

Message

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.
- >

PTX0118

1:23-cv-00108

> 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](tel:+16174070203)
>>
>>
>
>
>
>
> --
> Marc Theermann | Head of Mobile Platform Sales | theermann@google.com
> | [+1 617 407 0203](tel:+16174070203)

--
Marc Theermann | Head of Mobile Platform Sales | theermann@google.com
| [+1 617 407 0203](tel:+16174070203)

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