As discussed earlier, these scenarios are of two types: fixed form (manually developed) and parameter driven (expert system) For the fixed form scenarios, users need only select the scenario, and the transaction procedure is determined. For parameter driven scenarios, a user-dialog is needed to determine the situational characteristics. As with other aspects of contract negotiation, this will proceed from one party to another in an offer, counter-offer, acceptance sequence. Once this dialog is complete, the inference engine will assemble the trade scenario.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

A design and pilot implementation of a system, called InterProcs, supporting electronic contracting has been presented. A key concept in the design of this system is the notion of electronic trade scenarios (or procedures), which are generic may be downloaded by the trading parties for a particular transaction. These scenarios may be fixed in structure, with simple parameter substitution, or they may also be designed to be customizable, within a certain range of flexibility, depending on the type of transaction.

This system, at present, has mainly been used for creating pilot models to demonstrate the usefulness and feasibility of electronic trade scenarios. These pilot applications models for an electronic negotiable bill of lading, the port community of Rotterdam, and international trade transaction models (in collaboration with the International Trade Procedures Working Group of the United Nations).

Though electronic trade scenarios have not yet appeared in actual commercial practice, we have observed that as electronic commerce turns more towards the needs for business-to-business transactions, interest in these concepts is growing quickly. We look forward to further commercial experimentation.

MAKING ELECTRONIC COMMERCE EASIER TO USE WITH NOVEL USER INTERFACES

BY JOSÉ L. ABAD PEIRO AND PATRICK STEIGER, IBM ZURICH RESEARCH LABORATORY, SWITZERLAND*

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM

Certain security properties of electronic commerce (e-commerce) services are too complex to be fully understood by non-professional users. For example, group signatures or anonymity (Chaum 1981) with fair-exchange properties for online purchases are not easy to use by inexperienced users, who may not recognize the equivalent meaning in the real world, or may find that the parameters required in the protocols are too complex.

We claim that by adopting new user-interface technologies we can provide the users of electronic-commerce services with powerful and easier-to-use tools. New technologies applied to user interfaces, e.g., virtual worlds and network-based games, have been targeted to increase sales in the entertainment industry. Many suppliers on the Internet may have an interest in adapting these novel interfaces to capture a bigger share of the market, especially because many of their potential customers have grown up using video games more than wooden blocks.

In this paper we address the border between user-interface technologies and protocols used to implement secure e-commerce services, see Fig. 1. As both user interfaces and e-commerce services are increasing in complexity and functionality, we believe that a deeper reasoning for their optimal integration is required.

Our goal is to bring the marketplace closer to users by means of new interface technology in such a way that users need not be concerned about technical issues related to their communication media. For example, when a merchant is selling a product worth $100,000, he should not have to be concerned about the bandwidth on his link or the key length of the encryption channel. The underlying e-commerce services process the transaction respecting security and legal requirements, whereas the user-interface supports the deal on a pure business level. In Fig. 2, the integration of these two elements is marked with a dashed line. This model is

*José L. Abad Peiro (jla@zurich.ibm.com) has been a member of the network security research group at the IBM Zurich Research Laboratory since 1995. Prior to joining IBM, he was a network manager engineer in the communications division of the European Space Agency in Darmstadt, Germany. He is currently working towards a Ph.D. degree in applied sciences from the Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium.

Patrick Steiger (steiger@acm.org) has been member of the e-business solutions group at the IBM Zurich Research Laboratory since 1995. He is currently a Ph.D. student at the University of Zurich, Switzerland. His research is focused on increasing consumer sovereignty on the Internet by providing tools to make their needs explicit. He is working on a prototype for personal risk management.



Figure 1 Model of Electronic Commerce.



Figure 2
Stack Model of E-Commerce

similar to the idea of the ISO OSI protocol stack model used to represent different layers of communication protocols and services (ISO 1984).

ELECTRONIC COMMERCE SERVICES

Many services for electronic commerce are available, e.g., product selection (Steiger and Stolze 1997), support for auctions (Schmid 1997) and other types of business negotiations (Guttman and Maes 1998, Beam and Segev 1997) as well as contract signing (Ben-Or et al. 1990) and electronic payments (Asokan et at. 1997).

