



RETS Conference April 9th - 11th, 2008 Philadelphia, PA

Information

Meeting Date: Thursday, April 10, 2008

Meeting Time: 8:45 – 5:30

Location: Philadelphia PA

Meeting Type: In-person

Chair: Paul Stusiak

Minutes: Cheryl Andrichuk (from recording)

Agenda adjustments:

- Room change announcement for final session of the day.
- Voting on Omnibus change proposal for the adopted schema. There were a number of errors and omissions in the schema that are being brought to the group as a whole for voting on.
- Will be voting on Syndication Schema coming out of the Syndication draft
- Will be voting on Syndication Schema draft coming out of the Syndication workgroup
- Will be voting on two additional schemas from the Schema workgroup: Legal and Licensing
- Will not be voting on Media Schema
- Will not be voting on RETS 1.8 document

Minutes

Adopt previous meeting minutes

No discussion was held around the minutes of the previous meeting.

Wednesday

No minutes available.



Thursday

8:30 - All - Opening Remarks, Agenda Review and BoD Report

Paul Stusiak welcomed attendees. Notification of room and agenda changes.

Schema group meetings earlier this year were in Denver, and Sunnyvale. Also several meetings in Sunnyvale with the Syndication workgroup. Good to see that people are still investing time and budget in RETS.

Monthly status calls continue on first Wednesday of the month. You are encouraged to join in on a regular basis. Only a few people are currently participating and some participants are sporadic. These calls are useful to stay up to date on what's going on. If more people don't participate regularly, the calls may be cancelled. It's on the calendar.

Standards Committee has been formed and has been meeting to define the versioning road map and change proposal process. Dan Mills will be addressing this at the end of the day.

If your workgroup is thinking of bringing a change proposal forward you need to follow these dates if you want it to show up at the next trimester meeting (assuming the process gets passed at this meeting).

Introduction of Mike Wurzer Chair and the Board of Directors

Mike Wurzer took the floor.

In December the Board of Directors was elected. Myron Adams has been hired as the Executive Director of RESO, and will be full time in July. Good news because there will be someone with the time and resources to drive this forward on a consistent basis.

In December, all workgroup chairs were elected or re-elected. A transport workgroup was created to modify the 1.7 document to allow schema to be transported over that protocol. In February, a Syndication workgroup was created to develop a schema with a reduced number of elements for submission to a recipient website. They have agreed to work together to create a consistent schema.

Standards committee has been working on a process for the "request change" proposal. Dan will discuss this later.

Tentative roadmap of 1.7.1 document will be submitted on April 24 and will include technical revisions to date and there will be an electronic vote on it on May 11.

Yesterday, the Board voted to have 1.7.1 be the minimum requirement for the NAR MLS policy and asks MLS's to be compliant with RETS by June 2009. John Holly and his group will be working on the certification process for that. Myron is working with Mark and John to get a compliancy test suite together. There will be site compliancy at that point.

1.8 is the target for the August trimester meeting. There has been much discussion about what will happen with the version of the document as we move forward. Dan Mills will cover this



later. The Specification committee is discussing separating the specifications into functional areas with each functional area having a separate version.

A lot of progress has been made since December and it is expected a lot more will happen by August.

Paul thanked Myron and Debbie for their hard work organizing the meeting.

8:45 – 10:15 - All - RETS Perspectives

Mark Wise, Threewise Corporation

Talked about Threewise experiences solving problems, looking at industry trends and needs, and using RETS to address this.

Listhub looked at what RETS really does for an MLS. It allows you to say: “Enter your data with us, first, keep it up to date, and we’re going to give you a standard way to get it back.” Many MLS’s don’t realize how powerful this statement is.

A lot of time is spent gathering and entering the information. Many MLS’s have strict rules and regulations about the time period this information has to be added or changed. And nobody wants to keep adding the same information.

This is a great opportunity. It all starts with the data and getting the data out to different products is what it’s all about.

Business problems Threewise has solved using RETS include syndication:

Brokers want to get that information in front of buyers, and there are many buyers on the internet. Listhub’s an MLS system with a RETS interface. Over last year have connected with 70+ MLS’s using RETS. They don’t have a big staff. If they had to do one-offs for each MLS it wouldn’t be cost effective. Because of RETS they can get an MLS up and running in 3 or 4 hours. Then the listing agents and brokers have the ability to log in and access just their office ID inventory and then can quickly make it available on all these other sites for consumers to find. Users don’t have to change their process or re-enter data . They just had to log in and click a couple of buttons. This provides enormous value to them. The MLS can then say to them, keep your data up to date because millions of consumers have access to the information on the web

From a consumer standpoint, they find the listing, they click on it and drive the traffic to whatever site they want.

Threewise is able to provide above and beyond RETS: formatting, packaging and analytics on what listings were clicked on and did it lead to an appointment or a sale rather than just sending data out there.

