



AdsML® Framework for E-Commerce Business Standards for Advertising

Requirements for Interactive Bookings

Document Authors: AdsML Technical Working Group

Document ID: AdsML3.0-InteractiveRequirements-PD-5

Document File Name: AdsML3.0-InteractiveRequirements-PD.pdf

Document Status: Proposed Document

Document Date: 9 May 2008

Draft Number: 5

Table of Contents

ADSML STANDARD DOCUMENTATION 2

- DOCUMENT STATUS AND COPYRIGHT 2
- DOCUMENT NUMBER AND LOCATION 2
- ABSTRACT 2
- AUDIENCE 2
- PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT 2
- ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS 3
- CHANGE HISTORY 3
- ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 3
- DEFINITIONS OF KEY WORDS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT 3

INTRODUCTION 3

GENERAL AND NON-FUNCTIONAL 4

- COMPLEX INTERACTIVE ORDERS 4

FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS 5

- Media type 5*
- Occurrence Event and additional Behavior 6*
- Occurrence event Count or Budget 7*
- Desired Distribution targets (demographics, geographic regions, devices, etc.) 8*
- Pricing 9*
- Outlets and Locations (network, outlet, publication, site, channel, sub-channel) offered by the selling party 11*
- Materials 12*

<i>Scheduling</i>	14
<i>Additional Triggering Events and Contexts</i>	15
<i>Capping</i>	15
<i>Throttling</i>	16
<i>Positioning</i>	16
<i>Classification code</i>	17
<i>Classified ad Styling</i>	17
<i>Additional Services</i>	17
<i>Redistribution</i>	18
<i>Provenance</i>	18
<i>Miscellaneous services packages</i>	18

AdsML Standard Documentation

Document status and copyright

This is the Proposed Document of AdsML Requirements for Interactive Bookings.

This is an internal AdsML document for use by AdsML Members and other interested parties. It may be updated, replaced, or made obsolete by other documents at any time.

Copyright © 2008 AdsML Consortium. All rights reserved. Information in this document is made available for the public good, may be used by third parties and may be reproduced and distributed, in whole and in part, provided acknowledgement is made to AdsML Consortium and provided it is accepted that AdsML Consortium rejects any liability for any loss of revenue, business or goodwill or indirect, special, consequential, incidental or punitive damages or expense arising from use of the information.

Document Number and Location

This document, AdsML3.0-InteractiveRequirements-PD-5, is available to members of the AdsML Consortium and other interested parties. It will be located in the public area of the AdsML website at <http://www.adsml.org/>.

Abstract

This document sets out requirements for additional functionality to be added to AdsMLBookings (and related standards) in order to provide dedicated support for the booking of advertisements in Interactive media.

Audience

This is an internal working document that is designed to provide guidance to the AdsML Technical Working Group. Some familiarity with existing AdsML processes and deliverables is assumed.

Comments on this document should be addressed to the Technical Working Group of the AdsML Consortium (technical.wg@adsml.org).

Purpose of this document

This document sets out the requirements that the AdsML Technical Working Group has determined regarding new work to be published as part of Version 3.0 of the AdsML Framework – in particular, new capabilities related to the booking of advertisements in Interactive media. It is intended to provide guidance to developers of the AdsML Phase 3.0 deliverables.

Accompanying documents

The reader is assumed to be familiar with the AdsMLBookings structures and capabilities.

Change History

Version	Date	Changes	Editor
PD 5	9 May 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Editorial cleanup Added introduction about the scope of the project 	TS
PD 4	2 April 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added comments to reflect decisions made by the TWG over the past year 	TS
PD 3	16 April 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formatted for distribution 	TS
PD 2	23 March 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second draft – content is substantially complete 	TS
PD 1	15 January 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First draft – partial content 	TS

Acknowledgements

This document is a product of the AdsML Technical Working Group.

Primary authorship and editing was performed by:

- Tony Stewart (RivCom) - tony.stewart@rivcom.com

Definitions of key words used in this document

The key words "**MUST**", "**MUST NOT**", "**REQUIRED**", "**SHALL**", "**SHALL NOT**", "**SHOULD**", "**SHOULD NOT**", "**RECOMMENDED**", "**MAY**", and "**OPTIONAL**" in this document are used as described in IETF RFC 2119. When any of these words do not appear in upper case as above, then they are being used with their usual English language sense and meaning.

