



The Newsletter for
Magazine Sellers,
Buyers & Circulators

From
Jack Hanrahan

Volume 1, Issue 2

February 11, 2008

FAS-FAX Findings...First and Fast for You

ABC's FAS-FAX Report for the second half of 2007 hit cyberspace this morning. Here are the headlines:

What Matters Most

Today's FAS-FAX

- Total units up
- Single copy sales steady
- Verified use drops
- Reader's Digest misses 2nd half rate base

- **Total circulation topped the 400MM units mark** across the 625 magazines submitting data to ABC in time for FAS-FAX
 - The total (401.5MM copies) is up 1.1% over year ago
- **Single copy sales treaded water**
 - Just shy of 50MM units sold...good news given newsstand challenges
- **Publisher-provided, free verified circulation dropped 3.3%**
 - 13.6MM verified copies equaled 3.4% of total circ...much higher for some books...see the Dirty Dozen in this issue
- **Paid subscriptions rose 3%**
 - Need more detail in upcoming pinks sheets to really whoop it up on this...but up is more good news for the industry
- **Reader's Digest missed rate base by 677.2M copies**
 - Would have missed by 1MM+ without average 433M verified copies per issue
- **Mixed bag for celebrity titles**
 - People and Star comfortably deliver rate base but:
 - People's newsstand dips 8.5%; Star subs off 20%; newsstand off 4%
 - Us Weekly up 10% overall and 13% in paid subs...verified up 169%
 - Bauer in brief: In Touch solid—Life & Style Weekly misses guarantee
 - OK! Weekly grows 24% versus year ago
 - Delivers 10% bonus on rate base



Audit Bureau of Circulations

Also in this issue

FAS-FAX Basics	2
A Closer Look: Rate Base Guarantees	3
The Ultimate Odd Couple	5
Newsstand Sales and MRI's ISS Study	6
Sorry, Pop Science	7

FAS-FAX Basics

Before we get too deep into the specifics of today’s FAS-FAX, let’s take a minute to review some basics about this Audit Bureau report.

What is ABC’s FAS-FAX Report?

FAS-FAX is an ABC report that provides magazine sellers, buyers, and consumer marketers a 35,000 foot view of magazine circulation data. This top-line look covers all publications that file a Publisher’s Statement. The FAS-FAX provides an early read on circulation realities prior to the availability of the Publisher’s Statement.

What is included in this top line look?

For each title in FAS-FAX, the report provides single copy price, the number of issues published in the period covered plus circulation statistics for the current six month period as well as the same period a year ago for these categories:

• Paid Subscriptions	• Total Subscriptions + SCS
• Verified Subscriptions	• Analyzed Non-Paid (ANP) Circulation
• Total Subscriptions	• Total Subscriptions, SCS and ANP
• Single Copy Sales (SCS)	• Rate Base (if any) and its components

Percent change between this six month period and the comparable one from a year ago is provided for all of the circulation statistics.

When is FAS-FAX released?

Magazines file for FAS-FAX in the summer and winter. (There is a FAS-FAX for newspapers; that comes out in the spring and fall.) Today’s release covers consumer magazine and religious and farm publications. CircMatters only focuses on the consumer titles. What we are reviewing in this issue was released by the ABC at 8 a.m. EDT on Monday, February 11.

Where can I find it?

FAS-FAX is released on the ABC website and is available to members.

Over 90% of Rate Base Claimers Make Guarantee...Match That TV

There’s a lot of good news from today’s FAS-FAX. The growth in units and subs....the steady performance at the newsstand....even the cut in verified copies.

Yet, nothing makes buyers feel better than knowing that a title delivered on its circulation promise.

In this FAS-FAX, 305 titles provided a circulation assurance to buyers. Of these 276 made good on their promise...and delivered at least to the level of the guarantee.

That’s over 90% of those claiming a rate base making it! Something to crow about today when the television networks chronically underperform.



