From: Chris LaSala [chrisl@google.com]
Sent: 10/31/2012 8:31:15 PM
To: Marc Theermann [theermann@google.com]
CC: Matthew DelRe [mcdelre@google.com]
Subject: Re: urgent input for bonita meeting today

I'd get specific and look at 2 or 3 examples.

1) Why was AdMeld OK?
2) In what situation would it be OK for a pub using AdMarvel to call AdX?
3) ???

that is the only way to get clarity here - in my **opinion**.

On Wed, Oct 31, 2012 at 4:03 PM, Marc Theermann <theermann@google.com> wrote:
Chris, Matt,
I am trying to get clarity from Scott on if we can allow ad requests
from mobile ad servers.
I am not getting a clear answer.

See the email exchange below.
At this point I do not know how to proceed, and or what to communicate
to sales.

Marc

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Scott Spencer <scottspencer@google.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 31, 2012 at 3:44 PM
Subject: Re: urgent input for bonita meeting today
To: Marc Theermann <theermann@google.com>

I agree that we need to make this simple and clear for sales.

That said, I don't think we need new contracts or a specific
certification process. These restrictions are in the existing
contract. It's just a case of making it clear to sales what
constitutes compliance.

-scott

On Wed, Oct 31, 2012 at 10:34 AM, Marc Theermann <theermann@google.com> wrote:
>
> How would we identify, measure, or enforce this?
> Perhaps that brings us back to the official certification.
>

> The certification could help us understand how their systems work AND
> we could put a legal wrapper around it.
> We could create a contract that specifies that these companies can not
> call us from their exchanges?
>
> We need to be pretty specific, because otherwise the sales teams will
> not be able to understand and sell it.
> Marc
>
>
> On Tue, Oct 30, 2012 at 9:19 PM, Scott Spencer <scottspencer@google.com> wrote:
> > Sorry for the delayed response.
> >
> > We can split hairs in one way here. If the system has the functionality, but
> > the functionality is turned off or not in use, then they can call AdX. We
> > just can't have the parallel functionality in use for the same ad call.
> >
> > I hope that makes sense.
> >
> > -scott
> >
> >
> > On Tue, Oct 30, 2012 at 10:29 AM, Marc Theermann <theermann@google.com>
> > wrote:
> >>
> >> Hi Scott,
> >> Hopefully you and your family made it through the storm ok.
> >>
> >> I have a meeting with Bonita and her direct reports today to talk
> >> about our sales strategy for 2013. In addition, we have a mobile
> >> training for all 100 NPL sales folks next week.
> >>
> >> I am happy to march into any direction that you put in place, but I do
> >> need 100% clarity from you.
> >>
> >> We are saying that AdX can not be called from any 3rd party SSP and
> >> yield management system. And in consequence AdX Mobile can not be
> >> called from third party mobile ad server that incorporate these
> >> functionalities.
> >>
> >> Specifically that would exclude mobile web and mobile application ad
> >> requests from the following companies, no matter if the publisher has
> >> a direct contract with us or not.
> >>
> >> (a slide for information is attached).
> >>
> >> Admarvel
> >> Mocean
> >> Mopub
> >> Burstly
> >> Mobclix
> >> Nexage

> >> MADS
> >> Amobee
> >> Smaato
> >>
> >> Is that correct and our current strategy?
> >> If it is, this is what I will communicate today.
> >>
> >> Thanks
> >> Marc
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> --
> >> Marc Theermann | Head of Mobile Platform Sales | theermann@google.com
> >> | +1 617 407 0203
> >
> >
>
>
>
> --
> Marc Theermann | Head of Mobile Platform Sales | theermann@google.com
> | +1 617 407 0203

--
Marc Theermann | Head of Mobile Platform Sales | theermann@google.com
| +1 617 407 0203

--
Chris LaSala / Director, Americas Publisher Product Sales & Commercialization / 212-565-8801 (office)