Introduction

According to the Internet Advertising Bureau (UK), as of early 2008 most interactive advertising fell into four categories, for which the percentages of bookings in the UK are shown below:

- Paid for Search (57.1%)
- Display (21.5%)
- Classified (20.8%)
- Solus email (0.6%)

Despite the prevalence of paid-for search advertising, the AdsML Technical Working Group has chosen to focus its efforts on adding dedicated support for interactive Display and Classified bookings, and secondarily for email campaigns. We made this choice because search advertising is dominated by a few well-known companies, each of which has already defined a mechanism by which advertising systems can submit their orders automatically. There is no current business requirement for a third party such as the AdsML Consortium to develop a standard for search engine bookings, and little likelihood that any standard we did develop would be widely adopted.

Conversely, many publishers sell interactive display and classified advertisements, and no agreed standards for booking such ads have been

developed. This is a domain in which an extension to AdsMLBookings could make a positive impact.

This document is written in an informal style because it was felt by the Technical Working Group that the level of formality in earlier AdsML requirements documents was inappropriate to the task at hand.

The contents of this document are based on a series of meetings during which the AdsML Technical Working Group examined sample orders for interactive advertisements and interviewed domain experts. A record of those discussions can be found in the formal Minutes of each meeting.

The document contains the full requirements that were originally published by the Technical Working Group, plus Commentary about each requirement which reflects later discussions. In most cases the commentary indicates how the requirement will be implemented, but in some cases it wholly or partially overrides the original requirement.

General and non-functional

The following requirements have been identified for capabilities to be added to AdsMLBookings in order to support Display and Classified Interactive ad bookings.

Note that although almost all of these are currently described as SHALL, we may well decide only to implement a subset of them in the first release.

Complex Interactive orders

REQUIREMENTS:

1. AdsMLBookings SHALL support the concept of a single interactive "buy" which may include multiple ad content (which may or may not be delivered to different locations or have other constraints associated with them) that must collectively be served to a single distribution spread.
2. We SHOULD attempt to work within our existing Bookings structure as much as possible rather than making radical changes for interactive orders. However, where appropriate we will add new structures which have the suffix ".Interactive".
3. We will not use the LinkedPlacement structure to address this requirement.
4. We will either create a new structure that can interrelate a set of Placements and provide additional metadata for them such that they collectively comprise the interactive order, or augment the PlacementGroup structure to enable this. For the purposes of this document the new structure is called an "interactive order header" but that does not imply a requirement to create a schema structure with that name.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- a. We decided to use the placement group header as the wrapper for a complex interactive order, but we also decided not to put any media-specific elements into the header and that its purpose should be to convey pricing information that is common to the entire order but not

production information. All production information will be conveyed at the Placement level.

- b. We will support the requirement for a shared distribution spread by creating a package of placements within a placement group, one for each set of ad content, where each placement specifies the same distribution spread as the other placements in the package. In other words, we decided not to implement a single distribution structure at a higher level that would enable the distribution to be conveyed just once for the entire package.
- c. We decided to maintain the mainly price-focused, media-agnostic role of placement groups, which means we will avoid adding elements at the placement group header level which would impose a particular media on the members of that group. This approach allows for the interactive package to contain placements of other types or in other media, where their pricing can be merged at the header level but their production and distribution information remains at the Placement level.
- d. The LinkedPlacements structure will still be used to fulfill requirements that parallel its existing uses in other media. For example, if two placements have a relationship to each other that can be expressed in a machine-processable fashion, that relationship will be communicated by LinkedPlacements.

Functional requirements

Media type

5. Each Placement within an interactive order SHALL be required to identify the **Type of media** that it relates to. Only one Media Type will be allowed per Placement.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This is a standard feature of our existing placements. No structural changes needed.

6. Available media types SHALL include (but not be limited to):
 - Websites
 - Email (direct)
 - Email (newsletter)
 - Mobile devices (including SMS, MMS, Games, Location-based services, maps)
 - Teletext (including interactive TV)
 - Games ??