They looked at syndication for MLS’s, brokers and agents. MLS’s can send out all the listings and have it all come back to their website; some don’t send any listings, it’s completely opt-in for the broker; and once the broker has signed up, the agent can participate in any way with



their listings. This is all using RETS to get the data and keep it up to date, and wouldn't have been possible without the RETS standard. It has been a success for the services Threewise can provide the industry and that speaks well of the RETS organization and where it started and where it's going.

The future for MLS's is much brighter when you say: We are the main point of data entry, we're going to provide the best tools, and we're going to allow you to get that data back so you don't have to redo the work.

Q: When you say it takes, on average, 3-4 hours to set up, is that typical of an MLS that has a certain population of standard fields that you can identify? How does that 3 hour number go up when you have to do additional investigation of the source page to figure out what that field really means, and is this the one I should send out?

A: There are several factors. Mapping of the data is one piece. We map it all into a common data model so we don't have to remap.

Another is queries. i.e. IDX Yes or No.- Is there internet? Yes or No.

Also mandatory things you have to do for the query. You have to send MLS number. You have to use date.

Q: What's a typical number of fields you have to pull?

A: 60-70 is in our data model. It's pure advertisement so we don't have to send everything. It's just the fields consumers search by on these sites, find it, then go back to the detailed page in the broker's site.

Mark Wise asks the audience questions:

MW: How many MLS's fear that these sites are in competition with you? And why?

A: The fear is that the data on those sites is not accurate and not an accurate reflection of what our particular market is.

MW: That's valid. It's bad for everyone when consumers find a place that has the wrong price or is already sold. We try to work with these entities and have the data come right from the MLS the moment the price changes or a listing goes on or off the market. We try to get an accurate representation of the marketplace. By embracing this we can clean that up a little bit and add value to the broker. 85% of people who use the internet as a tool, end up with an agent.

A: Could there be some way to identify the listings which are accurate and from the source. It would make it more appealing to the committees that have to approve it and the realtors.

MW: We can make that available but the search sites have to embrace that and be able to utilize that.

Q: What are your criteria on third-party sites. How do you determine which are serious businesses that your broker could have value from using?



MW: We had a couple of criteria. One was that you had to provide a direct link back to wherever the broker wanted the traffic to go.

1. You had to have a “listing link” so the browser could get back to the details page without filling in any forms, no leads being sold back to the broker.
2. You couldn’t charge to have the data posted.
3. We had to have the ability to keep you synchronized and up to date.

We have a list of 137 sites we’re looking at right now. We don’t judge business models but we do put them in different buckets in Listhub. For example, we tell the brokers that certain sites charge, and if they still want to work with those sites, they have the choice. We’ve already let a few sites go because they weren’t up to speed on accuracy. We monitor that and the biggest thing we do is audit and make sure it’s up to date.

Q: You are working with individual brokers, do you have any MLS’s where all the brokers are up and you get full feed?

MW: Of the 70 we have, 15 MLS’s have public websites and this drives traffic to the public website. You take a whole area’s inventory, put it on Google Base, and it’s a great way to do search-engine optimization. It’s a great way to track traffic and we can get reports for them. The MLS can let the brokers know, and the brokers can log in and change inventory and take control.

Q: Do you run into problems with the sites updating in a timely manner, which is outside of your control?

MW: Once the broker has signed up, we can have the data prepared within minutes. However sites might only update once a day or twice a day. All of them know that quicker updates are good for everybody. So they are all working on accepting diffs instead of fulls (just the changed part of the record as opposed to the full record) so we can do updates every 15 or 30 minutes, but they are not there yet.

Comment: It sounds like there is a disconnect. The outside parties coming in to do syndication and the industry partners who do syndication think very differently about what the word syndication means. We need to spend some time educating them on what syndication should look like as opposed to where it is right now in their minds.

Q: Does the direct link you provide the third party sites redirect to the home page or directly to the listing?

MW: Deep link directly to the listing.

Q: How do you achieve that?

MW: Most of the sites have the ability to dynamically build the URL for a listing. If we can’t, we offer “property pages” that we build dynamically that’s branded for them.

Most of the websites will work with us on that. If we can’t figure out a way to do it, we contact



the website vendors and they usually say – Here's how you do it.

Q: With 3rd party sites, what do you have in place contractually to prevent them from redistributing those listings to their partners?

MW: Each site is a little different. With Google Base, you can have syndication-“no” because they have an EPI that you can log into and actually get the data. They give you the ability to mark it as no. We try to look at Terms of Use, and if it looks like they are really going to shoot it out there, we don't put them on the list. We make it clear to the brokers. Every channel has a Terms of Use and a Website button. We encourage the brokers to go look and if they aren't comfortable with it, don't click the button and send your data there.

