

MRC Board of Directors and Participating Measurement Services, and (2) violations of the provisions of the Code – these arise from actions of Members, Member-Representatives or Participating Measurement Services, and can be asserted by any Member, Member-Representative or Participating Measurement Service.

**1. Accreditation-Related Disputes:** The procedure for addressing disputes related to the suspension, revocation or denial of accreditation is described in the MRC Procedures for Accreditation. Ultimately disputes related to these circumstances are resolved through hearing procedures described in the Procedures for Accreditation, *Article VI – Hearing*. These procedures are not modified by the Code.

**2. Violations of Provisions of the Code:** Violations of the Code can be asserted by the MRC Staff, any Member, Member-Representative or Participating Measurement Service.

Any Member, Member-Representative or Participating Measurement Service alleging violations of this Code shall submit its allegations to the Disciplinary Committee (“Committee”), a Committee comprised of five member-representatives selected by the MRC Board of Directors. In the event that a member of the Committee must recuse themselves from the matter, remaining members of the Committee shall hear the matter. Within 10 days of receipt of the written allegations, the Committee shall notify in writing, the party against whom the allegations (alleged violator) have been made of the substance of the allegations. The alleged violator, within 30 days of receipt of the allegations, shall submit to the Committee a written response to the allegations. The Committee shall then conduct a full and impartial hearing as soon as practicable to all parties concerned. The Committee shall provide at least 30 days notice to the parties as to the date and time of the hearing. The parties may be represented by counsel at the hearing, present witnesses and documentary evidence at the hearing. There will be a stenographic recording of the hearing. The party making the allegation shall go first, followed by the alleged violator. The Committee, in its discretion may permit rebuttal by the party making the allegation. The parties agree to fully cooperate with the Committee, including complying with any request for information relevant to the investigation. The Committee decision shall be based on a “preponderance of evidence” standard, with the burden of proof of establishing a violation of the Code resting on the party bringing the allegation. The hearing shall be open to Members and Participating Measurement Services. The Committee, upon reaching its conclusion, shall prepare a written statement of findings, copies of which shall be provided to the parties involved and the Executive Director (or the MRC Board Chairman, if the MRC Executive Director is the alleged violator).

Within 45 days of receipt of the Committee’s statement of findings, either of the parties involved may request oral argument before the entire MRC Board of Directors (“Board”) at a time and place reasonably convenient to the Board. Failure to request a hearing within the proscribed time period shall be deemed a waiver of the right to Board review. The parties shall be permitted to make a written submission to the Board of

Directors. The submission shall contain the following: (1) a statement of the issues presented for review; (2) a statement of facts relevant to the issues presented for review; (3) an argument; (4) a short conclusion. The hearing can be conducted either in person or telephonically. There shall be a stenographic recording of the hearing. The Board shall base its decision upon the transcript of the Committee hearing, the Committee's statement of findings, the parties' written submission to the Board and the oral argument. The Board has the authority to reverse, affirm the Committee's decision and the authority to modify any sanction imposed by the Committee. However, any such determination shall be made only if at least two-thirds of the Board members present in the meeting concur (there must be a quorum of at minimum two-thirds of Board members present in the meeting for purposes of this proceeding).

Members, Member-representatives and/or Participating Measurement Services that disagree with a determination of the Committee, or as applicable the MRC Board of Directors, regarding disciplinary action shall use their best efforts to settle such disagreement.

If the parties are unable to resolve their dispute within 60 business days from the Committee decision or Board hearing, then the issue shall be settled by arbitration administered by the American Arbitration Association ("AAA") under its Commercial Arbitration Rules and the judgment of the award rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof. In such an arbitration proceeding each party shall appoint an arbitrator selected from an approved list provided by the AAA, within 15 days of the referral. The two arbitrators shall mutually appoint a third arbitrator selected from the same approved list within 10 days of their appointment. If either party fails or refuses to appoint an arbitrator, the arbitrator appointed by the other party shall be the sole arbitrator. If the two arbitrators are unable to agree on the appointment of a third arbitrator within 10 days, the AAA shall appoint the third arbitrator selected from the list. The decision of a majority of the members of the arbitration panel (or a single arbitrator, as the case may be due to a default in appointment) shall be final binding and subject to the provisions of the United States Arbitration Act (Title 9, United States Code Sections 1-14; 16; 201-208).