Rate Base Guarantees: A Closer Look

The terrific news that 91% of those FAS-FAX reporting titles claiming a rate base delivered on that guaranteeand then some...is just part of the story. We are going to dive in a bit deeper and let you know:

- **Who’s NOT making a rate base claim?** (Seems only fair to single out those who don’t provide any reassurance to their advertisers before we report on those who fell short of rate base.)
- **Who missed?**

In all, there’s 717 titles listed in this FAS-FAX. Ninety-two (92) didn’t get there data into ABC in time for today’s release. They’ll have to submit shortly to make the February 25th release of the FAS-FAX Supplement. Most missing the deadline are smaller publishers; Cigar Aficionado and Wine Spectator are the most widely used among the late filers.

So, excluding the 92 tardy filers, we have 625 titles in this report. Just shy of half of them make a rate base claim and slightly over half of them don’t.

As Butch Cassidy asked the Sundance Kid: **“Who are those guys anyway?”** The ones not providing a guarantee.

The short answer is small circulation titles. Of the 320 FAS-FAX filers that do not have a rate base, 75% serve under 200,000 copies. Among these, many are city and regional titles or highly selective books serving niche markets (Model Railroader, Cat Fancy, Guitar World).



(Continued on page 4)

Single Copy Sales: What’s Behind the Numbers?

On the front cover, we pointed out a few facts that seemed to be at odds with other:

1. Single copy sales were flat overall versus last year
2. Big newsstand sellers were down: People (-8.5%), Star (-4.1%)

Going deeper into the numbers, we saw a couple of reasons why newsstand stayed even:

- The **inclusion of Hearst’s Quick & Simple** in FAS-FAX for the first time. It didn’t hurt to have the book’s 21 issues averaging 308M per issue boosting the newsstand bottom line.
- **Huge gains from four Meredith monthlies**
 - Family Circle was the strongest performer among the top 10 newsstand books (top part of this chart), adding 112M/issue.
 - Look at both the absolute and percentage jumps of three other MPC titles. The trio on the bottom of the chart averaged about

Publication	Cover Price	Newsstand Sales - 2nd Half		Percent Change
		2007	2006	
COSMOPOLITAN	\$4.37	1,896,641	1,945,296	-2.5%
PEOPLE	\$3.84	1,428,760	1,561,386	-8.5%
WOMAN'S WORLD	\$1.58	1,317,389	1,407,355	-6.4%
IN TOUCH WEEKLY	\$2.29	1,228,056	1,227,350	0.1%
FIRST	\$2.16	1,206,222	1,262,581	-4.5%
US WEEKLY	\$3.69	1,005,086	978,285	2.7%
FAMILY CIRCLE	\$1.99	976,821	867,008	12.7%
O, THE OPRAH MAGAZINE	\$4.50	836,770	866,884	-3.5%
GLAMOUR	\$3.99	747,014	861,006	-13.2%
STAR MAGAZINE	\$3.49	712,980	743,439	-4.1%
Other Large Meredith Titles				
LADIES' HOME JOURNAL	\$2.49	386,600	281,201	37.5%
BETTER HOMES AND GARDENS	\$3.49	379,667	221,333	71.5%
FITNESS	\$3.50	334,959	240,667	39.2%

Rate Base Guarantees: A Closer Look

(Continued from page 3)

Among the largest circulation group (2MM+) in the table below, there really are no major consumer titles. The second group with 1MM—2MM circulation has Hachette’s Car and Driver, which along with Hachette sibling Road & Track, went *sans* guarantee only last year. The National Enquirer and WHERE magazine were the only other notable rate base holdouts in the 1MM+ group.