They way we look at it is if it's on another site, the worst thing that could happen is they find you a buyer. Get it out there. Get it everywhere, it's just an advertisement and you might find a buyer.

Q: Are you able to track page views on these sites.

MW: No. Some of the sites provide impressions back but it's not easy to integrate yet. We provide per listing/per site traffic. Property pages we can actually provide 500 clicks on Google this month turned into 5 appointment requests, 2 questions asked, lead/click ratio.

For the future, we hope to provide more information. The question is: How can we work with those sites and are there ways to gather information through some type of standard?

Q: What are the two positions of what syndication means?

PS: From within the industry, Syndication means the ability to deliver records and to track those records. And it needs to be light.

Parties that are currently external to the community and interested in Syndication, have the perspective that a couple of fields is good. We don't care how we get it. Just form it into a document we can get to our site somehow.

Internal community view is most data will come from MLS (and a little from broker and agent). The Syndication feed should allow tracking and we have to figure out how to get the Syndication document from point A to point B.

But as we have gone through this process over the last two months, the Syndication schema has grown quite heavy and we need to pull some of it to make it lighter. It has been developed for specific people who would be happier with a full listing feed.

Q: Is anybody coming back and looking for additional information like open house info?

MW: Open house has been requested by sites because they see consumers want that information. We are looking at integrating it.

Q: Comment: As an MLS operator, one of our biggest fears is that Google wants to take over every MLS and become the largest MLS provider. But in November in NAR Vegas the Google founder got up and said: They don't want to be an MLS. They want to use your data for the



best search engine they can provide. There's a lot of property out there and it is a benefit to have accurate, timely information provided to the most people possible, in an easy-to-access way. It makes sense for MLS's to add value to members by providing syndication

MW: Right. There has to be an organization and structure around data acquisition and maintenance. It starts with good, clean data and the MLS play an important role that provides that and governs that and provides a data feed. MLS

Q: When you have dealt with large MLS firm, what experience have you had with negative feedback?

MW: Right now big brokers like to have a competitive advantage. By having syndication, it allows "the little guys" to have access to a level playing field. After I've talked with the big brokers, they are surprised to see how much they can save on IT not having to write all these scripts and doing all this work. MLS provides a member service for no cost and basic syndication is free so they're saving money with access to good reports.

The fears: Haven't met a broker yet who didn't want to get his listings online in front of buyers. So I haven't seen fear on broker side.

Q: Comment: Referring to White Paper published by attorney Brian Larson "Syndicating Real Estate Listing Data" (<http://www.larsonlegal.com/>). Looking at Terms of use, he has determined that if listing content is incorrect, sites receiving syndication assume no liability; they say that the source they get the data from is responsible for the accuracy and independent rights to ownership. It's been legally tested and proven that a broker owns his/her data so it's pretty straightforward when you are one-on-one with the broker. So the MLS's need to be aware that if they are setting up IDX feed Syndication receivers say they have the right to sublicense your content through their website. And something like Google Base can send it off to a million other websites.

MW: Right and don't forget you can turn that off.

We review terms and if we see huge land mines we go back and talk to the sites. But we just make it available and make sure brokers know to click on the terms, do their due diligence and see if they really want to get involved here. Our cursory review is a marketing play.

Getting information from MLS is a good filter. You guys have rules and processes in place and we know it's already going out to the IDX and so we use the same search criteria to ensure we represent the right data and have less liability from the broker's perspective.

Conclusion: We work with the MLS's because we see this as a great member service that can be offered. Listhub.net.

Gregg Petch, Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc.

Gregg split the audience into 2 groups each with a team captain to play RETS Jeopardy.

Categories included History, Versions, Certification, RESO, Schema, Data Shares. Everyone enjoyed the event.



Break

10:30 – 12:00 Technical Track - Syndication Workgroup

Paul Stusiak

Would like to bring forward a draft Schema for voting, that was voted on last Friday on a conference call to bring to the group as a whole to adopt. It's a draft so we have the ability to make some minor changes which should be as minimal as possible since people will start developing against it.

Should discuss where we go from here. Providing secondary syndication format that allows you to group the listings by either franchise or broker and not repeat broker element inside that as a potential other use case for this. The primary use case was for the individual listing entry of the information from a text editor, which is a constrained set of rules. But we are going to see syndication work that is going to be bulk or data feed type rather than one-offs.

If MLS's will be streaming this out we may want to consider other payload packages.

May also want to talk about how information gets from point to point.

May want to talk about people inside this industry having a slightly different view of what syndication feed looks like (tracking for example).

Or we could follow agenda points.

Dan: Where do you think we are on underlying concept of consistency between schema RESO?

PS: In the first schema we brought forward, within the community there was concern that what we were seeing in the schema had names that were radically different from what we were seeing inside of the schema workgroup. An effort has been made to rationalize the two naming sets and bring them together. If Syndication schema could be a subset of the Listing schema, then when building out a system, Syndication is just a simpler view of Listing and would be much easier to program and support.

