

Standards, Research and Rationale



George Ivie

CEO and Executive Director



Board of Trustees

Cross Media – Many Years in the Making

1st – Establish a Quality Digital Measurement Foundation

- Viewability; IVT Filtration; Digital Audience Processes
 - SIVT required for Audience Reporting
- Standards Already Issued; Adoption in Various Stages

Now – Cross Media Standard (Phase 1, Video)

- Establishes a framework to consistently measure ads and content across platforms
- Starts from a base of impressions with a common granularity; seeking second by second
- Creates a measurement (counting) foundation to optimize allocation to enhance analysis of ROI and efficiency of media spend

Cross Media Standard – Project

- Process – MRC & Working Group; Research; Finalization
- Participants – 175+ Organizations; 300 People
- Timing:
 - Development/Research – December 2017 to February 2019
 - Public Comment Process – Initiated in March; 60 Days
 - Mid-2019 Launch

The Big Picture: Orientation of Standard

- Establishes a stronger content focus for digital and stronger ad focus for television
- Rules for granularity and comparability of underlying measurement source data
- 100% pixel in view requirement for cross-media comparisons (Research Reviewed/Performed); requires consideration of audio
- Duration measurement – Various Options; 2021 Duration Weighting (Research Reviewed/Performed)
- Sound practices for establishing audience characteristics for media consumption

Key Work Areas for Cross-Media Standards (Phase 1 Video)

- Align exposure measurements across platforms
 - Standardizing metrics
- Deduplication concepts and processes
- Sets guidance for consistent frequency measurement; necessary to enable frequency management
- Integration practices, quality control and disclosure requirements for audience information
- Preserves relationships and fair foundation for ROI and other outcome measurement

Research Conducted – Described in Draft

Pixel Change (50% to 100%)

- MRC Feedback; Research Request
 - 7 different orgs provided granular or generalized data including analysis of over 3 billion impressions.
- Observations
 - Conceptually desirable change for consistency across platforms and to reduce custom criteria
 - Impact in terms of loss of impressions was minimal (3-9%) across general internet, except in certain platform newsfeed environments where impact varied but platform ROI indicated material
- Conclusion
 - Leave pixel threshold unchanged for stand-alone reporting; but continue to study with ROI efforts
 - Changed threshold to 100% for cross media comparisons

Duration

- MRC Feedback; Research Request; Outside Research Review
 - Same 7 companies – included eye tracking, biometric, research and granular data
- Observations
 - Duration reporting critical to differentiate impressions to compare exposure delivery across different creatives
 - Completes important to buy-side
 - Promote use of duration metrics in conjunction with ROI
 - Data and studies varied on effectiveness of longer duration; some linear, some not; all showed correlation
 - Duration unignorable, but weighting relative to length will bias toward short form
 - Duration weighting helpful to create view of equalized units with fixed denominator; 30 seconds an existing mechanism that may decrease infrastructure adoption costs
 - Need time for preparations to build systems to measure as well as understand and study weighting, denominator and use with ROI
- Conclusion
 - Codified multiple duration approaches (average second, completion and DWVI)
 - Codified fixed-denominator DWVI; January 2021 adoption

KEY METRICS

TO BE IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE

- Duration of impressions
 - Actual, average, quartile
- Completions
- Reach and Frequency
- GRPs
- Certain legacy metrics preserved in certain circumstances

TO BE ADDED IN 2021

- Duration-weighted viewable impressions (DWVI)
 - Sets a base of viewable impression counts with duration, while assigning proper weight to the impressions, reflecting a larger weight for longer exposure
 - Uses 30 seconds as a denominator to normalize, which will be evaluated as this rolls out
 - Allows for GRPs for creatives of different lengths to be more comparable
 - Preserves accurate value and ROI decisions regardless of length of creative and platform

Thank You!

MRC Contact Information:

212-972-0300

George Ivie – givie@mediaratingcouncil.org

David Gunzerath – dgunzerath@mediaratingcouncil.org

Ron Pinelli – rpinelli@mediaratingcouncil.org