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This can be implemented by creating an appropriate Controlled Vocabulary. No structural changes needed.

- ~~7. It SHALL alternatively be possible to identify a single Media Type in the interactive order header. If a Media Type is defined in the header it MUST apply to all placements within the order.~~

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We have decided not to implement this requirement. We prefer to keep media and production information out of the placement group header.

Occurrence Event and additional Behavior

8. For each Placement within an interactive order the buyer **shall** be required to identify the **type of occurrence or event** that is meant to be triggered by that Placement (and that usually will serve as the basis for its pricing). Only one Occurrence Event will be allowed per Placement.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- The element and CV name should be something like "PerformanceType" or "InteractionType" rather than occurrence event. However, in order to retain continuity between drafts of this document the name "occurrence event" has been retained here.
 - This concept is not specific to interactive bookings. We should make the element optionally available for all types of bookings.
 - This concept will effectively be implemented twice: once in the pricing area of the message, and again in the production area of the message. The means by which the concept is supported in these two areas of the message will differ:
 - in pricing structures the type of thing being counted will be expressed via price components using existing structures
 - in the production part of the message we will augment the header of the Distribution structure with new elements in which the type of thing being distributed can be explicitly defined.
 - Because of the separation between pricing and production structures, it will be possible to define one type of occurrence event for pricing purposes and a different type of event or thing in the distribution structure. This would support, for example, a booking whose Distribution specifies a required number of page impressions across multiple channels, but whose pricing structures indicate that the price being paid is based on newsletter registrations or some other derivative result of the ad's distribution. However, we do not expect that this will be the normal case. Normally, we expect that the type of event being counted for pricing purposes will be the same as the type of event being specified in the distribution tree.
9. Types of occurrence events will include (but not be limited to):
- **Page Impression** (also called "Showings" or "Viewings") i.e. delivery of the ad to a targeted device
 - **Click-thru**, i.e. active response to the ad (aka "PPC" or "Pay Per Click")
 - **Product purchase** as a result of the ad, in which case a definition of the "product" associated with this would need to be provided
 - **Registration** (including newsletters, etc.) as a result of the ad
 - **Phone call** made by the recipient of the ad to a phone number specified in the ad

COMMENTARY (April 2008): Occurrence events will be defined by means of a controlled vocabulary.

- ~~10. It SHALL alternatively be possible to define a single type of Occurrence Event in the interactive order header. If an Occurrence Event is defined in the header it MUST apply to all placements within the order.~~

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We have decided not to implement this requirement.

11. In addition to the chargeable occurrence event, it SHALL also be possible in a Placement to describe one or more additional **Actions** or **Behaviors** that should be performed by the publisher (or its agents) when the user interacts with the advertisement described in that Placement.

Note that these additional actions or behaviors may or may not be chargeable.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): AdditionalServices should be used for this. (A billable additional action or behavior can be directly referenced from the PriceComponent.) No structural changes required.

Occurrence event **Count** or **Budget**

12. At each location in the message where an Occurrence Event can be defined (~~e.g. Placement level or Interactive Order Header~~) it SHALL be possible to specify a combination of **Occurrence Event Count and/or Budget** which is the target for that part of the order.

For example, an order might have a target occurrence event count of 100,000 Page Impressions, or alternatively the target might be a Budget of \$50,000 which will be allocated across various Placements each of which might have a different occurrence event type and target occurrence event count.

Usually the event count is the primary target and the budget is calculated by multiplying the events times a price per event. However in some cases the budget will be the primary target and the occurrence count will be provided optionally as supporting information.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- The budget for occurrence events is a pricing concept. It can be expressed in our existing pricing structures using a PriceType of "Not to exceed" and price components that indicate whether the pricing is based on a count of the events or some other basis.
- Pricing can be defined at the header level (e.g. in the Placement Group header). Therefore, it will be possible to express the budget at the header level even though the formal definition of the occurrence events will occur only at the Placement level.
- A target count of occurrence events will be able to be expressed in a price component for pricing purposes and also in a Distribution structure for production purposes.