There has been much agreement between the parties and the intent and hope is that we are now there. For example we have come to agreement on namespace values. There is no case where they've done something inside of this other than unbundling media. It may not make sense within Syndication to make them take the full media package. But there is one-to-one mapping between the element name photo and a media type which should be sufficient for the purposes of those building off the main listing schema. They don't think they'll ever do anything more on the media side than URLs so asking them to take the whole media package seemed excessive.

It's very simple. Media is the bad case where their data set is so much smaller than our broad data set so we might want to incorporate the media into the response document. Providing them with 4 text fields was sufficient with one-to-one mappings into things in the media package.



Q: Could those elements be represented in duplicate in the RESO schema?

PS: Each element is in the RESO schema, but the higher photo element isn't right now. If the group as a whole would like it to be one-to-one element mapping we could do that.

Q: Can there be a blanket statement that Syndication schema is a subset of RESO schema and changes in syndication workgroup will be retrofitted?

PS: It is like that except for photos and virtual tours and videos.

Q: I'd like to see that RESO schema is the dictionary and Syndication schema is a subset.

PS: We will backfit photos, virtual tours and videos into the media schema.

Q: Any changes here that have element names get directly reflected back into an element name of the same value inside of the main schema so there is no mapping.

(General consensus from group was that this was possible.)

Q: Are we going to have more schemas like Syndication? If we have more schemas after this, we can't push it back.

PS: A little history. In address, we had a full address which meant you could put in the street number and that's sufficient and backend processes will parse that out. Or you could put it in un-parsed. Syndication participants requested pulling unit number out as a separate element, because it could be at the end, at the beginning, it could have "suite" or "#" attached to it, so it would be easier to program if it were pulled out.

One of the points in the change proposal goes back and pulls that out as a separate element. If the number of changes going back into an adopted schema is high, we will have a problem but so far it hasn't been a problem. We shouldn't say schema aren't frozen to addition by being adopted but that they are frozen to deletion by adoption.

Q: In the next level of Syndication schema if the use case is different than what was thought of for the base schema how will we deal with it?

PS: Definitely worth consideration.

Intent is to have one-to-one mapping and Syndication group are amenable to using what we've already defined.

Q: Can you give background on pace and schedule of this? There seems to be earnestness to get to the end of this.

PS: Syndication group has worked quickly, partly because business drivers from outside have a real problem that they want fixed quickly. They are willing to do whatever they need to do to get that done. They had already agreed on a lot beforehand, and there is common use (sharing advertising data), they were able to come together very quickly on required and recommended fields. Most of the work after that was on optional fields. The basic 30 fields were in IDX already. Going forward, the participants that are new to community are keen to



move ahead, and I'm keen to have it done in appropriate manner. I want to be responsive within the Syndication workgroup to the needs of the members of the workgroup but I also want to be sensitive to the fact that we have created a standard that people are going to start working against.

We also have a bit of a disconnect between the people who had the burning business need to get something done and the people who are suggesting useful additions to the Syndication group. I think we are going to find the Syndication group is going to fall more into a slower pace that is more typical. Transport layer has not been an issue for the people that have been driving this but they are interested so we will work on that.

They might also want to create an additional schema. I don't want to have one schema serve all these different uses which was the use of individual entered record or franchise level broker records, I think those are different use cases and should be represented differently. But that's not as hot an issue.

Q: Is there anything that we, as a community, need to do to keep the momentum going?

PS: They are not using the same sources as we are. Many of them didn't have a background in real estate so they didn't consider that they could get the data from an existing syndication aggregator like an MLS. They saw it as coming from an agent or a broker. We could educate them what we can do together is useful because there are a lot of things they don't know yet that would be helpful to them.

I think Google at the Annual Meeting said they weren't interested in being an MLS, they just want to see the traffic flow through them. We can help that and everyone benefits.

Q: Why are we voting on a draft?

PS: They wanted something fast but some changes still need to be made. But we are close enough on the required and recommended fields to put this out there, get some people to use it, and give us some feedback. This gives us the latitude to change in small ways but not in major ways unless we find some significant structural fault in it. It's not in flux, you can use it with confidence that any changes are small and to everyone's benefit.

Q: Is there a defined period for the draft state?

PS. Not at this point, but the intent is to pull it out of draft and into final by August. But it depends on people starting to use it.

Q: We need to make this known to the community to start using it because it's going to go final.

PS: There will be a call on the 16th, and after that we'll be able to make that statement.

Comment from Chad: We are going to set up this format. Having a standards group really helps but I'd like to add something else. We discussed within Homescape but the legal side slows us down. I don't think there's one legal agreement that will work for everyone.