The arbitrators' decision shall be in writing and shall provide a reasoned basis for the resolution of each dispute. Remedies available to the arbitrator in this proceeding will be limited to Disciplinary Action as herein defined. The substantive and procedural law of the State of New York shall apply to any such arbitration proceedings. The place of any such arbitration shall be New York City. Enforcement of the decision may be sought in any court of competent jurisdiction. Each party shall bear its own fees and expenses with respect to the arbitration and any proceedings related thereto and the parties shall share equally the fees and expenses of the AAA and the arbitrators.

D.) Referral to Government Agencies: Consistent with its mandate, the MRC Board of Directors reserves the right, in instances of egregious, repeated or willful violations of the Code, to refer such violations to the appropriate Federal agency.

## **Section 4 – Other Matters**

1. The MRC staff, MRC-engaged consultants and CPA firms who interact with the accreditation process on behalf of the MRC agree to follow the Code insofar as applicable.

2. MRC accreditation voting is complex and based on several sources of information – for example, the Audit Report, Members’ professional judgment, various relevant and material performance metrics of the Participating Measurement Service and the intended use of the Participating Measurement Service’s data in the marketplace (the intended use of the Participating Measurement Service’s data will be stated by the Participating Measurement Service upon application for accreditation and should be consistent with the Service’s marketing material). The combination of these sources of information creates very unique circumstances for each accreditation proceeding. While no single accreditation vote should be interpreted as precedent setting, especially between different services, the MRC will strive to assure that accreditation determinations will be made in a fair and consistent manner, considering the above sources of information.

3. The MRC Staff will provide Members and Participating Measurement Services with copies of the MRC By-Laws, Procedures for Accreditation, MRC Minimum Standards and the Code upon request.

4. The MRC, acting through its staff, will notify Participating Measurement Services in writing of any contemplated changes in MRC Minimum Standards, Procedures for Accreditation and this Code and will afford Participating Measurement Services an opportunity to consult with respect to such changes. The MRC agrees that such changes will be objectively derived and provided, in writing, to Participating Measurement Services in sufficient time to permit Participating Measurement Services to incorporate changes to affected services prior to the effective date of such changes.

5. The MRC will promptly and accurately communicate in writing to Members and Participating Measurement Services each grant, withdrawal or change with respect to accreditation.

**Minimum  
Standards  
For  
Media  
Rating Research**

**Media Rating Council, Inc.**

© Copyright Media Rating Council, Inc. All rights reserved.

---

# **Introduction**

---

The Media Rating Council, Inc. (MRC) believes that adherence to the following minimum standards is necessary to meet the basic objectives of valid, reliable and effective media audience measurement research. Acceptance of MRC minimum standards by a rating service is one of the conditions of accreditation by the MRC, Inc. These are intended to be minimum standards and neither they, nor anything in MRC Procedures, shall prevent any rating service from following higher standards in its operations.

The minimum standards listed herein are divided into three groups:

## **A. Ethical and Operational Standards**

These standards govern the quality and integrity of the entire process by which ratings are produced.

## **B. Disclosure Standards**

These standards specify the detailed information about a rating service, which must be made available to users, to the MRC, Inc., and its audit agent, as well as the form in which the information should be made available.

## **C. Electronic Delivery and Third-Party Processor Supplementary Standards**

These standards reflect additional requirements for rating services that deliver audience data electronically and for third-party processors that apply for accreditation.

---

## **A. Ethical and Operational Standards**

---

1. Each rating service shall try constantly to reduce the effects of bias, distortion and human error in all phases of its activities.
2. Appropriate quality control procedures shall be maintained with respect to all external and internal operations which may reasonably be assumed to exert significant effects on the final results.