USER INTERFACE

Asynchronous interaction between a seller and a buyer through e-mail and the World Wide Web was the traditional way to perform retail electronic commerce before 1998. User interfaces for synchronous interaction also emerged several years ago, mainly for entertainment purposes and social interchanges (Rheingold 1993). Text-based chat systems and text-based interactive worlds, so-called multi-user domains (MUDs) (Curtis and Nichols 1993), were the predecessors of today's multi-user chat systems such as Microsoft Chat (formerly called Comic Chat) (Microsoft) and three-dimensional virtual worlds (Damer 1998). Augmented reality interfaces, also called "natural user interfaces" (Rauterberg and Steiger 1996), constitute new directions of development. Augmented reality "extends" the real world by augmenting it with external computational capabilities, i.e., real and virtual objects can be mixed in the same user interface, which will facilitate computers becoming ubiquitous (Weiser 1991). Some predict that, eventually, the physical world itself will become the interface to cyberspace (Ishii and Ullmer 1997). These emerging interaction technologies create a fascinating new realm in which to design and present electronic-commerce services in a more user-oriented way. Figure 3 summarizes the different levels of interaction available to a user to make use of electronic-commerce services.

In the following section we focus on the "bridge" between the service level of the e-commerce infrastructure and the business level at the user interface (indicated by the dashed line in Fig. 2).

BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP PROPERTIES

If we assume that it is difficult for average users to set their own security properties within an electronic-commerce framework, we need a higher level of abstraction closer to the user's real-world experience. If a user were to be represented by a software entity, such as a cartoon character or an avatar (Damer 1998), it would be easier for him to specify how he wishes to conduct business by using that representation. Obviously, the type of user interface determines how the representation is actually built and to what extent the user can actually specify details. In any case, the meaning of some of these properties is the same for all types of interfaces. When these properties affect the way in which business is conducted, we call them business relationship properties.

REFERENCES

Asokan, N.; Janson, P.; Steiner, M.; Waidner, M. "State of the Art in Electronic Payment Systems", in: IEEE Computer, 30 (9), 1997, 28-35.

Beam, C. and Segev, A. "Automated Negotiations: A Survey of the State of the Art", in: WI 39 (3), 1997, 263-268, URL: http://haas.berkeley.edu/~citm/wp-1022.pdf.

Ben-Or, M.; Goldreich, O.; Micali, S.; Rivest, R. "A Fair Protocol for Signing Contracts", in: IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 36 (1), 1990, 40-46.

Chaum, D. "Untraceable electronic mail, return addresses, and digital pseudonyms", in: Communications of the ACM 24 (2), 1981, 84-88.

Curtis, P. and Nichols, D. "MUDs Grow Up: Social Virtual Reality in the Real World", Xerox PARC, Palo Alto, CA, USA, 1993.



Figure 3
Six Levels of Interaction

Business Relationship Property	With respect to	Range of values			
Identification of the user	by other users	everybody	business partner	nobody	
Visibility	to other users				
♦ of the representation		everybody	visible users only	business partner	nobody
♦ of the interaction		everybody	visible users only	business partner	nobody
Presence	of the user	absent	delegated presence (agent)		present
Trust	on other users	everybody	business partner	nobody	
Multiplicity of representations	of the user	1/m	1/1	n/1	n/m

Figure 4 Attributes and Values of Properties for Business Relationships.

We identify five properties that a user can set to configure his business relationship (see Fig. 4 for a summary):

The Identification of the user defines which e-commerce participants are allowed to obtain some knowledge about the user's real identity. There are at least three levels: everybody, only-the-business-partner, and nobody.

Visibility with respect to other users. A user can select how visible his actions and representation(s) are to other users. We distinguish between interactions, e.g., talking or exchanging objects, and representations, e.g., avatars, a cartoon character, or a sound. For both attributes we consider at least four levels, i.e., visible to everybody, only-to-visible-users, only-to-business-partner, and nobody.