13. It **shall** be possible to express the target occurrence count or event count as either
- Absolute Target (number of events or budget), or
 - Target Range (minimum – desired - maximum)

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- We will support the range concept by adding a new structure to the top of Distribution which allows the expression of a total target range of

events. However, we do not plan to copy this structure down to lower levels of Distribution (i.e. at the level of Targeting and Target). Therefore, users will be able to express an absolute target count at any level of the distribution tree (as is currently the case), and/or a target range at the top of the tree only.

- We will not support the range concept in pricing structures.

Desired *Distribution* targets (demographics, geographic regions, devices, etc.)

14. For each Placement in an interactive order it **shall** be possible to identify the **distribution targets** to which the ad materials described in that Placement are intended to be delivered.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): Distribution should be used for this. No structural changes required.

15. The distribution information SHALL include all of the types of information that can currently be conveyed in the distribution structure in .Inserts: Geographic targets, demographic targets, etc.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): No structural changes required.

16. In addition, it SHALL be possible as part of distribution information to describe one or more delivery **devices** (or any characteristics of the device, such as an operating system or rendering engine) to which the advertisement should be targeted. For example, characteristics of a device might include:

- a. device name (e.g. Blackberry Pearl)
- b. rendering engine (name and version)
- c. screen size
- d. color vs. non-color
- e. operating system (name and version)
- f. Javascript capable?
- g. Flash capable?

NOTE that this same information may also be provided as an artwork constraint. See below.

NOTE that it would be useful to be able to specify minimum, maximum or a range of supported versions.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will not add any structures to Distribution that are specifically for this set of requirements. It is already possible to use user-defined CV values in our Distribution structure in order to specify distribution to specific types of delivery devices.

17. It **shall** be possible to associate a target **distribution count** with any sub-tree of the distribution structure.

- e.g. X occurrences to be delivered to this part of the Distribution structure (women under 30), Y occurrences to be delivered to this other part (women)

COMMENTARY (April 2008): No structural changes required.

18. It **shall** additionally be possible to define a distribution pattern in the Interactive Order Header.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We have not decided whether to implement this requirement. But if we do implement it, we should make it available to all media types, not just interactive orders.

19. When distribution information is provided at both the header and Placement level, any distribution information provided in the header **MUST** apply to all placements within the order.

- a. One might use the Distribution structure also at a lower level to express different types of distribution targets from those expressed in the header, for example, the browser(s) that a given placement should be targeted to.
- b. Therefore, in a multi-placement interactive booking, use the distribution structure at the top level to describe the overall demos and distribution that apply to all the placements, and at the placement level to constrain or guide that placement so it is delivered to the correct users, devices, etc.

Note that in this scenario the target distribution count for a given placement may be reached before the entire interactive buy (as described in the interactive ad header) has been fully delivered.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This requirement will be moot if we decide not to put Distribution in the Interactive Order header (i.e. placement group).

20. In theory the distribution counts should also be expressible as:

- a. a minimum - maximum numeric **range**
- b. a **percentage** of the actual total occurrence count
- c. that percentage expressed as a minimum - maximum range
- d. any other arbitrary relationship expressed as text or a code

However it is not considered a high priority for release 1.0 to support these capabilities in a machine-processable fashion.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will implement a simple version of the range concept in the Distribution header.

Pricing

21. At each level of the structure where it is possible to define an Occurrence Event or Target Count, it **SHALL** be possible to provide **pricing** for the interactive ad order.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): Pricing structures already exist at these levels. No additional work necessary.

22. It **SHALL** be possible to associate the pricing with the defined occurrence event type and target count.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): Per the notes earlier in this document, this requirement is supported by our existing price component capabilities.

23. When pricing is associated with an occurrence event, it SHALL be possible to express the price in the form of any of the following (or a combination of them):
- a. Total price for all occurrences triggered by publication of this ad
(~~and/or~~)
 - b. Per-occurrence price for occurrences triggered by publication of the ad
 - c. A rate based on the passage of time, e.g. a monthly or weekly rate.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- Each individual item in the above list can be specified on its own using existing pricing structures plus appropriate CV values.
- We will not make any structural changes in this area. It is possible that the "and/or" construct in the text above will not be fully supported.

24. It SHALL be possible to express **Minimum** (or Guaranteed) and **Maximum** prices

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This is supported by PriceType.