Quality control shall be applied to, but not necessarily limited to, sample selection, sample implementation, data collection, data editing, data input, tabulation and data delivery in printed and electronic formats. It shall include (where relevant) periodic independent internal verification of fieldwork and periodic accuracy checks of meter performance and computer accumulations of base data.

3. The sample design for audience surveys (sample frame and sampling plan) must, to a reasonable degree, accurately reflect the statistical population targeted for measurement. In each rating report, the statistical (target) populations to which measurements are projected must be clearly defined. In instances where the sample frame may exclude part of the "target" population, such deviations shall be described clearly.
  4. All field personnel (including supervisors) shall be furnished with detailed written instructions and manuals covering all steps of their work. Such personnel shall be thoroughly trained to assure that:
    - a. They know the responsibilities of their positions.
    - b. They understand all instructions governing their work.
    - c. They will deviate from such instructions only when justified by unusual conditions and that any such deviations will be reported in writing.
    - d. They recognize and will avoid any act which might tend to condition, misrepresent or bias the information obtained from respondents.
  5. To improve quality of performance, interviewers and other personnel shall be informed that their work will be periodically checked by internal quality control procedures and by MRC auditors. Every effort shall be made to avoid divulgence to such persons of the checking procedures and the personnel, times and places selected for checking.
  6. Detailed written instructions shall be maintained to insure uniform procedures in editing operations. Any editing changes in diaries or questionnaires (additions, deletions or changes) shall be made in an easily identifiable manner so that such editing changes can be checked or audited. Any routines for editing by computer shall be clearly documented.
-

7. Each rating service utilizing computer systems for processing audience data shall establish procedures to insure that:
    - a. The operations to be performed by the computer system are documented in sufficient detail to specify for each computer program at least: the objective of the program; the input data to be used; the editing and processing steps to be performed, and the output data.
    - b. The computer programs and data are diligently protected from unauthorized manipulation.
    - c. Changes in any computer program are documented in enough detail to identify what is being changed, the reason for the changes, tests performed to confirm the effect(s) of the changes, and the effective date of the changes.
  8. The anonymity of all personnel in any way concerned with sample respondents or households shall be preserved.
  9. If respondents have been led to believe, directly or indirectly, that they are participating in an audience measurement survey and that their anonymity will be protected, their names, addresses and other such identifying information shall not be made known to anyone outside the rating service organization, except that such information may be provided to:
    - a. The audit firm of the MRC in the performance of an audit.
    - b. The MRC when such disclosure is required in a hearing before the MRC.
    - c. Another legitimate market research organization, for methodological purposes only, at the discretion of the rating service.
  10. Experiments in methodology shall not be conducted in conjunction with regular syndicated surveys unless previous independent tests have indicated that the possible effect on the audience data reported will be minimal and unless full disclosure is made as provided in B2 below.
  11. Rating services shall take adequate steps to avoid including in audience measurement samples any station, channel, system or network (television, radio, cable or satellite) principal or employee or any member of their households because of the possibility of conscious or unconscious bias in the reporting of their media behavior.
  12. In the event that a rating service has identified an attempt to bias measurement results by a respondent's submission of fabricated information, it will do whatever may be necessary to identify and eliminate such cases. In the event that such cases have been included in published data, the service will attempt to assess the effect on results and will notify users should this prove to be of practical significance.
  13. All weighting or data adjustment procedures utilized by a rating service in the process of converting basic raw data to rating reports shall be based on systematic, logical procedures, consistently applied by the rating service and defensible by empirical analysis.
-

## **B. Disclosure Standards**

---

### ***General***

A concise description of the survey methodology shall be included in each rating report. This description shall include, but is not to be limited to, a description of the survey technique used, a delineation of the area or areas for which ratings were reported, the sampling procedures used, periods during which the audience data were obtained, criteria for reporting stations, a statement as to whether weighting and/or adjustment factors have been used, and a statement as to whether special interviewing and/or retrieval techniques have been used. Additional details regarding procedures used in sampling (including the selection of samples, callback procedures, substitution procedures), weighting area determination, etc., shall be provided to subscribers in methodological supplements which shall be updated periodically (at a minimum, annually) to reflect current policy and practice.