PS: We have approached the MLS's and said, here's how you can put together a contract for



an agreement, but the lawyers didn't agree. All the MLS's run into the same problem. How do I start? What do I do? Etc. We have talked about having contract suggestions about language you could use or what a contract might look like, even though it's not actually a contract.'

Action Item: Chad will go back to his legal department and come up with some standard language around contracts that might be appropriate.

Q: Is there anything that the rest of RETS can do to help with Syndication? Are you concerned about the size of the payload?

Discussion from the floor ensued:

-About reasons for the size (addressing the needs of one of the members in the group, XML, need to enter data by hand).

-Should this Syndication group work on using the schema as metadata and providing a compact format? (separator delimited file as well as XML).

-Maybe once this moves out of draft, these issues should be looked at by Syndication workgroup at a slower pace.

-Schemas need to be reconciled. Syndication schema as a use case – identifying the elements that satisfy a particular use case.

-If the Syndication schema is deemed to be too heavy, then the parties that need the additional data could just take full feed instead of Syndication feed.

-As long as we have a comprehensive dictionary that defines what the fields mean in the real estate industry, then use cases can be found concretely and universally.

PS: There was no will or interest in the transport mechanism to get point to point. I agree it got bulky, quickly. I understand the need for people to enter the data by hand and there are good solutions to that we should look at. It should be trivial to have a form application with little check boxes. Realistically, I'm expecting it will be the fsbo's entering using that.

PS: We should set upper limit on coming out of draft. Possibly one year

Discussion:

- Suggest December as outer limit with a goal of August
- Don't want it to be like 1.7 and if we set a limit, that won't happen here.
- If it ends up staying in draft, it would still be useful in perpetuity as long as everyone agrees
- Are there implications for compliance?
- Next year when most MLS's are RETS compliant will we be able to request RETS Syndication standards?



- Syndication is not part of the standard for 2009.
- Right now only one form of XML that you get back, called Standard SML and it doesn't have Syndication in it.
- Whether it's a site compliance issue or not there's certainly a commitment from a lot of people to support it.
- What does support mean? How will it change?
- The payload is being drafted and submitted now. Hopefully we'll get to the transport side at some point which I hope this workgroup addresses. I'm not part of the workgroup but we are committed to delivering the ability for all 105 of our brokers and MLS's to send this data format to the sites they want. (Mike)
- As long as we feel comfortable that the standards organization is heading towards a set path, we will commit our service to adopting that path in advance of you formalizing it. If we can rely on way to provide mapping on the back end we'll start mapping and if we see Syndication as a well-established usage, then we'll be delivering those specific data elements.(Steve)
- PS: Some useful work is talking how this can turn into a compact format within the group.

PS: How do you feel about transport. The community that was here before is transport-centric at some level and the people joining the community have been data-centric. Chad, I understand you are taking some RETS feeds now.

Chad: Once we got past the steep learning curve, we've embraced it. We support lots of data elements and it's great for us.

PS: Do other transport formats help you more than the existing RETS format where you are getting pulls going to the Atom thing or being able to do deltas, does that help you more?

Chad: Not sure yet. The live feeds we have with RETS are the best feeds and we have the least amount of issues with.

Jeff: When agents want their information up there immediately, is that a concern?

PS: Before, people were pushing for immediate updates but that is no longer being asked for. The suspicion is that this is because the market slowed down, but once the market heats up again, that will be important again.

If Syndication is going to be more than just a simple broker feed we need to address the issue of once a day complete (if you had 10,000 records and you changed one, you sent all 10,000), so it makes sense to doing deltas more often but it hasn't been a concern in the past. In many markets the time sensitivity is something we'll have to address.

Q: We're running into a problem syndicating ReMax bulk listings - you send data upstream in appropriate format but for some reason, some listings aren't accepted so ReMax calls us. It's



almost impossible to diagnose because of inadequate feedback. That's related to the speed issue.

PS: This is a problem. This is just a request. There is no response. It's a fire and forget. That solves the business problem today but it definitely needs to be revisited.

Q: It's complicated because a vast portal like Google or Yahoo might be getting data from a magazine, a newspaper, an MLS and a broker and there's a race condition.

PS: That is an issue as well. How do you say: "This is your best data point so you want to pick this one."

Q: That's where tracking and reporting becomes essential. We need to build some mechanisms as part of the schema or parallel to that. It's impossible to track manually, it has to be automated.

PS: The originators of the group were looking at it strictly as consuming the feed and not providing a feed, so we have to revisit that.

General consensus was that the feed spec is a very important problem to tackle.

Q: It would be nice to be able to determine which is the original record?

PS: What happens when it's an MLS and a broker? Who is the original?

Discussion ensued about originals and the identification thereof.

Idea from Steve: Need a set of data elements that identify the origin, when the originating record was modified, and when it was pulled to determine under what circumstances and where this record came from. That would be the tracking feed and as the record is passed along, add more information to that signature and use it to go back and track where it came from.