Circulation Size Group	# in Group	FAS-FAX 2nd Half 07 Made Rate Base?		Publications making no Rate Base Claim	
		Yes	No	#	Notables
2 MM or more	41	34	2	5	Any AAA publication and Kraft’s custom publication, Food & Family
1MM-2MM	54	44	2	8	Car and Driver, National Enquirer, Where Magazine
500M - 1MM	91	74	7	10	Road & Track, Bassmaster, Electronic Gaming
200M- 500M	133	70	6	57	Bride’s, Air & Space, Martha Stewart Weddings, Penthouse
Under 200M	306	54	12	240	Robb Report, Worth, The Nation, American Photo, any Transworld title
Sub-Total	625	276	29	320	
Late Filers	92	—	—	—	
TOTAL	717				

Even the next group of 91 titles between 500M and 1MM circ has nearly 90% of the titles providing an advertiser assurance.

It’s below the half million mark when the likelihood of finding a guarantee starts to erode. Various bridal category titles, Smithsonian’s Air & Space, Penthouse and about 50 other titles in the 200M—500M range have no rate base. Still, rate base guarantees are more likely in this range than not.

(Continued on page 5)

The Dirty Dozen

FAS-FAX reveals how dependent some magazines are on free distribution. Some non-paid copies get classified as analyzed non-paid by the publisher, others fall into the category given the unfortunate name of verified.

Verified copies can be either sent to individuals or to public place locations. How well-targeted or precisely-directed either of those sub-groupings are is the topic of much discussion between buyers and sellers.

We will return to that topic sometime down the road.

For this issue, we simply want to share our choice for this **FAS-Fax’s Dirty Dozen**...12 titles that simply have too much free distribution. The percentages provided as verified copies di-

vided by the total of paid plus verified. We do NOT include Analyzed **Non-Paid** Circulation in the base.

Why? You only get one bite of the unpaid apple. **Sorry, Family Fun and Golf for Women.**

The Dirty Dozen	
Twelve Major Magazines with Way Too Much Verified	Verified as % of Paid + Verified
SKIING MAGAZINE	56
SKI MAGAZINE	56
TRAVEL + LEISURE GOLF	55
COSMOPOLITAN EN ESPANOL	34
WORTH	25
FAMILYFUN	22
PETERSEN’S HUNTING	22
AUTOMOBILE MAGAZINE	21
MOTOR TREND	20
GOLF FOR WOMEN	18
PEOPLE EN ESPANOL	18
SOUTHERN ACCENTS	18

Rate Base Guarantees: A Closer Look

(Continued from page 4)

It isn't until one gets to the smallest circ books that you find titles with a rate base in the minority.

Who Missed Rate Base?

The two largest titles missing their guarantee were Reader's Digest and Playboy. (See story below for details.) The 1MM—2MM circ size group had the lowest percent missing rate base (4.3%). I'm tempted to say that it isn't always a Woman's World...and a Boy's Life isn't all that hot either as these were the only titles in this group to fall short.

In the middle group, we find Sierra oddly paired with BH&G's Wood magazine. (Hey, I'm not making this up.)

The 200M—500M bunch holds Country Weekly (which comes out every other week, go figure) and Guns & Ammo. Have to muster up some courage to call them for your rebate check.

And it was a miserable FAS-FAX for the Nutmeg State as Connecticut Cottages & Gardens, Connecticut magazine, Sail, and Preservation all missed their second half guarantees.

Circulation Size Group	# in Group Claiming RB	FAS-FAX 2nd Half 07 Made Rate Base?		Rate Base Misses	
		Yes	No	% Missing	Notables Missing Rate Base
2 MM or more	36	34	2	5.6%	Reader's Digest, Playboy
1MM-2MM	46	44	2	4.3%	Woman's World, Boy's Life
500M - 1MM	81	74	7	8.6%	Life & Style Weekly, Business 2.0 (RIP), Sierra, Wood
200M- 500M	76	70	6	7.9%	Country Weekly, Auto Week, Soap Opera Weekly, Guns & Ammo
Under 200M	66	54	12	18.2%	Sail, Preservation, Connecticut, Connecticut Cottages & Gardens
TOTAL	305	276	29	9.5%	

The Ultimate Odd Couple: Reader's Digest and Playboy



Two institutions in American magazine publishing (not to mention American culture) share a dubious distinction today. They are the largest titles to undershoot their guarantees to their advertisers in the FAS-FAX.