### ***Specific***

1. Each report shall include statements calling attention to all omissions, errors and biases known to the rating service which may exert a significant effect on the findings shown in the report.
  2. Each rating report shall point out changes in, or deviations from, the standard operating procedures of the rating service which may exert a significant effect on the reported results. This notification shall indicate the estimated magnitude of the effect. The notice shall go to subscribers in advance as well as being prominently displayed in the report itself.
  3. Each rating report shall show the number of different households (or individual or other sample units) initially selected and designated to provide audience information and the number among these that provided usable rating data utilized for that specific rating report. If any of the usable interviews or responses have not been included in the final rating report, that fact and a description of the procedure by which the responses used were selected shall be included in the report.
  4. Each rating report shall indicate the sample base for the reporting of any separate audience data (households or persons, geographic breakdowns such as Metro and Total Area and demographic tabulations based on age, sex, ethnic origin, etc.). This information is to be provided on a basis of in-tab and, where appropriate, effective sample sizes.
  5. Geographic areas surveyed shall be clearly defined in each rating report and the criteria and/or source used in the selection of the survey areas shall be given. (Thus, if the area surveyed is the Metro area as defined by the U.S. Census, the report should so state.)
  6. The rating service shall show in a prominent place in each report a comparison of the geographic distribution of sample data with universe data as obtained from primary sources. In the case of individual local reports, the data shall be shown in each report according to counties or reasonable county groupings. In the case of services using continuing samples, the above information shall be published in each report but need be updated only semi-annually.
-

7. Each rating report shall state that the audience data obtained from the samples used in audience measurement surveys are subject to both sampling and non-sampling errors and shall point out the major non-sampling errors which are believed to affect the audience estimates.
  8. With respect to sampling error:
    - a. Each rating report shall contain standard error data relevant to the audience estimates contained therein. Such data shall be presented whether or not effective sample sizes are shown.
    - b. The report shall also contain a non-technical explanation of the meaning and use of standard error as well as a clear guide to how the data may be applied to any given estimate contained in the report.
    - c. The method used to develop standard error estimates as well as the formulas used to compute the standard errors shall be fully disclosed. The service shall provide a basis for calculating sample errors for other audience estimates commonly calculated from data published in its reports, although this material may be included in a methodological supplement rather than the report itself.
    - d. In order for the MRC to verify the accuracy of the standard error and effective sample size approximations contained in a rating report, rating services will be requested periodically to provide a sample of standard errors and effective sample sizes calculated by appropriate standard error formulas. The MRC may use this information as a comparison with results obtained by applying the approximation formulas given in ratings reports.
  9. All weighting or data adjustment procedures utilized by a rating service in the process of converting basic raw data to rating reports shall be clearly stated and quantified. This detailed information should be available in each report or reporting system. Appropriate reference material shall also describe procedures and the reasons for such adjustments or weighting.
  10. If a rating service establishes minimum requirements for the issuance of a rating report or for reporting stations, or demographic or geographic breaks, the service shall indicate the minimum number of sample returns required for each category.
  11. If the rating service becomes aware that a station, channel, system, or network has employed special non-regular promotional techniques that may distort or "hype" ratings and/or exhortation to the public to cooperate in ratings surveys, the rating service shall publish a description of this effort in the appropriate report.
  12. If a rating service has knowledge of apparent rating distorting influences such as community power outages, catastrophes or transmission failures, the rating service shall indicate in its reports that such conditions existed during the survey period.
-