25. If a minimum price is expressed, it SHALL be possible to offset it against a specified number of the chargeable events, e.g. "Minimum charge of \$500/month includes the first 500 registrations; \$1 per registration thereafter." This is sometimes called "commercial partnership" pricing.

Note: there is disagreement within the group as to how much effort should be spent in release 1 enabling the above to be expressed as machine-processable elements.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): Existing pricing structures should support this requirement, assuming that the trading partners can agree on appropriate price component names.

26. It SHOULD be possible to express pricing in the form of a "bid" - e.g. the Google AdWords approach - where the buyer offers a price they are willing to pay for the occurrence events and based on that price the publisher prioritizes delivery of the ad.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We have decided not to implement this in the first release.

27. It SHALL be possible within the pricing information to express additional charges directly related to this ad and/or its delivery, for example:
- a. **extra services** related to the processing of the ad or the occurrence event
 - b. **bandwidth** used for uploading/running the ad
 - c. **exclusivity**
 - d. use of **third party rich media** such as TangoZebra, PointRoll, Shoshkeles, etc.
 - i. We may owe a royalty to the third party for use of their media format. This is explicitly spelled out in the order, including which party (buyer or seller) pays that royalty.
 - e. **featured placements** for a classified ad such as 'Job of the Day' or ad to appear grouped with other classifieds in a banner or skyscraper ad

- f. Whether the site will **manage the hiring process** (see http://get.monster.com/uken/product_home_index.asp?ecomad=emplogin_viewall)
- g. Whether the ad will contain a **button to link to the homepage** of the advertiser
- h. Whether there will be **self upload facility** for the ad content(s).
- i. in the case of recruitment ads **whether the advertiser will have (online) access to the CVs** of those who apply
- j. CV filtering**
- k. Whether the **advertiser's logo will appear in a 'Currently Recruiting' palette ad** or similar with a link to a web page on the advertiser's web site
- l. **Photos**
- m. **Videos**
- n. Customer logo**
- o. Customer logo with click-thru**
- p. Keyword purchases**
- q. etc.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- This is fully supported by existing pricing structures.
- The user can also define AdditionalServices and link them with pricing information if it is necessary to convey more details for production purposes.

Outlets and Locations (network, outlet, publication, site, channel, sub-channel) offered by the selling party

28. For each Placement in an interactive order it **shall** be possible to identify the set of **outlets** and, within them, **locations** to which the ad materials described in that Placement are intended to be delivered. These include the following options, in hierarchical sequence:
- a. 0...1 Network (a group of publications comprising a network as defined by the seller). When omitted it is assumed that the network consists of "all publications represented by the seller".
 - b. 0...* Publication or Site. This may also be expressed as "run of network", meaning "any of the publications/sites comprising the specified or implied network"
 - c. 1...* Channels. This may also be expressed as "run of site", meaning "any of the channels comprising the specified publication or site"
 - d. 0...* Sub-channels. This may also be expressed as "run of channel", meaning "any of the sub-channels comprising the specified channel"
 - e. 0...* Sub-sub-channels. This may also be expressed as "run of sub-channel", meaning "any of the sub-sub-channels comprising the specified sub-channel"

Note: The cardinality constraints described above need to be reviewed.

Note that when the selling party is a middleman the "network" may include publications or sites published by multiple publishers.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will implement a hierarchical channel structure going down to the Sub-Sub-Channel level as described above.

29. It SHALL be possible to **negate** a specified channel, sub-channel or sub-sub-channel, in order to indicate, for example, "run of site except the Health channel" or "run of network except 'This is London'"

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will implement this.

Materials

30. For each Placement in an interactive order it SHALL be possible to identify the **ad materials** that should be distributed according to the instructions contained in that Placement.

Note that ad materials may be added, removed or changed during the run of an interactive ad. For example, it may start out with a single piece of artwork distributed to all locations, but that may later change to multiple pieces of artwork (and therefore, in our current model, multiple Placements) each of which is delivered to a subset of the overall distribution targets.

NOTE that the artwork is often expressed as a link.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- Most of this requirement is supported by existing materials structures and messages.
- However, the AdContent structure needs to be reviewed for usage with non-filebased ad content such as a javascript or link. This is currently not explicitly supported.

