB; Socialtext; Microsoft SharePoint Server

TecTerm(s): Data Sharing; Database Management; Indexing; Information Management; Podcasting; Social Media; Webconferencing; Web 2.0; Wikis

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Attack of the Giant Web 2.0 Lies!**

Author: Castillo, Jose

Source: Streaming Media Magazine – June 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.streamingmedia.com>

There are a few common myths surrounding Web 2.0. Learning to separate fact from fiction can generate true business-changing ideas in this combination of Internet video, social networking, revenue generation and user-generated content. Myth #1: traditional businesses cannot raise funds through Internet videos. BlendTec, a blender maker from Utah, was able to boost its direct-to-consumer sales by creating a series of videos showing torture tests of its blenders and uploading them to YouTube. Myth #2: Podcasting, which is called by various other names, is dead. The emergence of Web 2.0 enabled millions of people to create, upload and share videos through user-generated video sharing sites such as YouTube, Revver, Google Video, etc. Even established companies like Microsoft and Ford have joined the video podcasting craze. Myth #3: It is hard to find relevant videos on the Web. There are next generation video search technologies that can be used to find relevant videos online, including a 30-year-old military technology, video preview walls and the old-school TV Guide. Myth #4: 99 percent of Internet videos are created by kids. Recent partnership deals between YouTube and the BBC, Joost and Viacom, CBS and Brightcove, and other media companies will allow users to watch their favorite shows online. Myth #5: Ad agencies must be paid huge sums of money to create viral videos. Myth #6: Videos cannot be shared online because of the threat of piracy. Myth #7: Online videos are reserved for individuals and companies with extensive knowledge of the Internet.

TecTerm(s): Data Sharing; Digital Video; Internet Television; Podcasting; Video Streaming; Video Search; Web Development; Web 2.0

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Amid the Rush to Web 2.0, Some Words of Warning**

Author: Gaudin, Sharon; Greenemeier, Larry

Source: Information Week – May 28, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.informationweek.com>

Businesses must ensure to set up security measures as they move to adopt Web 2.0 technologies, such as wikis, blogs and social networks. A social network or blog, for example, can be used to let customers post their experiences about using a certain product or service, or upload photos and videos. But Web 2.0 technologies are vulnerable to security attacks. Hackers and spammers can create MySpace accounts and put malicious codes on their pages to infect the pages of their MySpace friends. Also, malware creators are now targeting Ajax applications, which are responsible for making Web 2.0 very dynamic. Before adopting Web 2.0 technologies or techniques, companies must trust the source of their third-party widgets and also audit the program. JavaScript should also be banned to users. IT managers should set up security measures and warn users against posting too much personal information. Company blogs should also be scanned for malicious codes. In addition to these measures, banning certain Web 2.0 websites from work PCs should also be considered. The Department of Defense recently prohibited employees from going to social networking and entertainment sites such as MySpace and YouTube. But most businesses are keener on banning certain website categories, such as gambling and adult websites, than individual sites.

TecTerm(s): Computer Security; Corporate Blogs; Corporate Wikis; Cybercrime; Internet Security; Social Networking; Web 2.0

## **Article**

### **Article Title: User Revolt at Digg.com Shows Risks of Web 2.0**

Author: Kopytoff, Verne

Source: San Francisco Chronicle – May 3, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.sfgate.com>

Digg.com, a news website that allows users to select which stories receive the most prominent display, faced a rebellion among its users when it removed links to stories that described a secret computer code for copying high-definition DVDs. Users believed that Digg had gone against one of the major tenets of Web 2.0, which is that members of an online community should be allowed to police themselves. Digg ultimately decided to let the controversial content remain on the website after users claimed the company was imposing unwanted censorship. Digg now faces legal issues stemming from its provision of links to illegal DVD copy technology. The liability of Digg is unclear, however. Digg's founder, Kevin Rose, says the firm would rather 'go down fighting' than bow to the interests of a larger company. He said he had listened to his users' arguments and will not delete comments or stories that contain the DVD-bootlegging code. Digg will deal with whatever repercussions arise, he says. The debate at Digg emphasizes the power and danger of Web 2.0, a loosely defined number of websites that encourage online social networks and depend on purely democratic principles to promote news stories, music, photographs, and other online content. Other examples of Web 2.0 sites include YouTube, Wikipedia, and Flickr.

Company Name(s): Digg Inc.