13. With respect to accreditable but presently non-accredited surveys conducted by a company which produces a rating service(s) accredited by MRC:
    - a. Efforts must be taken by the company to disclose fully that these other services are, in fact, not accredited by the Council. To avoid subscriber confusion, the minimum requirement is: (1) the report covers for non-accredited services be distinctively different from those used on accredited service(s), and (2) each non-accredited report must carry prominently (on the outside front cover, inside front cover or the opposite page) the following statement:
      - (a) "This service is not part of a regular syndicated rating service accredited by the MRC and \_\_\_\_\_ has not requested accreditation. \_\_\_\_\_ does provide one or more syndicated services which are accredited by the MRC."
    - b. Surveys executed by a rating service for a specific client or clients shall clearly show that the report is of a special nature and not part of a regular accredited syndicated rating service. Such report shall show the name of the client or clients and shall be (1) easily distinguishable from accredited rating reports by use of distinctive report covers, and (2) notice to this effect must be on the outside front cover, inside front cover or the opposite page.
    - c. The MRC accreditation symbol will not be used on any reports which are not an integral part of a service accredited by and subject to audit by the MRC.
  14. The rating service shall permit such CPA firm(s) designated by the MRC for the purpose of auditing to review and/or audit any or all procedures or operations that bear upon the development and reporting of audience estimates.
  15. Although the anonymity of all personnel concerned with sample respondents or households shall be preserved (as required by A.8), the MRC audit firm will have the right to check with such personnel and any other appropriate persons as part of the auditing process. (The audit firm will in its audit reports maintain the anonymity of such personnel.)
  16. Interviewer and supervisor records shall be maintained at least eleven months by the rating service to show: name; date of work; time; type of work; location of work; manner of payment (e.g., full-time staff, part-time staff, hourly, per interview, conditions [if any] under which bonuses are paid, etc.).
-

17. Each rating service shall maintain, for at least eleven months from the end of the period covered by the report, all diaries and interviews (or a complete facsimile thereof), tape records and/or other primary sources of audience data. These shall include material actually used in the preparation of published rating reports as well as material collected but not used. In addition, each service shall maintain records of:
    - a. All attempts to place diaries or meters, or to obtain interviews or whatever other form of cooperation is required for the research technique used.
    - b. All unsuccessful attempts to obtain information, including- but not limited to - refusals, not at home, cases requiring further discussion and/or correspondence (c.g., with another member of the household), busy signals (phone), and returns from postal authorities.
    - c. Actual or assumed reasons for non-cooperation.
    - d. Which cooperating sample members are original sample selections, and which are first, second, third, etc., substitutions.
  18. Returned diaries or questionnaires not put into tabulation for any reason (incomplete, late, poor quality, wrong area, etc.) shall be marked to indicate the reason for rejection and filed as provided under B.17.
  19. Each service shall keep documentation of errors of any type in published figures for a period of two years.

Included in such documentation shall be: the length of time the error affected published figures; the effect of the error in absolute and relative terms; its cause; the corrective action taken; and the disclosures, if any, made to subscribers (copies of notices, etc.). If no disclosure was made, the record should indicate the reason underlying this decision.
  20. Rating service edit manuals will be made available to subscribers at service headquarters where raw data is made available for inspection.
-

## **C. Electronic Delivery and Third Party Processor Supplementary Standards**

---

### *General*

In addition to groups A and B above, rating services that deliver audience data electronically and third party processors of accredited rating service data are required to adhere to the following minimum standards. In these cases, many of the disclosures required by the minimum standards can be made within the electronic delivery system.

In this context a "System" refers to the electronic delivery system or the software used by a third party processor to manipulate an accredited rating service's data. A "Third Party Processor" is an organization that reprocesses audience data from a primary supplier to provide alternative report formats, applications, etc.

### *Specific*

1. The System must have reasonable controls to prevent:
    - a. Users from accessing respondent identifying information.
    - b. Users from altering raw data, such as listening, viewing, readership, product usage or qualitative estimates. Raw data also includes weighting and sample balancing results.
    - c. Users from altering System software.
    - d. Report headings selected by users from being misleading. This includes the use of footnotes and "flags" where necessary to clarify limitations of the data presented,
  2. Users of the System should be alerted, and reports from the System must delineate:
    - a. Audience estimates produced by the System having suspect reliability, such as in cases of less than minimum reportability. Minimum requirements for reporting and reliability can change due to the customizable nature of System analyses; in these instances the System shall indicate the minimum number of sample returns required for each analyses.
    - b. Audience estimates originating from statistical models rather than directly from reported audience data with documentation made available to auditors on request.
    - c. Data from non-accredited sources. System reports should clearly disclose these situations using language similar to that in B.13 above.
    - d. Situations of data reissuance due to errors.
-