31. It SHALL be possible to provide metadata about a piece of artwork that describes the **circumstances or environment** in which that artwork *can*, *should* or *must not* be delivered. This capability should support situations in which multiple pieces of content have been provided but only one of them should be delivered in any given context. Such information includes:
- a. Target Device and Characteristics (same list as in the Distribution requirements, above)
 - b. End-user characteristics
 - c. Rendering engine
 - d. The context in which the ad is being viewed
 - e. Any other arbitrary set of information about the artwork or the context in which it is being delivered.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- We will support the transmission of the types of information described in the bullet list above but not the ability to define in a machine-processable format how that information should be interpreted (e.g. whether it indicates that the artwork "can", "should" or "must not" be delivered in the defined context). Such semantics will have to be provided in textual instructions.
- It may be necessary to expand the current rendering structure, e.g. by making Usage repeatable or some other simple change.

32. It SHALL be possible within an Interactive Ad Order to provide **alternative ads for use in mutually exclusive circumstances**, along with rules that will determine which ad should be delivered in a given situation. For example, an interactive order might include the following versions of the ad:

- a. Search results listings version
 - b. Full ad details version
 - c. Summary ad details version
- ... along with instructions for how to decide which version of the ad to deliver in a given context.

Note that the group does not agree about where to put this information. In particular, some of us think these should be considered multiple renderings of the same ad, while others of us would treat them as separate placements.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This information will be conveyed at the rendering level using existing structures, e.g. a combination of Rendering metadata, textual instructions at the AdContent level, and machine-processable LinkedPlacement information as appropriate.

33. It SHALL be possible to describe the **Size** of the artwork that is associated with that Placement. If multiple ad content is associated with the same placement, it must all share the same size. Size information shall be expressible either with numbers and unit of measure or a standard code, for example:

- o 160x600 pixels
- o 468x60
- o IAB code
- o etc.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This is supported using the current Size structure.

34. It SHALL be possible to describe the **Ad Type** of the artwork that is associated with that Placement. If multiple ad content is associated with the same Placement, it must all share the same Ad Type. Ad types shall include:

- a. Pop-Up
- b. Pop-under
- c. Interstitial
- d. Banner
- e. Mini Banner
- f. Wide Skyscraper
- g. Rich media overlay
- h. Rich media expandable banner
- i. Inline ads inside a video
- j. Search results listing (e.g. for Google AdWords)
- k. MPU (message plus unit)
- l. etc.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This is supported using the current AdType element.

35. It SHALL be possible to describe the **Materials Format** of the artwork that is associated with that Placement. If multiple ad content is associated with the same placement, it must all share the same Format. Formats shall include:

- o GIF
- o JPG
- o Png
- o Text

- Flash
- Java fragment
- etc.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- If we deliver a piece of javascript in ContentData to be published on the publisher's website, then we need to be clear on how to transmit properties of the ad that will then be delivered by DoubleClick to the publisher's website.
- This also implies a new concept (to us) of Materials Server Party. At least one part of the requirement is the agreement between parties as to the size, weight, technical specs, behavior, etc. of the materials served up by the third party. Even as the artwork may change during the run of the ad, all versions of the artwork would need to conform to these properties. Is this a new requirement on MaterialsExpectations?

NOTE that we might want to relax the constraints on all materials in a placement sharing the same size, type and format, in order to allow multiple ad content handling that is based on size, type or format differences between two or more sets of artwork. (Could these be handled as multiple renderings of the same ad?)

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We do not currently expect to relax this requirement. Different formats of artwork would need to be booked in different Placements.

Scheduling

36. It SHALL be possible in each Placement to define the **dates, times and/or dayparts** within which that Placement ~~can only, should or must~~ be delivered. Scheduling options SHALL include:
- a. One or more **date/time periods**
 - b. Zero or more **Named Days** (or periods) and event-related days
 - i. E.g. Christmas
 - c. Zero or more **Dayparts**
 - i. E.g. Lunch time, drive time, stock exchange closing time, etc.
- d. Plus of course a text field in the appropriate place to add notes about what is intended by those dates

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- We plan to implement this by expanding the capabilities of the Scheduling structure. These capabilities should probably be available for all types of bookings.
- We have identified a new requirement: that it SHALL be possible to negate a daypart, so as to indicate, for example, that an ad should be delivered throughout the day except for one or more specified dayparts.
- We will not implement the "can only, should or must" concept.