Who the originator is, is probably a business decision. We need to avoid opinions and stick to facts: This isn't really MLS aggregation. Whether to send it to a particular site or not is their decision to make. Just as it's the recipient's decision whether or not to accept it. Everyone has different opinions on how the information that's shown, gets there. And that's a business decision.

There is also a need for performance data.

Q: What's next?

PS: Today – bring forward a draft for vote. (passed unanimously by syndication group on Friday)

Meeting scheduled for the 16th – today's concerns need to be reflected back to that group.

From outside of the Syndication workgroup – some members need to take the draft schema and pass it on to their partners and start using it.



Within the Syndication workgroup, we need to start addressing some of today's comments.

- Flagging, tracking on top of the document.
- Start to look at turning this into a compact format and work with transport group to get it into the standard itself.

After the 16th we'll fall back into a bi-monthly call to take the pace back a step or two.

The draft will be published on the RETS.org website in a definitive location with multiple links pointing at it.

In the works: Two engineering documents.

One that is an overview of how do you actually do one of these. Another that is a more detailed engineering document about how you actually form the documents and send them back – similar to what all the participants have right now for their existing API's.

Session adjourned.

10:30 – 12:00 Business Track - Certification Workgroup

No minutes provided.

1:00 – 2:30 Technical Track Change Proposal Q&A

Errors and Omissions Solutions

Have adopted schemas already and if we want to make changes – there needs to be a change process, and this meeting is the attempt at doing this.

A number of schema were brought forward to be changed.

The following are being changed:

Offices, Members, Teams, Persons, Contact Methods, Address, Financial, and Listings

Changes occurred as work was being done on schemas and underlying schemas.

- **Licensing:** Noted that other than Realtors might be licensed. Specifically Appraisers and Auction Licenses. Thought it was appropriate to change from MLS Licensing to the more generic Professional License Type. Should have minimal impact as it's just a mapping change.
- **Cardinality mismatches:** Offices, Members and Teams should have the same cardinalities. Needed to explicitly state that maxoccurs=1. Not structural, just a comment.



- **Modification Timestamp Element:** It wasn't the same date format as the top level elements like Listings and Property, so it was changed to match.
- **Missing RETS ID values:** Added to explicitly state that this schema element is defined by this number and if the name is changed like RE Licensing to Professional Licensing Type, that number remains the same. If you do an automated mapping process, you change metadata value and not key value.
- **Missing Media for Members and Offices:** RETS 1 had the ability to load images and logos and this was an oversight that has been corrected.
- **Role Types, Billing Codes:** Overlooked but previously agreed to incorporate into Members. Additions to existing schemas.
- **Name Change – Office Type to Office Category:** in keeping with our standard naming conventions. Type is used a lot in XML schema so whenever we define a value, we try to use the term Category. Also this change resolved a Java Tool problem that was occurring.
- **Offices, Teams :** added Media tools that were missing.
- **Address:** Took out unit from composite street name and made it a separate element to help syndication group who were concerned about parsing within the full address.
- **ID type overlaps:** which shouldn't affect anyone who has implemented anything. If RETS ID changes, there should be little or no impact. Renaming might cause some clashes but this was felt to be low impact.

The changes and additions of elements will affect compatibility with previous version. Schema group unanimously recommended bringing forward the changes and adopting them.

Q: What about versioning Namespace?

A: This hasn't come up within the group. But it's a good idea. We will move the namespace version to 2008-04 to reflect changes that occurred here.

Q: The changes to the RESO schema to reflect syndication changes will come in a similar fashion.

A: Anything that doesn't affect adopted schema will just go in as part of the workgroup and be brought to the vote. The changes will be reflected back at that time.

1:00 – 2:30 Business Track Compliance Workgroup

No minutes provided.

2:45 – 4:00 Technical Track - Transport Workgroup

Steve Clark: Chair of Transport

Jeff Brush is co-chair

Encouraged participation – level is fine now but participation in the process will be defined by some minimum level of participation.

Steve gave a summary of what the Transport Group charter was.

Discussed: XSD is dictionary of terms within the industry, from that, derive a list of RESO standard names that would become basis for mapping on MLS servers to decode native MLS data and meet use cases.

Need tools to do these mappings. Tools would have to go to the customers who are the experts in their MLS domains. Once schema mappings are made, RETS schema mapping would create RESO-based payloads.

Transport group has worked on:

- Payload discovery mechanism: a way for RETS server to publish and for RETS clients to find out which payloads are available.
- Flattened RESO schema
- What metadata changes would be necessary to connect flattened RESO schema into RETS 1.7 or 1.8
- To what extent an MLS maps its values would be depend on business cases. Fully qualifying metadata so it's meaningful with respect to RESO schema.
- Need to mechanically generate a super set of standard names. But it's quite complicated.
Currently use underscore as delimiter instead of dot.
- Member and Room are special cases. For every element that could describe Room, we have to have a standard name for every possible room type. There are around 10,000 possible names.