TecTerm(s): Censorship; Community Building; Legal; Social Media; Social Networking; Web 2.0

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Bubble 2.0?**

Author: Waters, Richard

Source: Financial Times – May 1, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.ft.com>

In commenting on the likelihood or not of a Web 2.0/Bubble 2.0 possibility in the Silicon Valley (due to overinvestment in online video and social networking start-ups), Google's AdSense would probably be best left out of "some 16-year-old's chat room," says a partner for BenchMark Capital, a company that has invested in Linden Research's Second Life, a 3D online world. He says specialized strategies that appeal to narrow groups of users valued by marketers will probably find that they can attract advertising. For many consumer Internet companies, revenues will become harder to get, because there are so many new websites battling for attention. Those that do get an audience could find it pretty challenging to make it profitable, even though many are depending on the ad networks of Google, Yahoo!, and Microsoft to monetize gathered eyeballs. The heavy concentration of audience and revenue from ads that is seen in most media markets is not taken into account. About 500 new consumer Internet companies raised \$3.2 billion between them in 2005, and 700 others raised \$4 billion in 2006. The number for the final three months of 2006 rose by one-third in the first quarter of 2007. Even so, said John Doerr, a leading financier in Silicon Valley and a backer of Google and Netscape, the sector will not decline because venture capitalists (VCs) are not running out of money any time soon. Another difficulty for smaller entries is the growing participation of large media companies, which further weakens the ability to get more eyeballs. If companies cannot find buyers, there will be a bone-rattling shock to Web 2.0 companies, but there should be little broader impact.

Company Name(s): Google Inc.; Linden Research Inc.

Product Name(s): Google AdSense; Second Life

TecTerm(s): Financial Analysis; Financial Information; Internet Advertising; Investment Analysis; Venture Capital; Web 2.0

## **Article**

### **Article Title: Techs Turn to Web 2.0**

Author: Connolly, James M.

Source: BtoB – April 2, 2007

URL of Publication: <http://www.netb2b.com>

Technology companies are moving quickly to introduce Web 2.0 interfaces, and as they do so, they are changing traditional thinking about issues such as communicating with customers, marketing, developing products, and sales. Wherever a firm is using Web 2.0 technologies, it must be prepared for significant changes in customer relationships, marketing roles, sales processes, and product development, say industry observers and marketers who have committed to Web 2.0 approaches. Web 2.0 is generally considered an environment in which communities of participants who have common interests make contributions to a collective intelligence. Additionally, Web 2.0 uses dynamic applications that are independent of hardware and that are developed with the aid of customers. Web 2.0, in practice, involves things like blogs, podcasts, shared news, social networking, wikis, and other technological capabilities that allow users to connect with and learn from each other. For some technology firms, however, Web 2.0 only means having someone write a blog-style commentary to promote a new product. Web 2.0 has developed a new thought process and an entirely new way of doing business. Executives and company staff can communicate directly with current and potential customers, while customers have forums in which to communicate their ideas for product development and services.

TecTerm(s): Business Planning; Interfaces; Internet Marketing; Product Development; Web Development; Website Design; Web 2.0

## **Web 2.0-Related Companies**

### **Bloglines**

170 Knowles Dr #208  
Los Gatos, CA 95032-1833  
United States  
Phone: (510) 985-7400  
<http://www.bloglines.com>

### **del.icio.us Inc.**

701 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
United States  
Phone: (408) 731-3300  
Fax: (408) 731-3301  
Toll-free: (800) 438-9246  
<http://www.del.icio.us>

### **Facebook Inc.**

471 Emerson St.  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
United States  
Phone: (650) 853-1300  
<http://www.facebook.com>

### **FeedBlitz LLC**

35 Field Rd.  
Sudbury, MA 01776  
United States  
Phone: (978) 758-8686  
<http://www.feedblitz.com>

### **FeedBurner**

549 W. Randolph, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60661  
United States  
Phone: (312) 756-0022  
Fax: (312) 756-0033  
<http://www.feedburner.com>

### **JotSpot Inc.**

167 Hamilton Ave., 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
United States  
Phone: (650) 323-3225  
Fax: (650) 323-1049  
<http://www.jot.com>

### **LinkedIn Corp.**

1840 Embarcadero Rd.  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
United States  
Phone: (650) 687-3600  
Fax: (650) 687-0505  
<http://www.linkedin.com>

### **MySpace**

121 2<sup>nd</sup> St., 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3608  
United States  
Phone: (415) 882-2130  
<http://www.myspace.com>

### **Netvibes Ltd.**

99 City Rd.  
London, UK EC1Y 1AX  
United Kingdom  
Phone: 333 610032748  
<http://www.netvibes.com>

### **Six Apart Ltd.**

548 4<sup>th</sup> St.  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States  
Phone: (415) 344-0056  
Fax: (415) 344-0829  
<http://www.sixapart.com>

**TagWorld Inc.**

227 Broadway #300  
Santa Monica, CA 90401  
United States  
Phone: (310) 394-5164  
<http://www.tagworld.com>

**Technorati Inc.**

665 3<sup>rd</sup> St. #207  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States  
Phone: (415) 896-3000  
Fax: (415) 896-3004  
<http://www.technorati.com>

**Twitter Inc.**

164 S. Park St.  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States  
Phone: (415) 963-2357  
Toll-free: (866) 418-8988  
<http://www.twitter.com>

**WordPress**

355 1<sup>st</sup> St.  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States  
Toll-free: (877) 273-8550  
<http://www.wordpress.org>

**YouTube Inc.**

71 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave.  
San Mateo, CA 94401  
United States  
Phone: (650) 343-2960  
Fax: (650) 343-2983  
<http://www.youtube.com>