Can't say that Playboy was such a surprise. They made their 3MM rate base last December by 1,723 copies. Plus, they missed it in June 2007.

But, the Digest? That surprised me. Sure, I knew they took the rate base down to 8MM with the January 2008 issue, down from the 10MM guarantee for the second half of 2007. In their mid-year pink sheet, the Digest reported a little over 10.1MM circ. So, why did they fall to today's reported 9.3MM...including 433M verified?

Publisher Jeff Wellington kindly responded to our query sharing that "we planned to miss the rate base in each issue this fall" leading into the lower 8MM rate base level in January.

That sounded to us that the book covered off clients in the fall issues that they'd fall below rate base. We followed up asking if our assumption was right. Jeff replied back: "You are correct."

Guess I was the only one out of the loop.

Newsstand Sales and Issue-Specific Audiences

Wouldn't you think there would be a relationship between readership and circulation for a magazine?

How about between a title's newsstand sales for an issue and the audience delivered for the same issue?

You might be surprised to find out that an all-star quintet of researchers at MRI* (Julian Baim, Martin Frankel, Michal Galin, Joseph Agresit and Kerry Zarnitz) found that the relationship between issue by issue audience and both total circulation and newsstand circulation was weak.

The correlations were positive (that's good) but not terribly high...0.13 for total circulation and 0.14 for newsstand.

That got me wondering why that might be.

There are many possibilities including:

- Little circulation variation from issue to issue for most of the 164 titles measured at the time in MRI's Issue Specific Study (ISS). The paper points this out.
- The normal bounce associated with sample research.
- The inability of newsstand copy-generated audience to stand out over public place copy-generated audience.

What do I mean by that last possibility?

Total audience is composed of primary and pass-along readers (see sidebar). The latter group...pass-along readers...includes those who read or look into copies in places like doctor's office, beauty salons, and other public locations.

The role of public place copies generates much conversation in our business:

- Waiting room copies constitute about 7% of all copies (according to Waiting Room Subscription Services)
 - These copies produce about 25% of all readers (MRI)
- Waiting room copies are created with generating about 30 readers per copy (RPC)
 - Locations like salons produce even more

With those high RPC levels from public place copies, do newsstand copies (credited in one study with yielding 4 readers per copy) stand a chance to influence total audience?



Total Audience Components

Primary: Those readers who either bought the magazine copy themselves (single copy or by subscription) or live in a household where someone else did.

Pass-along: Those readers who obtained the copy second hand (in a public place, from a non-family member, etc.)



*You can find this paper in [MRI's Library](#) of papers from last fall's Worldwide Readership Symposium. We pointed you in this direction in our first issue. Look for the paper entitled "Measuring Issue Specific Audiences".

Newsstand Sales and Issue-Specific Audiences

(Continued from page 6)

A few numbers may help me make this point. Take a magazine with 1.4MM total circulation:

- Suppose the publisher put 200M copies into public places and sold 1.2MM copies either to subscribers or to single copy buyers
 - If the subscription and newsstand copies generate 4 RPC, then these 1.2MM copies generate 4.8MM readers.
 - If the public place copies generate 25 RPC, then these 200M copies generate 5MM readers...slightly more readers than were produced by all 1.2MM copies sold.

You can see the challenge facing any one hoping to find a relationship between shifts in newsstand sales and audience with this example. Readership, in this example, is really driven by the public place copies.

There is little chance anyone will find a correlation between readership levels and newsstand sales when there is significant "interference" introduced by public place copies. **The audience generated by the public place copies can just swamp any incremental audience generated by above average newsstand sales.**

However, for a magazine that relied heavily on newsstand sales and did not use any or many public place copies, we might find a stronger correlation between newsstand sales and MRI's ISS audience levels.