Steve made the point that in his opinion RESO payload is just a subset of RESO schema.

Schema Flattener:

Goals: Not to abbreviate or alias names; Avoid looking like xpath (hence underscore notation)

Gave a demonstration of Schema flattener and generation of standard names. Talked about good uses of standard names, and the fact that the length of names was not a problem.



Discussion on floor about mapping of elements that could exist multiple times on the same record i.e.: Listing record: colisting agent 1, colisting agent 2, colisting 3 etc.

Discussion on how query language and foreign key ties into this.

Discussion of standard names deficiency in RETS1.

A file with all the names has been distributed to workgroup – need to find out where problems might occur and do it sooner rather than later. So if people foresee problems, it's a good time to get it all out on the table.

There was a spirited discussion about the role of this workgroup, what is necessary to do, and how to go about doing it.

Topics included: foreign keys, classes and resources related to property type status values, mapping, building tools, standardized name, and the ability for effective, efficient mapping of schemas to be one-time, automated and based on RETS standards.

Much of the discussion centered on standard names to support RESO schema and the best way to accomplish this.

Steve indicated that his demo was to show one way the schema could be flattened, and to talk about how to use flattened schema. He believes there are advantages to this mechanical method of doing and went through his reasoning.

Steve: I believe it is necessary and desirable to have a comprehensive set of names with distinctive meanings to relate data into the schema and I'd like to do it through the RETS community.

The audience was non-committal and Steve encouraged interested parties to participate in the group.

Early on in the process, the workgroup wanted to come up with a way to discover available payloads. Options were to describe in metadata, logresponse or new transaction. We decided to come up with a new transaction. Steve explained the new payload list transaction in RETS 1.7. This will be revisited.

Should payload be a format or a substitution for select clause? Steve prefers substitution. Discussion followed on this question.

Encouragement to audience to participate in workgroup.

The session was adjourned.

2:45 – 4:00 Business Track Marketing Forum

No minutes provided.

4:00 – 5:30 All - Vote and wrap up



Dan Mills went over the Standards committee update:

- RETS change proposal submittal
- Review ratification process
- Status of existing 1.6 document and its evolution into next version
- Plan for 1.8
- Longer term road map for RETS standard

Need to formalize procedure

At this meeting there is a draft of process and timeline to be reviewed and voted on and contents will end up be in governance document.

Document in entirety will be posted on RETS.org. Myron will announce when it is available. Everyone will have a chance to review and comment and then have an electronic vote around the time of the 1.7.1 standards document.

RCP's (only from workgroups) need to be submitted to standards committee 60 days prior to next trimester meeting.

Standards committee will review within 10 days and return to submitting workgroup. (at least 50 days prior to next trimester meeting)

If response comes back with requests for clarification, workgroup has 10 days to re-submit RCP.

Standards has 10 days to review revised RCP with acceptance or rejection. If there is less than 30 days left to next trimester meeting and the RCP is rejected, RCP will have to be submitted for subsequent trimester meeting.

This is done to ensure standards committee and workgroups have enough time to have the document ready – no less than 25 days before next trimester meeting. This gives everyone ample time to review RCP and discuss at the next meeting.

The next version of RETS will be 1.7.1 (essentially non-breaking changes to 1.7D6). Paul will have document fully reviewed by standards committee and ready for RETS.org by April 24 with electronic vote date of May 11. This is the version targeted for June 2009 NAR mandate.

Change summary:

- BNF changes
- Metadata field sizes that were inadvertently missed
- Make specs consistent with the DTD



- Other clarifications

RETS 1.8 will contain:

- Addition of schemas
- Work done by update workgroup – time zone clarification
- May want to include single sign-on (SSO) extensions for authentication pieces of protocol

There has been much discussion about how to matrix different protocol versions into the different pieces of functionality each one of them produces. No good solution yet.

Looking at having “RESO collection of RETS standards” which would have one standard that would contain all of the attributes of each of the individual standards. It will contain all of the information that is in Schema 2.0 and 1.7 but will be reorganized into a series of documents that better represent individual actions (actions, transactions, message formats) but express them in terms of a web service or http request through headers.

May end up with documents which describe how to do Search, Update, Metadata or Schemas.

Other alternative is to use patterns of other standards organizations (i.e. MISO and OASIS). Collection of documents broken down into

Those documents are broken down into:

- elements or pieces of the specification that are common across all the transactions or actions.
- Profiles that are analogous to transactions like Search, Update or GetMetadata

This is the potential direction of RETS standard 1.8 (which may be renumbered). Leaning towards splitting up omnibus specification into a collection of RESO specifications. If done correctly, can remove ambiguity within industry of when 2.0 is available.

