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Discussion

**ZING**

- ZOOM – discussed briefly
- **SRW and SRU** – discussed in detail
- CQL – discussed briefly
- **ZeeRex Explain** – discussed
- ez39.50 – not discussed
- Evolution of Z39.50; Inherits best bits
- More extensible than Z39.50
  - Access points, data schemas, extra data
  - Extendable operations
- Industry standard platform – HTTP; web services
  - Easier fit with other developments
  - Easier to find developers
  - Less to maintain and optimize
  - Fewer firewall problems
- Simplicity
  - People don’t need a diploma to start
- Performance
  - SRU re-uses data in cache – less load on server
- Cross Domain interoperability
  - Easier to promote
Keeps best bits of Z39.50

- Abstract indexes
  - DC
  - Bath profile mapped
- Precise searching
- Result set concept
- Improves Explain – machine configurable
  - really
- Extensibility
  - better: other info at message & record level
Zed’s best bits continued

- Multi-target searching
  - One user interface; one search
  - different platforms (UNIX, NT, IBM etc.)
  - different database systems (relational, network)
  - different database models
- Searching based on abstract concepts
  - “Title”, i.e. not database columns
- Can combine results from diverse databases
  - Common record syntax (XML; in Z39.50 is ISO 2709)
- Reuse of results
- Facilitates follow on delivery – electronic & physical
When to stay with Zed

- No problems with firewall
- System needs zero maintenance / enhancements / optimization
- System needs no new targets or clients
- System needs no external interoperation with dissimilar systems and portals
Bill’s Commercial Break

http://herbie.bl.uk:9080/cgi-bin/multi_2.cgi

http://greta.pica.nl:1080/sru/?query=dc.creator+%3d%22frank%22+and+dc.date+%3d%221986%22&recSchema=dc
Implementations

- TEL
- OCLC PICA
- ONESAC
- BIBSYS
- LC
- OCLC – OR - IMS

- Low cost
- Technically compatibility
- Compatibility with TEL
- Easier; want to promote
- YAZ facilitates
- Z39.50 not acceptable to IMS

SRW - Search/Retrieve Web Service
Z39.50 International: Next Generation
Tools

- Cheshire II – database
- Index Data – gateway to/from Z39.50
- LC – MARC to MARCXML
- CQL parsing tools
- Explain stylesheet
- SOAP tools are SRW tools
- Browsers are SRU tools
- Portlet?
SRW - Search/Retrieval Web Service

**SRW** WEB service
- HTTP POST, SOAP wrapper, XML encoding, WSDL
- Client / server (machine to machine)
- For long query strings, complex queries
- For protected servers

**SRU**
- HTTP GET (URL) with XSLT
- thin client – (browser to machine)
- Full function but simple implementation & take up Simple
- URLs for documents, browser bookmarks
  - Mozilla: saved URL, multiple search, tab presentations from multiple servers
Recommendation - Update

For: simple update of a record from a result set, addition of holdings, addition of links, annotations, reviews, etc.

- UCP as Z39.50 extended service – too complicated to implement; so
  - Limit to online only; single record
  - Inherit from UCP:
    - Data structures, diagnostics, version control
  - Separate operations for insert, modification, delete
  - Fetch record command

- Make into SRW / SRU operations or make new protocol SRW inspired
Other recommendations

- More examples on web site
- New tool for automatic generation of explain record (Bill to provide.....)
- Link to Collection Level Description from within the explain record
- XHTML as an option instead of XSLT (for browsers without XSLT capability)
Lovely party – Thank you for asking me.
Main Differences from Z39.50

"Stateless" and "connection-less", with continuity maintained by:
- result set (server named)
- Authentication token
- Only one database
- Only one record syntax & encoding – XML (not ASN.1)
- CQL (CCL inspired) not RPN
- Explain – XML document (eye & machine readable)
More Differences

- Search & present use same request mechanism

- Services:
  - Search
  - Sort (part of search request)
  - Scan (v. 1.1)
  - Explain