- ~~37. It shall alternatively be possible to define scheduling in the interactive order header. If scheduling is defined in the header it MUST apply to all placements within the order.~~

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will not implement this requirement. Scheduling will be specified at the bottom of the message structure, as it is for the other types of bookings.

Additional Triggering Events and Contexts

38. It SHALL be possible within a Placement to specify a **triggering event** and/or **context** in which the materials specified in that Placement *can only, should* or *must* be delivered. These could include, for example:
- User behaviors
 - Keyword search for a specified term or phrase
 - Query for/about a category of thing (e.g. search for a restaurant or movie, check the weather)
 - Many other possible behaviors here!
 - Mobile user is in a specific location
 - Real world event outcome, e.g. particular driver wins a race
 - Context / characteristics / constraints =
 - search engine search
 - Display of to a user of an article or other text containing a specified term or phrase

(NOTE that we might use linked placements to solve the problem of two alternative ads where the choice is driven by an external event. At least we should consider this.)

NOTE that the difference between a triggering event and a context is itself one of context: the same thing might be a trigger in one buy, and a contextual constraint in another. In practical terms, when it is indicated that a Placement "should" or "must" occur when an event happens, the event is a Trigger; when it is indicated that the Placement "can only" occur when this event happens then the event is a Context.

NOTE that Scheduling is actually another variety of an external event which may serve as either a Trigger or Context for a Placement.

Note that the events above could also operate at a lower level of the buy to determine which artwork to run. This already applies to print, e.g. "if she wins the election run this copy, vs. if he wins, run that copy". This could be implemented by having, for example, mutually exclusive contexts on two different Placements.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will not implement anything that is intended just to support this requirement. Most of the requirement is expected to be supported by a combination of existing structures and changes we will make in order to support other requirements in this document. The balance of this requirement, if any, will not be supported.

Capping

39. It SHALL be possible within a Placement to specify the **maximum number of times** that the materials described in that Placement may be delivered to a single user. (For example, a "cap" of one exposure per unique viewer to the artwork described in the placement.)

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will implement this.

40. It SHALL be possible ~~within an Interactive ad buy header~~ to specify the maximum number of times that any of the materials referenced in the ad

buy may be delivered to a user as part of that buy. (For example, a “cap” of three exposures per unique viewer to any aspect of this interactive ad buy.)

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We would like to avoid adding production control structures to the header level. Therefore we expect to implement this requirement at the Placement level.

41. The cap may be defined as a count of occurrences per user, or may be based on any other factor.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will implement this.

Throttling

42. It SHALL be possible within a Placement to provide **throttling instructions** which determine how the delivery of the Placement should be spread across its intended distribution, or within an Interactive Ad Header to determine how the delivery of that ad as buy a whole should be spread across its intended distribution.

COMMENTARY (April 2008):

- We define throttling as a target count of distribution events within a given time period. We will implement throttling by adding capabilities to the existing Scheduling structures in order to express this.
- Since scheduling is specific to a particular channel, if someone wanted to throttle two channels differently, those two channels would need to be in two different placements.
- Distribution structures also contain a set of Counts. The counts in a distribution structure apply to the entire run of the ad, while the count in a scheduling structure will apply just to the period described by that scheduling structure. Potential issues arise if the user expresses both distribution counts which necessarily apply to the entire run of the ad and throttling counts for time periods that are shorter than the total run of the ad. Therefore we will write a usage rule along the following lines:
 - If you want time-based throttling you should not populate the counts in the distribution structure. In this case you repeat the schedule entry as necessary for each period and show the total count for that period, which is then allocated to whatever distribution pattern you have specified according to your throttling rules. (We might add a Requirements or Spec element to contain those rules.) This follows the same model as the current InsertionPeriod OccurrenceCount, but it would need to be available for all of the scheduling variants.

