Introductions and roll call.

CMF welcomes those in attendance.

1. **Media Analytics team begins with housekeeping and review of the briefing note.**
   - Background and measurement objectives: CMF is pleased with the uptake in tagging. The reason we need applicants to tag is because it is a requirement from Heritage and CMF's stakeholders.
   - Limitations: There is a gap in what we can measure. Different projects present certain technical hitches in terms of tagging. For example, a game on Steam or a video on YouTube cannot currently be tagged.
   - The current amount of projects that are tagged is roughly 75% for convergent and 55% for experimental.
   - Other measurement challenges: The CMF's current "iframe" proxy provides basic metrics only. There is also a significant amount of projects where applicants indicate they do not have the third-party access to implement CMF tags. This may require some sort of self-reporting mechanism in the future.
   - *Default* will be reinstated shortly for applicants who do not contact CMF for tracking codes within 6 months of their initial contract signing date. It is the responsibility of the applicant to contact the CMF if an extension is required.

   Floor is open for questions related to compliance and tagging experiences:

   - Question: "Is this related to adding Digital Media traffic as a potential envelope factor weight?"

     No, this is not a conversation about including DM performance as a factor weight in future Envelope calculations. "We've moved away from that line of thinking because it is too difficult to compare the different types of data." Nonetheless, the CMF needs to measure DM traffic in order to report to Heritage and our stakeholders to show that money is being invested wisely.

   - Question: "What is heritage doing with these numbers"

     No one from Heritage was in attendance; however, CMF believes that they are open to suggestions. "Measurement and reporting is a condition of CMF's contribution agreement, but what we've had in the past can be modernized".

   - Question: When a program has multiple seasons it presents a problem in terms of tagging. It is much easier to tag a website with one set of tags. There should be a tool or plugin created by the CMF because it is very time consuming to triage multiple seasons.

The current process reflects the reality that different seasons belong to different fiscal years. CMF will examine if something can be done to help with this issue.

2. **Moving on to the policy portion of the discussion.**
   - Over the past few months, a recurring theme from the working groups was the topic of "convergence". In 2010, the idea was to encourage television producers to work alongside digital media creators. This guided much of CMF's policy at the time. Television and digital media was meant to be integrated with "Rich and Substantial" digital media companion projects (not simply a basic website for the linear TV program).
   - In recent years, CMF created the category "Value Added" because there was an acknowledgement that one size does not fit all when it comes to different projects and genres. There is also a growing real-estate that social media occupies in terms of discoverability for linear projects. *"Therefore, in 2010 the mandate was to create a convergent industry (between television and digital media), have we now in 2018 achieved that goal and should we provide added flexibility to support content in different ways that is not as regimented?"*

   Floor is open for comments and questions:

   - Question: What is the definition of Digital Media in this context? There is: *type of content* but also the *platform*. Years ago the dichotomy was not as preannounced; however, content exists in so many different areas (websites, social media, YouTube…), how can this all be measured? Also, does it include the long-form television program if it is streamed online?

   - For the purposed of this discussion we are only talking about digital media in the convergent stream which is the digital companion project to a television program, not the long-form content streamed online.

   - Comment: The CMPA's position is that digital media is important for discoverability, but that not every project needs to be "Rich and Substantial".

   - A generally surmised comment from broadcasters in attendance is that digital extensions do not fit different genres the same way. For example CTV's audience does not want to play a game or watch webisodes related to a television program if it does not include the lead actors. Creating "Rich and Substantial" projects for certain types of television programs is something broadcasters have struggled with. The concept of "Value Added" has helped and they would like to encourage the CMF to move in the direction of more flexibility.

   - **Question from the CMF: If we removed the concept of mandated "Rich and Substantial" projects, how would this impact digital content that gets created? Would there be less of**

it? Would the relationships between broadcasters, producers and digital content creators continue without this mandate?

- The broadcasters' perspective is that not all television properties are suitable for the type of budget that "Rich and Substantial" mandates. Kids games (and in some instances documentaries) might fit well; however, there are external factors in determining if a project is a natural fit for such a large budget. The common theme amongst broadcasters is the desire for more flexibility. Hitting a 60% target often means that they take on "Rich and Substantial" digital media projects simply because of the CMF requirement and there is little ROIs to show for them.

- **Question from the CMF: Is there a better way to support the digital media industry without forcing these types of projects?**

- From the digital media producer's prospective there would be a substantial drop off in the industry if this was not mandated. Parallel to why Canadian content is mandated – "it would not happen if it wasn't".

- **Question from the CMF: Is there an opportunity for digital media producers to pivot into the realm of "discoverability"?**

- The issue is blurred lines with marketing budgets. CMF's digital media funds were never meant to buy ads on Facebook or YouTube. However in today's world, social media is what leads to discoverability more than companion digital media properties.

- An area that needs further examination is the raison d'être of convergent digital media projects? What is their goal? Is it discoverability of the linear television program? If so, historically there have been better ways to achieve discoverability (social media, marketing, etc.). Are DM properties meant as standalone projects that are independent of driving audiences to the linear content? If so, there are roadblocks (examples provided by TVO and the Ontario Board of Education).

- **Question from the CMF: If the CMF were to move towards a "Platform Agnostic" approach (where IP exists on different platforms and somehow we measure that as a whole) how would the Digital Media Measurement Framework need to be adjusted?**

- Measuring IP as opposed to separating digital media and television is something many broadcasters already do, but performance measurement is different depending on the type of project. Therefore, CMF would have to first determine what "success" looks like on a global scale then figure out how to measure it and verify it. This may include "bucketing" projects so that we can understand what emerges as "successful traits" when segmented into categories that make sense.

- **Question from the CMF: Is there something else to "discoverability" than advertising that ties into CMF digital media projects?**

- No one was able to definitively answer this question. However, "Value Added" and "Rich and Substantial" digital media projects do not drive audiences to linear projects as per broadcasters. Promotional campaigns and social media are much more successful in that respect.

- **Question from the CMF: If the $100,000 (English) and $50,000 (French) threshold for a "Rich and Substantial" credit is adjusted, is there a way to encourage broadcasters to produce digital media projects or does that money disappear from the system?**

- With the advent of "Value Added" some broadcasters have moved away from "Rich and Substantial" and decided to forfeit the credit altogether. Others struggle to make it work, though ROIs are hard to find outside of CMF's envelope calculation. When compared with US networks or Netflix for example, "Rich and Substantial" companion projects do not seem to be a "thing". Perhaps an examination of "Value Added" projects would determine a more appropriate dollar amount to trigger a credit; however, we must be careful about unintended consequences.