3. The rating service or third party processors must have reasonable controls to ensure:
  - a. Users have received the current version of the System.
  - b. Users are notified timely of errors noted in the System and/or data, and where necessary, that corrected software and/or data are distributed timely.
4. Exportation of data from the System generally takes manipulation of the data outside of the control of the rating service or third party processor, therefore this activity will not be accredited. Reasonable efforts must be made to identify and distinguish standard reports of the System from reports based on exported data.
5. The rating service or third party processor is encouraged to supply detailed written instructions, user manuals or on-line help facilities to assist users in properly executing System functions.

### **Additional Recommended Standards**

In addition to adherence to the Minimum Standards, the MRC requests that accredited rating services, insofar as possible, observe the "Recommended Standards for the Preparation of Statistical Reports in Broadcast Audience Measurement Research" and "Standard Definitions of Broadcast Research Terms", both published by the National Association of Broadcasters, but also endorsed by the Media Rating Council and the Advertising Research Foundation.

### **For MRC Minimum Standards for A.10 and B.2**

In an effort to assist research companies in their adherence to MRC Minimum Standards A10 and B2, the MRC suggests the following:

- I. Each research company is encouraged to provide the MRC a "Journal of Changes" on a quarterly basis. This Journal would include any and all changes in methodology and procedures that the research company is planning to test and/or implement in the next quarter or, if known, beyond. Submission itself, does not imply any waiver of A10/B2.

and/or

- II. Each research company is encouraged to avail themselves of the following voluntary "Live Test Procedures":
-

### *Live Test Procedures*

1. Before implementing a Live Test of any of the methods and procedures used to collect audience data, the research company agrees to review such proposed tests with the MRC Staff and two Ad-Hoc MRC Board members (Hereafter referred to as the MRC Group), detailing the objectives of the test and the contemplated procedures. Results of prior tests supporting minimal effects, if available, should also be offered.
  2. If the evidence suggests to the MRC Group that the possible effect on Audience Data will be minimal, then the research company will be advised that implementation of the test will not be considered a violation of Minimum Standard A.10.
  3. Should the MRC Group or the research company feel the need for outside technical counsel, this would first be jointly discussed and outside technical counsel will be jointly agreed on.
  4. Should the research company request it, the MRC Group would agree not to reveal the specific nature of these tests other than to the independent auditor working with the research company on behalf of the MRC and, if required, outside technical counsel.
  5. The research company would disclose to all subscribers that a test was conducted and reach agreement with the MRC Staff and the MRC Group as to the statement(s) to be made. Disclosure, per Minimum Standard B.2, will go to subscribers in advance as well as being prominently displayed in the report itself should the staff and group feel required.
  6. It is also understood that, ultimately, the decision to conduct a live test rests with the research company. The procedure described above is intended to assist the research company in working within the framework of MRC Standards A.10 and B.2.
-

MRC Executive Directors

Dr. Kenneth Baker	(1964 – 1970)
Hugh “Mal” Beville, Jr.	(1971 – 1981)
John Dimling	(1982 – 1985)
Melvin Goldberg	(1986 – 1992)
Richard Weinstein	(1993 – 1999)
George W. Ivie	(2000 – Present)

Media Rating Council, Inc.