That's the hypothesis. Let's test it out.

(Continued on page 8)

Pop Sci Survived the Wal*Mart Buzz Saw

CircMatters mistakenly listed Popular Science, a Bonnier title, as being bounced by Wal*Mart in our last issue. **We want to correct that.**



The title is still there but sadly many of its Bonnier brothers and sisters are out: Parenting, Garden Design, Ski, Salt Water Fisherman, and a bunch of the Transworld titles.

We (and others) were misled by the list of over 1400 titles that Wal*Mart allegedly cut. Pop Sci was on that list but it's fine...it's still sold at the retailer. So, what gives? **Why was it on the list if it never was cut?**

The short answer: **Pop Sci switched distributors**...moving to Comag (the Hearst/Condé Nast joint venture) after it was acquired from Time Inc. So, it appears on the Wal*Mart list under the former distributor, Time Warner Sales.

Spreadsheet maintenance doesn't seem to be a core competency in the magazine group at Wal*Mart. As we pointed out in the last issue, the Wal*Mart list contained lots of magazines that no longer exist...some defunct for 2+ years. Now, we also see how a change in distributor puts a magazine on a list where it doesn't belong.

You would think that a retailer responsible for 15-20 percent of magazine sales would be a little more careful when it constructs a list of titles that it is going to drop from its shelves.

When a giant sneezes, a lot of people can catch a cold.

Newsstand Sales and Issue-Specific Audiences

(Continued from page 7)

I asked MRI if they would share the issue by issue audience data for two titles: In Touch and Star Magazine (Star hereafter).

Why these?

In Touch is pure.

- No verified or sponsored circulation at all. Zip...Nada...NONE
- Plus, its circulation is virtually all single copy sales; 97% of all copies sold in the first half of 2007 were newsstand
- In Touch was not in Rapid Report in 2007 and so we can't analyze the second half of 2007 until their pink sheet is published

Star provides a little more variety...and an opportunity to examine both halves of 2007 individually...an interesting case study.

- Very little verified circulation in the first half of 2007 (0.7% of the 1.46 million circ total) and all of was individually addressed. (Note: there were 40M sponsored copies out of those 1.46MM paid going to public places.)
- Verified copies jumped to slightly over 3% of the total in the second half of the year. (We don't know yet whether these verified were public place or individually address as Rapid Report doesn't break that out...the pink sheet for the second half will.)
- In both halves of 2007, newsstand sales accounted for 50%+ of total circulation

Before we get too far, let's remember **we are only looking at two titles here**. So, we want to be careful not generalize too much. That said, I think the findings are worth sharing.

Where should we begin?

Let's start with something simple. Do the worst and best newsstand sellers yield correspondingly low and high MRI audience estimates?

Worst Sellers

We'll look at the issues with below average newsstand sales first.

Here are the covers that came up short of average. On page 9, we'll see how they performed.



(Continued on page 9)

Newsstand Sales and Issue-Specific Audiences

(Continued from page 8)

Let's talk about the two January to June "worst seller" issues first.

- In Touch's 4/30/07 "Heroes of Virginia" cover dealt with the tragedy at Virginia Tech
 - It sold 32% fewer copies on the newsstand than the average issue in the first half of 2007. Thus, the 68 index in the column next to the issue date.
 - MRI's ISS numbers are very much in parallel with the below average single copy performance
 - The audience indices are not only well below average but **MRI's indices for adults and women are the lowest among all 26 issues** published in the first half of the year. Nice congruence.
- Star's worst sellers both featured Angelina Jolie.
 - The first half's bomb: Brangelina "Threesome" 5/29/07 cover sold 575M copies, 21% less than the title's first half average
 - **Once again, the MRI ISS index numbers are also well below average**
 - Also, once again, **none of the 26 issues of Star had lower MRI indices** for adults and women in the first half of 2007

"MRI's (audience) indices are the lowest among all 26 issues" for In Touch's worst selling cover.

