

# **RETS - Separation Anxiety**

**Uncoupling Transport from Payload**

# Topics

- Naming confusion
- Separate Development Camps
- Challenges in migration
- A new perspective in development cycle
  - Painless migration
  - Logical Workgroups
  - Community Defined Paths

## RETS – Two Standards, Too Confusing

- “I’m Waiting for RETS 2”
  - Why are you waiting?
  - How long will you wait?
- “RETS 1 does all I need”
- “RETS 1 and RETS 2 will never co-exist”

"They all said that 2.0 was an upgrade to 1.x and wanted to wait so that they only had to pay their IT guy one time."  
- During NAR @ RETS Booth

## Forked Development

- Changes and updates RETS 1.x
- RETS Data Schema
- Community resources diluted
- Standards themselves are bloated

Who will decide when one get cuts off?

## The Alternative

- We already started: Modularize the Standard
  - Data Schema
  - Transports
- A Transport can receive any payload
- A Payload is Transport independent

It's the Data that's important, not how you get it

# RETS Modularity

- Transports
  - RETS-http
  - RETS-soap
- Payloads
  - RETS-Data Schema
  - RETS-Compact/Compact Decoded

## The Results

- Standards are composed of pieces
  - RETS-http
  - RETS-compact/compact-decoded
  - RETS-data Schema
- Workgroups coincide with development efforts
- Ease Migration
  - RETS 2 can include the RETS-http spec
  - FTP RETS Schema interim phase

## The Process

- Concepts are proposed to/in Workgroups
- Workgroups test and progress the implementation
  - Develop task specific specifications
  - Workgroup participation drives Standard direction
  - Natural end-of-life
- Community Adoption
- Mature changes are included in the Standard

**No theoretical concepts define the Standard**

## Quick Glance

- Decouple Transport from Payload
- Create a robust data set
- Agile Workgroups
  - Define transports/payloads based on new technologies
  - Active ones demonstrate need/desire

## Feedback

- “...it is becoming clear that RETS2 and future standards will likely offer an array of choices for data transport and data representation”
  - Colby A. (RealGo)
- “There is much inertia on the existing 1.x – all the existing tools - it would be easier to blend the two - add SOAP to RETS as a 'non-version' thing.”
  - Seain C. (TaraSoft)
- “Having two versions was diluting the effort. There are only so many hours to spread out between the two – the progress was stunted in both.”
  - Dan M. (MarketLinx)

## Quote of Summation

“It does make sense. It's Darwinian in the phasing out approach. Something new comes along and is implemented independent of what's already in place. If that new payload/transport replaces, say HTTP, in popularity then we've migrated without actually doing anything terribly traumatic to folks already using RETS.”

- Jaison F. (FBS)

# Benefits

- The RETS Standard is made up of Specifications
  - Can clearly define which specifications are required
- Data specification
  - Help consolidate all efforts
    - GoogleBase, Trulia, Zillow, or the next site de jour
  - Transport indifferent
    - Regionalization
- Removes Concept of 'Next Great Version'
- Transport and Payload are Separate
  - Definable Workgroups
- Clear Migration

# Challenges

- Compliance
  - Thoughts:
    - Community Effort on RETS Client
    - Compliance tests part of workgroup process
- Education
  - Community
  - Industry

*Look Familiar?*

# Summary

- Data is important, transport is interchangeable
  - Transports change with time and technology
- RETS 2 naming is deceptive
  - Roadblock for Industry adoption
- RETS Data Schema
  - Lives on its own
  - Transport Independent
  - Most valuable parts of RETS
- RETS as Modular Specifications

# **RETS - Separation Anxiety**

**Uncoupling Transport from Payload**

# Topics

- Naming confusion
- Separate Development Camps
- Challenges in migration
- A new perspective in development cycle
  - Painless migration
  - Logical Workgroups
  - Community Defined Paths

## RETS – Two Standards, Too Confusing

- “I’m Waiting for RETS 2”
  - Why are you waiting?
  - How long will you wait?
- “RETS 1 does all I need”
- “RETS 1 and RETS 2 will never co-exist”

"They all said that 2.0 was an upgrade to 1.x and wanted to wait so that they only had to pay their IT guy one time."  
- During NAR @ RETS Booth

## Forked Development

- Changes and updates RETS 1.x
- RETS Data Schema
- Community resources diluted
- Standards themselves are bloated

Who will decide when one get cuts off?

## The Alternative

- We already started: Modularize the Standard
  - Data Schema
  - Transports
- A Transport can receive any payload
- A Payload is Transport independent

It's the Data that's important, not how you get it

# RETS Modularity

- Transports
  - RETS-http
  - RETS-soap
- Payloads
  - RETS-Data Schema
  - RETS-Compact/Compact Decoded

## The Results

- Standards are composed of pieces
  - RETS-http
  - RETS-compact/compact-decoded
  - RETS-data Schema
- Workgroups coincide with development efforts
- Ease Migration
  - RETS 2 can include the RETS-http spec
  - FTP RETS Schema interim phase

## The Process

- Concepts are proposed to/in Workgroups
- Workgroups test and progress the implementation
  - Develop task specific specifications
  - Workgroup participation drives Standard direction
  - Natural end-of-life
- Community Adoption
- Mature changes are included in the Standard

**No theoretical concepts define the Standard**

## Quick Glance

- Decouple Transport from Payload
- Create a robust data set
- Agile Workgroups
  - Define transports/payloads based on new technologies
  - Active ones demonstrate need/desire

## Feedback

- “...it is becoming clear that RETS2 and future standards will likely offer an array of choices for data transport and data representation”
  - Colby A. (RealGo)
- “There is much inertia on the existing 1.x – all the existing tools - it would be easier to blend the two - add SOAP to RETS as a 'non-version' thing.”
  - Seain C. (TaraSoft)
- “Having two versions was diluting the effort. There are only so many hours to spread out between the two – the progress was stunted in both.”
  - Dan M. (MarketLinx)

## Quote of Summation

“It does make sense. It's Darwinian in the phasing out approach. Something new comes along and is implemented independent of what's already in place. If that new payload/transport replaces, say HTTP, in popularity then we've migrated without actually doing anything terribly traumatic to folks already using RETS.”

- Jaison F. (FBS)

# Benefits

- The RETS Standard is made up of Specifications
  - Can clearly define which specifications are required
- Data specification
  - Help consolidate all efforts
    - GoogleBase, Trulia, Zillow, or the next site de jour
  - Transport indifferent
    - Regionalization
- Removes Concept of 'Next Great Version'
- Transport and Payload are Separate
  - Definable Workgroups
- Clear Migration

# Challenges

- Compliance
  - Thoughts:
    - Community Effort on RETS Client
    - Compliance tests part of workgroup process
- Education
  - Community
  - Industry

*Look Familiar?*

# Summary

- Data is important, transport is interchangeable
  - Transports change with time and technology
- RETS 2 naming is deceptive
  - Roadblock for Industry adoption
- RETS Data Schema
  - Lives on its own
  - Transport Independent
  - Most valuable parts of RETS
- RETS as Modular Specifications