
AGENDA

- Introductions: Where We're At Today
- Progress Made on 3MS Priorities:
  - Viewable Impressions
  - Audience-Based Currency
  - Interactivity Metrics that Matter
  - Ad Effectiveness
- Location Based Metrics Project
- Q&A

The MRC/3MS Digital Measurement Evolutionary Path



Prior to June 2014	Current State	Digital and Cross-Media Audience Currency	Value of Advertising
Currency Based on Served Impressions	**Increasing use of Viewable Impressions, Improving Filtration for Invalid Traffic**	**Currency Based on Viewable impressions to a Human, with Duration, with Targeted Audience Characteristics**	**Selected Engagement Metrics, Ad Effectiveness, ROI Calculations**

MRC Guideline Efforts:

Served Impression Guideline **(2004)**; Clicks, Rich Media, RIA, Served Video Impressions, Audience Reach, Served Mobile Web, In-App **(Various Through 2013)**	Desktop Viewable Impression Guideline **(2014, v2.0 2015 Post Vendor Reconciliations)**; IVT Detection and Filtration **(2015)**; Mobile Viewable Impression Guideline **(Near Public Comment)**	Digital and Cross-Media Audience Currency, Data Attribution and De-Duplication **(In-Process)**; Modernization of Existing Guidelines **(In-Process)**	Social Media Measurement **(2015)**; Location Based Metrics **(In-Process)**; Others Planned

Progress on 3MS Priorities

- **Principle #1 – Move to a "Viewable Impression" Standard.**
- Standard for desktop was enacted in 2014, and updated in August 2015 to address issues that had led to reconciliation differences
  - Compliance with v2.0 of Guidelines was required by late 2015 to maintain MRC accredited status.
    - Although this information is not readily available, we estimate that about 1/3 of campaigns use viewability in terms/conditions or they use a viewability guarantee (e.g., the 70% level suggested by IAB). We see this accelerating given recent announcements by Facebook, Twitter and Google.
- Permanent Mobile Viewability standard currently in development; *Interim Guidance* issued in May 2015, Public Comment Version of guideline released this week.
  - To date, only Moat has been accredited by MRC for Mobile Viewable Impression measurement using the interim guidance (for both display and video, in both mobile web and application environments).

Mobile Viewability

- Some Key Open Areas in PC Draft:
  - Content/ad cognition as it occurs in feed environments
  - Study of impact of polling frequency

- Key Progress -- Longer observed times for ad rendering are handled in guideline (PC Draft) by requiring rendering prior to viewable impression measurement

  - ***Further study continues in open areas; current trading practices are driving need for issuance of guidance ASAP.***

Audience-Based Metrics

- **Principle #2 – "Audience Currency" Key Issues**
- Digital:
  - 1st Steps – Adoption of viewable impressions and IVT guidelines
  - Determine role of duration; need for segregation of creative types
  - Audience attribution, across granular campaigns – a difficult area
- Other Areas in Other Media:
  - Improve/develop ad-focused measurement
  - Improve granularity of measurement
  - Deal with non-electronic measurement instruments
- Accounting for duplication, both within and across media types.
- Sources for data attribution are key inputs, and will require significant attention—possibly auditing and/or including the creation of a separate guideline

Progress on Other 3MS Priorities

- **Principle #4 – Determine Interactivity "Metrics that Matter" for brand marketers, so that marketers can better evaluate online's contribution to brand building.**
- Social Media Measurement Guidelines issued by MRC (in collaboration with 4A's, IAB and WOMMA) in November 2015
- Additional work on Engagement Metrics are on MRC's roadmap for standards work to begin in 2016
  - Will build upon IAB's 2014 whitepaper, "Defining and Measuring Digital Ad Engagement in a Cross Platform World" and the work done to measure ad impressions that are in view, filtered for invalid traffic and segmented by audience target

Progress on Other 3MS Priorities

- **Principle #5 – Establish Brand Attitudinal Measures that can be applied across platforms.**
- Framework exists today to independently assess, and ultimately improve, digital ad effectiveness research
- Hesitancy of vendors to put products forward for accreditation consideration remains the biggest obstacle to advancing this goal
- While open to developing specific standards in this area as may be necessary in the future, no project is currently underway

Location Based: Topics Addressed

- Measurement Process and Metrics Definitions
- Transparency of Method and Performance of Device Location
- Transparency of Method and Performance of Place Information
- Information Use and Fitness for Purpose
  - Snapshot versus Behavioral Analyses Over Time
  - Use of Static Device Information
  - Use of Other Data – Social Media, etc.
  - Attribution to People
  - Customer Perception, Privacy, etc.
- Disclosures
- Auditing Considerations

Location Based: More Detail

- **Transparency of Method and Performance (Device)**
  - Beaconing (Accuracy: 10 meters or better)
    - Geofencing highly accurate, but contingent on implementation quality control
    - Difficult to scale and may be “hijackable”
  - GPS Device Information (Accuracy: 10 meters or better)
    - Latitude/longitude data, user opt-in, device confirmation, device known and possibly communicated
    - Micro-location with limitations indoors
  - Wi-Fi (Accuracy: approaching GPS, less coverage and IP based)
    - Not tied to mobile provider; app known and possibly communicated
    - Can be better micro-location indoors than GPS but IP switching and VPN/Firewall challenges
  - Wireless Carrier (Accuracy: miles to dozens of meters)
    - Cellular sector or tower information (triangulation); centroid; device known and possibly communicated
    - Absent other signals to refine, IP/tower centroid alone is low resolution; macro-location

Location Based: More Detail

- **Transparency of Method and Performance (Device) cont'd**
  - User Supplied Location (Accuracy: variable)
    - User check-in, etc., leveraged in social media
    - Registration – controls; where you live vs. where you are; can be reward based
- **Transparency of Method and Performance (Place)**
  - Accuracy and Source of Place data
    - Inferences tested
    - Free from manipulation (hijacking) and IVT compliant
  - Disclose capabilities and limitations (precision/accuracy)
  - Ad/Bid request data may carry varying levels of precision and accuracy
    - Open RTB Fields
    - Validation likely necessary in combination with other sources
  - Registration data (either location or associated audience characteristics) requires strong data recency policies

Location Based: More Detail

- **Snapshot vs. Behavioral Analysis Over Time**
  - Accuracy of information (based on methods, previously discussed)
    - Accuracy of measurement beyond source (rules based) – length of place connection, proximity minimums, other qualifying criteria and history
  - Time lag between ad-exposure and proximity indication, age of information, etc.
- **Other Matters**
  - IMPORTANT – Transparency and efficacy of data attribution/ascription
    - IP Data used to “derive” latitude/longitude, etc. or translation of fields
    - Using ad targeting data as a surrogate
  - Strong mobile application controls
  - Accuracy of other source data (social, registration, etc.)
  - Reporting Users vs. Devices
  - Customer Perceptions and Privacy
    - Opt-in; tailoring ads
    - PII protection

Location Based Guidelines

- Get Involved!!!

Thank You

Discussion, Q&A

George Ivie: givie@mediaratingcouncil.org

(212) 972-0300

Media Rating Council, Inc.