Presence of the user. A user can select from different degrees of involvement in a market transaction[1]. These degrees vary from absent, i.e., having an asynchronous interaction via e-mail or web, delegating a task to an automated process, e.g., a software agent that synchronously interacts with other market players, or present and interacting synchronously during a phase of the market transaction, e.g., in virtual worlds, comic chat environments, or in the real world enjoying pervasive computing support.

Trust in other users. We identify at least three groups in which to establish a trusting relationship. A user can decide to trust everybody, only-business-partners, or nobody. Different degrees and types of trust can be assigned to each group.

Multiplicity of user representations. Describes how many different instances of a user can exist in the system. We distinguish among four possibilities: a single representation for multiple (m) users, a single representation for a single user, multiple (n) representations per user or multiple (n) representations for multiple (m) users.

In the following section we describe several scenarios showing how e-commerce users could make use of these business re-

[1] Market transactions are defined in the next section.

Damer, B. "Avatars", Peachpit Press, Berkeley, USA, 1998.

Guttman, R. and Maes, P. "Agent-mediated Integrative Negotiation for Retail Electronic Commerce", in: Proceedings of the Workshop on Agent Mediated Electronic Trading (AMET'98), Minneapolis/St. Paul, USA, 1998.

Schmid, B. (ed.): International Journal of Electronic Markets 7 (4) (that issue is dedicated to electronic auctions; it contains six papers on that topic), 1997, URL: http://www.electronicmarkets.org.

Ishii, H. and Ullmer, B. "Tangible Bits: Towards Seamless Interfaces between People, Bits and Atoms" in: Proceedings of the CHI '97, Atlanta, GA: ACM Press, New York, 1997, 234-241.

ISO: "Basic Reference Model for Open Systems Interconnection", ISO 7498, Geneva, Switzerland, 1984.

Microsoft: Microsoft Chat Home, URL: http://www.microsoft.com.



Figure 5 Phases in the Establishment of an e-Business Transaction.

lationship properties, and we discuss some of the implications regarding the different settings of respective business partners.

SCENARIOS

The following two scenarios demonstrate the application of business relationship properties. The protocol flow used in these scenarios is based on the model of phases in the market transaction described by Schmid (1993). Basically in this model a transaction takes place in the following three phases: information, negotiation, and settlement. During the information phase a buyer looks for suppliers and products to evaluate. In the negotiation phase demand and supply are tried to be matched. The settlement phase consists of delivery and payment. Schmid limited market transactions to a linear and unidirectional process from the information phase to the negotiation phase and further to the settlement phase. We have enhanced this model by introducing additional reasonable transitions, Fig. 5.

During each transition we assume there is a possibility of changing the configuration of business relationship properties.

SCENARIO 1

Let us assume that Mary, a marketing director of a sportswear company, plans to launch a new line of biking garments. For this purpose, she is looking for a market research report on the newest trends and consumer requirements in that area. As Mary is a very busy person, she may delegate the task of collecting and analyzing offers to a software agent during the information phase, i.e., the agent is Mary's

Identification (identified by):	nobody
Visibility (visible to):	everybody
Presence:	delegated presence
Trust:	nobody
Multiplicity:	1

Figure 6
Initial Configuration for a Marketing Director in the Information Phase.

delegated presence. Of course, the competition must not become aware of the fact that she or her company is focusing on these issues. Therefore, her agent should stay anonymous, i.e., be identified by nobody. On the other hand, everybody (especially sellers) should see and possibly hear that her agent is looking for a market research report. In this way, not only does the agent approach suppliers, but also suppliers can recognize a potential customer and approach her agent. Mary (i.e., her delegated presence) trusts nobody.

The initial configuration of her business relationship properties to start the market transaction is shown in Fig. 6.

After some time, the agent presents Mary with several offers from various market research institutes. At this point, she may want to be present and get involved personally in negotiations with them whether she can simply buy an existing market research report or has to order a new investigation focusing on specific details of her project. During this phase, she remains anonymous and even reduces her visibility to be seen only by the business partner with whom she is currently communicating. After negotiating with all the candidates, she decides to buy an existing report from the company Collector Inc. Only at the settlement phase of the transaction (and because she decides to do so) does she reveal her identity to her business partner, Fig. 7. Changes in the business relationship properties are underlined.