Magazine	Issue Date	Newsstand Index	MRI ISS Audience Index		
		vs. 6 Mo. Avg.	Adults	Men	Women
In Touch	4/30/07	68	73	80	72
Star	5/28/07	79	75	83	72
Star	9/24/07	71	120	124	119

- The symmetry falls apart with the worst seller of the second half: the "Babies in Danger" 9/24/07 cover
 - This issue sold 29% fewer copies than the 2nd Half average but generated MRI ISS audience indices all above average.

Ahh....but remember, Star in the second half of 07 resorted to verified copies. They were virtually void of verified in the first half.

Perhaps the use of verified copies introduced "noise" into the system negating the parallel between low single copy sales and low audience levels that we saw with both Star and In Touch in the first half.

Best Sellers

How well did the ISS data parallel the best selling issues on the newsstand?

Not too bad.

The covers and the data appear on page 10.

Newsstand Sales and Issue-Specific Audiences

All three of the strongest selling issues shown here did roughly on par or better than average on the three audience indices.

The indices on circ did not diverge as much for the best sellers as they did for the disappointing covers.

- The newsstand bump for In Touch’s 2/12/07 “Katie Breaks Free” issue was only 18% above average
 - That wasn’t like the 30+% difference we saw on the worst selling side
- Star’s best selling “Beach Bodies” issues had bigger bumps of 27% and 25%, respectively.
 - These two issues performed very well in MRI’s ISS. The September 10 issue, in fact, had the highest audience indices for all three demos of any Star issue of the second half.



Magazine	Issue Date	Newsstand Index vs. 6 Mo. Avg.	MRI ISS Audience Index		
			Adults	Men	Women
In Touch	2/12/07	118	99	118	96
Star	6/4/07	127	106	122	100
Star	9/10/07	125	129	143	125

What’s up with the men?

We’ve highlighted the male indices in light blue above. **All three best sellers have above norm male readership levels. What might be going on here?**

The short answer is that I have no idea. I found it interesting that all the best sellers had this “male bump”. Speculating on what might be going on here produced some entertaining theories:

- Could male buyers be driving up the sales of these issues? The male readership and newsstand lifts are similar in direction and magnitude.
- Might men in “man/woman shopping together” situations influence the purchase of this title this week because an interest in the cover story? (Maybe with the two Beach Bodies top sellers but TomKat?)
- Could less frequent women buyers be bringing these issues home to an underserved segment of male celebrity title aficionados?

**“What’s up with the men?
All 3 best sellers have above norm male readership.”**

With both the worst and the best sellers for these two titles, I came away with the feeling that the MRI ISS data reasonably paralleled newsstand sales, especially on the worst sellers side when there was no “noise” entering from lots of public place copies.

Newsstand Sales and Issue-Specific Audiences

Guessing that some readers may want more rigor, I ran correlations of issue-by-issue newsstand sales with MRI audience levels for adults, men, and women for 3 groups of 26 issues (In Touch from 1H 2007, Star from both).

You'll recall the correlation between audience and newsstand circulation was 0.14 across all titles in the MRI paper noted at the beginning of this article. Given our earlier points on "public place noise", we would theorize that:

- The correlation would **better than the level (0.14) reported in the earlier-noted MRI paper for both In Touch and Star** in the first half. Why? Little or no public place copies to cloud the relationship.
- The correlation would be **better for Star Magazine in the first half of 07 than in the second half** for the very same reason, namely that the use of verified copies grew from 0.7% of total circ to 3.2%.

Here are the correlation coefficients for the three demos for each hypothesis:

- Hypothesis 1: The correlations between newsstand and audience for the two books in the first half (left hand chart above) are stronger than the 0.14 coefficient reported by the MRI team for all titles.
- Bottom line: When you examine a title with no or very little public place distribution, you get a stronger relationship between audience levels and single copy sales.