Syndication workgroup report from Paul Stusiak

- Syndication has prepared a draft schema to bring to the group.
- Expect meetings to continue with emphasis on transport and tracking which was put on back burner while the business problem was dealt with.
- Will meet bi-weekly next trimester

Schema workgroup report from Paul Stusiak

- Met in Denver and Sunnyvale and will continue monthly meetings
- Properties is close to being complete



- Bringing forward licensing and legal today
- Always looking for more people to help out.

Update workgroup report from Sergio Del Rio

- Meetings are every Monday 9 a.m. Pacific time
- Encourage workgroup members (existing and new) to join calls
- Reviewed document of general metadata changes from end to end.
- Replaced lookup parent with more flexible lookup filters
- Took out validation lookup and validation lookup types
- Presentation metadata reviewed and is now a separate document and has a separate version so it is completely optional.
- Discussion on how changes will be presented and voted on.

Marketing and Education workgroup report from Kristen Carr

- Education: Have been updating content for last 4 months – need to continue with that
- RETS Interactive Toolkit due to be ready for August. (Trend has offered use of their data licensing agreement.)
- Continue with booth and content for marketing

Transport workgroup report from Steve Clarke

- Meet every other week
- Working on connecting RESO schema into RETS 1.7 specifications
- Should have change proposals for June
- Steve feels the group is mis-named
- Encourages new members – links on RETS.org website

Marketing workgroup report from Mary Frances Adams

- Putting together materials to distribute at different conferences
- 3 flyers now ready for mid-year (MLS executive, Broker/agent, 3rd party vendor) on how RETS will benefit them



- Template for vendors to fill in and tell how RETS is utilized by them. (Can get copies from Mary Frances to hand out when you are manning the booth.)
- Creating a survey of all MLS's to identify who has RETS, who doesn't have RETS and anywhere in between to create marketing pieces for each segment.
- Will do some things on RETS.org website

Certification workgroup report from Paula O'Brien

- Have been trying to put business language around what RETS certification means per NAR policy for June '09 and build a roadmap for that certification
- What complying with that policy means in business English and how to structure certification to benefit MLS's
- Statement being crafted for policy committee with regards to certification
- Working with marketing to get the word out about certification
- Checklist for compliance testing group

Compliance workgroup report from Paula O'Brien

- Kinds of tests that are out there now, and enhancements for general compliance and could be used for certification testing
- Design meeting in 2 weeks to review the tests and
- Will come up with new tests for August that can be used for general compliance, updating the 1.7.1 compliance test and a different user interface reporting mechanism that can be used by the certification group in January.

Next meeting: Chicago August 6-8, 2008, in NAR building

Voting

Each Workgroup has voted unanimously to adopt these

- Change Proposal from Schema Workgroup:
Omnibus adopted schemas revision and errata
Moved: Mark Wise Second: Mike Wurzer
No Discussion
One opposed, motion carried.
- Licensing Schema (part of property and listing) enumeration of licensing types to extend beyond real estate to allow for auction, etc.
Moved: Ryan Bonham Second: Eric Peterson



No discussion

One opposed, motion carried

- Schema Workgroup: Legal : Contingencies and disclosure types
Moved: Ryan Bonham Second: Dan Mills

No discussion

One opposed, motion carried

- Syndication Schema: draft schema (expected to have changes as it is implemented)
Moved: Mark Leswing Second: Mike Werzer
Steve: I assume the Syndication Schema is a subset of RESO schema
Matt: Why does it have to be added existing specification document as draft?
Paul: The expectation is that once the schema is actually implemented, there will be minor changes to the document.

Further discussion on need to have a draft document and reasoning behind workgroup's request to have schema adopted.
Three opposed, motion carried.

Call for motions from the floor. None.

Mark Scheel called for vote on Interesting Applications:

Winner: Andrew Tillman

Mark: Commented on change in demeanor of group since change in governance. Congratulated the group on amount of work done and thanked everyone for their contribution to the industry standard work.

Paul: How can meetings be improved?

- Meet twice per year
- Fewer working meetings, more presentations/education
- Workgroups should be mandated to expose their work 14 days before the meeting
- Reports/summaries to the board be provided by each group at the end of each month
- Monthly board report to share with the group

Meeting adjourned.

Set Next Meeting

- Next 4 meeting dates are already set. Suggest setting December 2009 meeting at the August 2008 meeting.



Friday

8:45 - 10:15 Technical Track - Update Workgroup

Minutes not transcribed.

8:45 - 10:15 Technical Track - RETS.org website

Minutes not provided.

8:45 - 10:15 Technical Track - Schema Workgroup

Minutes not transcribed.

8:45 - 10:15 Technical Track - Security Workgroup

Minutes not provided.

Trimester meeting adjourned.