---

370 Lexington Avenue, Suite 902  
New York, NY 10017

(212) 972-0300

Revised December, 1999

---

---

**From:** Anthony Torrieri [mailto:atorrieri@mediaratingcouncil.org]

**Sent:** Friday, May 16, 2008 5:33 PM

**Cc:** 'givie@mediaratingcouncil.org'; 'David Gunzerath'; 'jpeacock@peacockresearch.com'; 'Albana Gashi'; 'randy.pyle@ey.com'; 'nick.terlizzi@ey.com'; 'jackson.bazley@ey.com'

**Subject:** Cell Phone Impact On Telephone Sampling

To: MRC Audited Services Utilizing Telephone Sampling Methods

Recently the CDC published statistics on the incidence of "Cell Phone Only" (CPO) households in the United States along with other findings related to wireless telephones based on their July-December 2007 NHIS study. The preliminary report indicates that the incidence of CPO households is nearly 16% among all U.S. households and varies widely by demographic group (e.g. 34.5% among adults aged 25-29 years); more complete information published by CDC is available at <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/wireless200805.htm>. The prevalence and disproportionate nature of CPO households continues to be a growing phenomenon and of great concern to MRC given its impact on telephone based survey sampling.

The MRC has raised this issue with all of the measurement services we audit whose sampling may be impacted by CPO and we recognize that some are already taking steps to include CPO households in their samples, using a variety of approaches.

Prior to the release of the latest NHIS information the MRC Board of Directors adopted the stance that accreditation will be at risk for any service affected by this issue that does not have a known solution and timeline approved by MRC to effectively measure CPO households. The recent information released by CDC further heightens our sensitivity to this matter and the need for effective solutions.

We thought it important that we update you on the MRC's perspective on the impact of this issue and continue to urge measurement services to work diligently towards developing the means to introduce CPO households into samples in a meaningful and timely way.

Please contact the MRC staff with any questions you may have.

Anthony Torrieri  
MRC



Media Rating  
Council, Inc.

# The Media Rating Council

## Our Purpose, Process and Value

---

Private Briefing for Senate Judiciary  
and Senate Commerce Staff

July 17, 2008

# Agenda

---

- MRC Background
- Process Basics
- Audit Procedures
- PPM Status Update
- PPM Roll-Out and the VCOC

# Background – The Team

---

- **Media Rating Council**

- George Ivie, Executive Director

Since January 2000; Former E&Y Partner, Information Systems Specialist.

- Anthony Torrieri, SVP, Associate Director

Over 25 years of Agency experience. Extensive buyer-side knowledge and focus

- David Gunzerath, SVP, Associate Director

8 Years, VP of Research and Information at NAB; 9 Years at TV Guide, Accounting Background

- Jim Peacock, Consultant

Over 30 years experience in media research. Heavy statistical experience. Fifteen years Head of Research at Arbitron.

- MRC Membership – Various Audit Committees, Board, etc.

Technical Committees, Consultants, etc.

- **E&Y**

- Dedicated Team (30)
- Media Research Experience
- All Research Audits
- Internet Ad-Serving Audits

- **PwC and D&T**

- Newer Relationships
- Internet Ad-Serving

- **Rating Services – MRC Serves an Oversight Role**

# Member Representation

---

- **Media Organizations**

- Broadcasters – Radio and TV
- Cable MSOs and Networks
- Internet
- Print Organizations
- Out-Of-Home Media

- **Advertising Agencies**

- **Advertisers**

- **Trade Associations**

- Voting – CAB, IAB, MMA, MPA, NAA, NAB, RAB, TVB
- Liaison (non-voting) – AAAA, ARF, ANA

- **Measurement Services Cannot be Members**

# Members - 116 Organizations

---

A&E Television  
ABC Networks  
ABC Owned TV Stations  
ABC Radio Networks  
American Urban Radio Network  
Anheuser-Busch  
AOL  
AT&T Mobility  
Atlas DMT  
Barrington Broadcasting  
Belo Corporation  
Bonneville International Corp.  
Cable Advertising Bureau  
Carat North America  
CBS  
CBS Radio  
CBS Television Stations  
Clear Channel  
CNET Networks  
Comcast Networks  
Comcast Spotlight  
Condé Nast  
Cox Media  
Cox Radio  
Cox Television  
Crown Media  
CW Television Network  
Discovery  
Disney