Rauterberg, M. and Steiger, P. "Pattern Recognition as a Key Technology for the Next Generation of User Interfaces" in: Proceedings of the SMC '96 (Vol. 4) IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Beijing, China: IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1996, 2805-2810.

Rheingold, H. "The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier", Addison-Wesley, Reading MA, 1993.

Schmid, B. "Elektronische Märkte", in: Wirtschaftsinformatik 5, 1993, 465-480.

Steiger, P. and Stolze, M. "Effective Product Selection in Electronic Catalogs", in: Proceedings of the CHI '97, Atlanta, GA: ACM Press, New York, 1997, 291-292.

Waidner, M. "Development of a Secure Electronic Marketplace for Europe", in: Proceedings of the ESORICS 96, Rome, 1996, 1-14.

Weiser, M. "The Computer for the 21st Century" in: Scientific American 265 (3), 1991, 94-104.



Figure 7 Overview of Scenario 1 — Marketing Director Buys a Market Research Report.



Figure 8
Overview of Scenario 2: An Auction Type of Negotiation

SCENARIO 2

The second scenario is about Tim, a 16-year-old boy who wants to sell games on the Internet. He visits a marketplace in Traveler[2] his favorite virtual world. In Traveler, many people deal with games. Tim wants to hold an auction to sell his games. He is quite clever and experienced with multi-user applications: he decides to instantiate two avatars and operate them simultaneously (i.e., a multiplicity of 2). The avatar A represents Tim himself, and the business relationship properties are openly configured for all phases, see Fig. 8. During the information phase, Tim presents his games to sell. In the negotiation phase, Tim (as avatar A) runs the auction. The same values of business relationship properties are kept during both phases.

The role of avatar B is to participate in the auction as a potential buyer trying to push up the price. The setup of business relationship properties for this avatar is also the same for the information and the negotiation phase. Avatar B should stay anonymous, i.e., nobody should identify the person behind it, Fig. 8. For the settlement phase, after the auction, Tim no longer needs the additional avatar, hence B disappears and the multiplicity of Tim's business relationship changes to 1.

[2] Traveler is an existing virtual world provided by Onlive! (www.onlive.com). One cannot only fly around in three dimensions, one can also talk. As the sound is three-dimensional, too, one can estimate the direction and distance of somebody talking [Dam98].

DISCUSSION

The two scenarios show how each user controls the setting of business relationship properties specific to their situation and particular goals throughout each phase of a market transaction. This is a convenient way to determine some of the security properties underlying in e-commerce services.

Let us see what happens when participants with different settings meet. For scenario 2, let us assume that, in addition to Tim's avatars A and B, another avatar C participates in the auction. Avatar C has the following configuration: [Identified by: business partner, visible to: business partner, presence: present, trust: business partner, multiplicity: 1]. By these means, only Tim can see C through his avatar A. Any other invisible observer O lurking around would only see Tim's representation A and B. Because they as well as their interactions are visible to everybody, even A's actions/words to invisible C are visible, observer O would know that A is running an auction with B and somebody else, but neither O nor B would see or hear the representation or an action/reply from C, see Fig. 9.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, the concept of business relationship properties has been introduced to show how users' preferences may dictate participation in electronic marketplaces using current e-commerce technologies. Projects such as SEMPER (Secure Electronic Marketplaces for Europe) currently support the security requirements for electronic commerce services (Waidner 1996). Various existing chat applications and virtual societies apply sophisticated user-interface mechanisms. Though our research has not found evidence of currently existing systems offering e-commerce services through such user interfaces, we consider their integration inevitable within the next few years. We hope with this paper to have enhanced the understanding of how this non-negligible step may be realized. Future work must be invested in elaborating binding relationships between the business relationship properties discussed in this paper and security properties, for example through the use of authorization policies. Another open issue is how e-commerce services can be represented in the new interfaces.



Figure 9 Different Perspectives of Paticipants of Scenarion 2