Correlation Coefficients Newsstand Sales and MRI Issue Specific Audience				
Title	Time Frame	Adults	Men	Women
In Touch	1st Half 07	0.30	0.20	0.30
Star	1st Half 07	0.31	0.28	0.29

- Hypothesis 2: The correlation found for Star in the first half, generally around 0.30, was not sustained in 2H 2007 when verified copies rose by a factor greater than four. That's what we suspected. The correlation between newsstand copies and female readership fell to zero (actually negative). Yet, the relationship between single copy sales and male readership stayed strong with 0.36 correlation coefficient.
- Bottom line: When you introduce more verified copies (probably placing them in beauty salons and other **locations where females can find them but not males**), you wipe out the correlation of women audience and newsstand sales but you don't adversely impact the male correlation (0.36).

Correlation Coefficients Newsstand Sales and MRI Issue Specific Audience				
Title	Time Frame	Adults	Men	Women
Star	1st Half 07	0.31	0.28	0.29
Star	2nd Half 07	0.10	0.36	-0.03

Some may question why audience levels don't move in line with issue-to-issue single copy sales variances. I come away from this admittedly limited investigation feeling that no one should have high expectations of finding that type of strong correlation when single copy sales produce such a small portion of total readership for most titles.

Certainly, should anyone criticize the ISS data because there's no relationship between a given title's audience and its newsstand circulation, that would be quite out of place.

After all, you can't blame the mirror because your hair is all messed up.



Insight and Information on
Magazine Selling and Buying

Produced by Hanrahan Media Services LLC

Jack Hanrahan, Editor and Publisher
42 Brodwood Drive
Stamford, CT 06902
Phone: 212-729-4063
Email: jack@circmatters.com

SOON ON THE WEB AT
CIRCMAITTERS.COM

Thanks for Your Feedback on 



I want to thank you all for the positive reaction to the first issue of CircMatters.

Hundreds of notes came in and I enjoyed reading every one of them. Here's a sampling:

- Carat CEO and ABC Board Member, David Verklin: "(I) am excited to see a product emerge that talks about circulation in a cogent, concise, and useful format."
- Friends like Barbara Borg (OMD) commented that it "was like hearing you talk" (Is that good, Barbara?) and Vicki Schwartzman (L'Oreal) thought I sprinkled a lot of my personality on its pages.
- Robin Steinberg (MediaVest) got right to the point: "Sign me up." Thanks, Robin.
- Veteran John Drugach called it "tight and bright" (I think he meant the newsletter!) and Irene Grieco (Unilever) said it was "awesome". I'm moisturizing with Dove right now, Irene.
- Daughter Magen Hanrahan (Group Media Director at Starcom) said Issue 1 "almost reads like a dishy magazine, but with useful info."
- Hogar Latino CEO Filberto Fernandez asked me to "keep them coming."

That's my plan, Filberto. This issue and the next one are being sent out with my compliments. So, please share these issues with colleagues, competitors, and anyone else who deals with the business side of magazines.

Any one who subscribes will get all the free issues. Paid subscriptions will start with Issue 4. The cost when we move to subscription mode will be \$400 for 17 issues starting with Issue 4.

If you received this issue from a friend and want to subscribe or get the final free issue, **send an email to jack@circmatters.com**. We'll take it from there.

We need to mention one last thing. We said this issue would give you a fast look at the second half 2007 ABC Magazine FAS-FAX. With five pages on today's release, we hope you see our commitment to CircMatters readers. We also said we'd expose the **biggest time drain for magazine buyers and sellers**. That article is in the can but not in this issue. Our coverage of FAS-FAX and the story on Issue Specific and newsstand sales got us to a twelve page issue...and we thought it better to hold that "time drain" piece. So, send in your guess on what's the biggest time drain for sellers and buyers. It's not too late.

Cordially,

Jack Hanrahan