Dispatching Printing Co.  
DRAFTFCB  
Emmis Broadcasting  
Entravision  
ESPN  
Forbes  
Ford Motor Company  
FOX Broadcasting  
FOX News  
FOX Sports  
FOX Television Stations  
Galavision Cable Networks  
Gannett  
General Motors  
Google  
Hachette Filipacchi  
Hearst Argyle  
Hearst Publications  
Horizon Media  
Interactive Advertising Bureau  
Initiative Media  
Inner City Broadcasting  
Interep Radio  
Lifetime Television  
LIN Television  
Lincoln Financial Media  
Magazine Publishers of America  
MAGNA Global  
Media General

Media Management Inc.  
Media Planning Group  
MediaCom  
Mediaedge:cia  
MediaVest  
Meredith Corp.  
Microsoft  
MindShare  
MSNBC  
Mobile Marketing Assoc.  
MTV Networks  
NAB Radio  
NAB Television  
National Cable Communications  
National CineMedia  
National Public Radio  
NBC Cable  
NBC Networks  
NBC Stations  
New York Times  
Newspaper Assn. of America  
OMD  
PARADE  
PHD USA  
Post Newsweek  
Premiere Radio  
Procter & Gamble  
Qualcomm/MediaFLO  
Radio Advertising Bureau

Radio One  
Radio Research Consortium  
Raycom Media  
Reader's Digest  
Saga Communication  
Scripps Networks  
Scripps TV Station Group  
Starcom  
TargetCast  
Telefutura Network  
Telemundo  
Televisa  
Television Advertising Bureau  
Time Warner  
Tribune Broadcasting  
Turner Broadcasting  
TV Azteca  
TV Guide  
Unilever  
Universal McCann  
Univision  
Univision Online  
Univision Radio  
USA Weekend  
Wall Street Journal  
WAPA TV/Televiscentro of P.R.  
The Weather Channel  
Yahoo!  
Zenith Media

# MRC - Structure

---

- **Board of Directors**

- Each Member has a Seat
- Advertiser Members can Designate an Agency Member as Proxy

- **Operating Committees**

- Five Standing
  - Internet
  - Out-of-Home
  - Print
  - Radio
  - Television
- Members Elect which Committee(s) to Participate

- **Executive Committee**

- Administrative Function and Oversight
- Comprised of
  - Chair of MRC
  - Chair of Each Operating Committee
  - Chair Ex-Officio
  - MRC Executive Director

# Background

---

- Congressional Hearings Held in 1963-64
  - System of Self Regulation Established
  - Department of Justice Review
- Not-for-Profit
  - Equal Access for All Stakeholders in Research Data
    - \$12,500 Annual Dues (1964 = \$7,500)
  - Small Business Class
    - Half Dues with Full Member Privileges
- Voluntary Process for Syndicated Measurement Services to:
  - Supply Complete Information to the MRC
  - Comply with MRC Minimum Standards
  - Conducted the Service as Represented to Clients – Full Disclosure
  - Submit to Annual Audits
  - Pay for the Audit Costs (internal & external)
- Conducted 50+ Audits in 2007

# Recent Government Involvement

---

## ■ **Congressional Hearings Held in 2004-5**

- Driven by Public Attention
- Principally Focused on Nielsen
  - LPM Introductions and Alleged Monopoly-Like Behavior
- Some Focus on Adequacy and Fairness of MRC Process
- FAIR Ratings Act Introduced in Senate and House
- Caucus Group Interest
- Two Senate Hearings
  - MRC Testified
- Voluntary Code of Conduct –DOJ Business Review

# Reaffirmation of Our Role

---

## ■ **FTC Issued a Letter**

*“...it appears to the Commission that the existing self-regulatory approach is having a significant effect in attaining both extensive transparency and greater reliability in media ratings. In many circumstances well-constructed industry self-regulatory efforts can be more prompt, flexible, and effective than government regulation.”*

Deborah Platt Majoras  
Chairman, FTC  
March 25, 2005

## ■ **DOJ Completed a Business Review**

*“In fact, with appropriate safeguards, auditing and accrediting activities can provide valuable, unbiased information to the marketplace...such activities can reduce the confusion and uncertainty among buyers and sellers of advertising...”*

Thomas O. Barnett  
Assistant Attorney General  
Department of Justice  
April 11, 2008