Positioning

43. It SHALL be possible a Placement to provide **positioning instructions** which specify where the materials described in that placement *should*, *must* or *must not* be positioned within the target medium’s “page” or equivalent.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will not add structures to convey machine-processable instructions that indicate whether a given positioning instruction

"*should, must or must not*" be obeyed. Other than that we will implement this.

~~44. It SHALL also be possible to provide such positioning instructions in the Interactive Ad Order's header, in which case the instructions must apply to all of the Placements contained in that order.~~

~~NOTE that this information is probably very site specific, and may need to be expressed in a notes field or equivalent.~~

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will not implement this requirement.

Classification code

45. It SHALL be possible to associate a Placement with one or more **classification codes**. These may be used to position the advertisement referenced by that Placement within the target publication, and/or to enable users to search for the advertisement by referencing the classification(s) with which it is associated.

Note that there may be an additional charge associated with providing more than one classification code.

Note that this mechanism should coexist with the ability to specify channels, sub-channels and sub-sub-channels for the Placement. For example, a placement might have both a classification code and an explicit sub-channel.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We may wish to implement this for all types of Placements, not just the Interactive ones.

Classified ad Styling

46. It SHALL be possible in a Placement to associate the text of the advertisement with predefined **styling information** or instructions.

Additional Services

47. It SHALL be possible in either a Placement or the Interactive Ad Header to describe **additional services** that will be provided by the publisher or its agents. Examples include:

- featured placements for a classified ad such as 'Job of the Day' or ad to appear grouped with other classifieds in a banner or skyscraper ad
- Whether the site will manage the hiring process (see http://get.monster.com/uken/product_home_index.asp?ecomad=empl ogin,viewall)
- Whether the ad will contain a button to link to the homepage of the advertiser
- Whether there will be self upload facility for the ad content(s).
- in the case of recruitment ads whether the advertiser will have (online) access to the CVs of those who apply
- CV filtering
- Whether the advertiser's logo will appear in a 'Currently Recruiting' palette ad or similar with a link to a web page on the advertiser's web site
- Photos
- Videos
- Customer logo

- Customer logo with click-thru
- Specify if the advertiser has bought (and show details of) keyword purchases such as:
 - enhanced search results placements when it features in a listing e.g. 'at top of search listing', 'in top 5 of listing', 'in first page of listing'
 - sole or additional rights to keywords and the context in which those rights will apply
 - links to keywords which may not appear in the contents of the ad

Note that additional services may or may not be associated with an additional price.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This is supported by existing structures at the Placement level, but might be a problem at the Placement Group level. Further discussion is required.

Redistribution

48. It SHALL be possible in a Placement to specify whether the publisher *can, should, must or must not* **redistribute** the ad to other media outlets.

Note that a price adjustment may be associated with the ability to redistribute the ad.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This requirement has not been confirmed. We will not implement it at the current time.

49. If redistribution is permitted, it SHALL be possible to specify the **permitted media outlets**, either by listing one or more media outlet names or by identifying the type(s) of permitted redistribution in a more general way.

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This requirement has not been confirmed. We will not implement it at the current time.

Provenance

50. It SHOULD be possible in a Placement to identify the **provenance** of that ad. Some aggregation sites which accept classifieds ads from a range of sources need this information, including where the ads have been previously published, to make sure that business rules can be enforced correctly. This information includes:

- a. Who originally provided it
- b. Whether the provider is considered to be a trusted source
- c. The path it travelled from its original source to current destination
- d. Where the ad has previously been published (possibly multiple locations)

COMMENTARY (April 2008): This requirement has not been confirmed. We will not implement it at the current time.

Miscellaneous services packages

51. It SHALL be possible in an Interactive Ad Order to specify **miscellaneous service packages** that are not inherently related to the delivery of an

advertisement. It shall be possible, for example, for the order to include delivery of a box of t-shirts to a specified recipient.

NOTE that in order to accommodate these we may need to create a generic order line, not using our current Placement structure, to allow for arbitrary / miscellaneous orders of things that do not have associated publication data. This would be analogous to Item.Generic in an invoice or credit line. The mechanism should include, at a minimum:

- Description
- Price
- Special requirements (repeatable)

COMMENTARY (April 2008): We will support the transmission of a Placement.Generic containing only one or more Additional Services structures.

(end)