

AMM Viewability Congress: Proposed Topics on Viewability and Guidelines Setting

1. **Viewable Impressions as a Measure of Campaign Performance:** Digital is more measurable in almost every regard than other media types, and there is an almost unlimited variety of factors that can be measured to determine a campaign's success. The technological ability to accurately measure the various performance metrics, as well as the depth of understanding needed to correctly interpret the findings, can challenge even the most seasoned digital marketer. Objectives for each campaign must be clearly understood, as optimizing a campaign against one metric can negatively impact the campaign's ability to deliver on other important metrics.

As a best practice, should viewable impressions be a measure of campaign performance?

YES OR NO

2. **Viewable Impressions as a Basis for Payment:** Data presents unique challenges, including how it is leveraged in decision making and what data should be tied to media payments. Inarguably, an ad must be viewed by a human being to have any impact whatsoever, and fraud—such as that seen in the consumer web publishing industry (but which is rare to non-existent in professional medical media)—should not be tolerated. The IAB, whose primary constituents are consumer publishers and advertisers, has attempted to address this challenge and has chosen to define a viewable impression as one where 50% of the pixels appear above the fold for one second. To date, however, despite developing to standard MRC accreditation requirements, different viewability vendors report significantly different results. The variations are mainly due to different methods of capturing data. This wide variation in reportable numbers would indicate that today's measurement tools are, as yet, far from accurate. Further, as is the case with other performance metrics, the responsibility for the results is shared among multiple parties. Factors impacting whether an ad will be measured as viewable are shared by the publisher (ad position, web page load time), the advertiser (redirects, tags, creative file sizes), and the viewability tool being used.

As a best practice in professional medical media, should payment be tied to viewable impressions?

YES OR NO

3. **Viewability Metrics as a Basis for Pricing:** Media has typically been priced based on its potential to reach an audience, and prices fluctuate based on the worth or value of the service. Because of the laws of supply and demand, highly targeted ads are typically priced differently from run-of-book or run-of-site ads, and performance-based contracts (e.g., CPC, CPE) are always priced differently from ROS. Advertisers with simpler needs do not expect to pay the same price as those with more complex requirements. As with any performance-based ad campaign, it is possible for publishers, working closely with their clients, to test, change and optimize each digital ad for viewability, but providing this service requires investments in both technology and staffing as the challenges are different from campaign to campaign. When ads are tied to viewability, the cost of doing business on the publisher side significantly increases while the available supply decreases. Not all agencies and not all clients require viewability, and may not wish to pay the price for those that do.

As a best practice, should campaigns billed against viewability metrics be priced differently from those that are not?

YES OR NO

4. **Sponsorships (Share of Voice Placements):** Road blocks, SOV, and other sponsorship opportunities are in a different class than run-of-site (ROS) ads because, in this model, the advertiser is buying ownership of the page or site—not a set number of impressions. The objectives are not only to maximize visibility but to limit the visibility of competitive ads. In SOV/Sponsorship campaigns, there is no opportunity for publishers to make up under-delivery because the advertiser already bought all inventory.

As a best practice, should viewability be factored into the billing for sponsorship or SOV opportunities?

YES OR NO

5. **Threshold and Billing Guidelines:** Different agencies have different formulas for billing if contracts are designed around viewability; some are designed around the IAB 2015 Interim Standards while others are not. This causes publishers to have to develop different processes for calculating billable amounts & delivering contracted impressions, and most of this work is manual. This adds greatly to the cost of doing business and, ultimately, pushes prices upward for all advertisers.

5a. As a best practice, should the calculation of vCPM or % in-view impressions be standardized across agencies?

YES OR NO

5b. If YES, should the then-current IAB guideline be used for this?

YES OR NO

5c. Alternatively, should a task force of medical publishers & medical agencies come together to create the standardized formula for professional medical media?

YES OR NO

6. **Viewability Tool of Record:** Viewability tools vary in their reporting methods so there is always discrepancy among different tools measuring the exact same campaign. The Media Ratings Council has a list of 17 accredited vendors that measure viewability, but they are not equal in their performance. While agencies are free to select one vendor, publishers today must be prepared to learn how to use multiple tools for both billing and optimizing. This is adding to the cost of doing business, and, ultimately, pushes prices upwards for all advertisers. While no vendor can capture every viewable ad and report it as viewable, it is much less likely that a vendor will report an ad as viewable if it isn't.

If the agency and publisher are using different viewability measurement tools, then billing should be based on the highest counts measurable from an accredited MRC vendor:

YES OR NO