Notes / DRX Strategy & PRD Review (go/drx-spr-notes)

<u>Review Schedule (go/drx-spr)</u>

| 201   Feb 25

Topic: <u>Demand Syndication aka Project Jedi</u>
Presenter: glevitte

Follow-ups
Ask from JB: Measure efficacy of cookie matching approach and if we need to expand scope keeping privacy in mind.
TODO Sasha/Curt/Glenn: Sync on appropriate resource request to meet Q3 deadline and estimation for remainder of 2016.

Meeting Notes/Q&A

Q: Will we be taking about different kinds of Header Bidding (HB) and pros/cons?
A: Not standardized yet, individual implementations happening now. Likely to see IAB standardization early this year which will increase adoption.

Q: Does the HB tag fire all the time?
A: Sounds like yes, but then auction isn't filling the ads are being taken by reservations. QPS to bidders is dramatically higher.
  - About 30% of DFP pubs using pre-bid (asynchronous), 500 ms to call to DFP.
  - Think of the "wrapper" as a mini ad server, which is why competitors are working on improving that offering.

Q: How much of the rev uplift in HB is due to being no sell-side rev share on the SSP?
A: We think the rev share is similar. Rubicon reported 20% rev share. Sometimes there are hidden fees to get to their number.

Q: Are we applying same 100 ms rule for call-outs in AdX?
A: We may increase for other exchanges based on initial feedback. HB taking around 500ms on average.
  - Note to compare latency to HB and not just AdX buyers.
Auction dynamics
Q: Why do we think HB model is the best way to start rather than a completely neutral approach?
A: Whether or not we get the last look or not doesn't impact the publisher's lift.
  - Pub POV is if the yield is the same they are open to this approach.
  - Could the exchanges tell a story that they could out-yield us?
  - We will measure results of POC and Beta (with us getting last look) and decide to iterate with RPO or another approach in Q2.

- Our philosophical approach is being debated and we need more data at this point, however, principally we want to provide the best yield for publishers.

A: When we do the push cookie match it's the buyers own cookie?

Q: Yes, we are only passing cookies between the buyer and DCLK. We don't think cookie matching is a limiting factor for AdX buyers. We don't want to expose to publisher so we can have flexibility.

Ask from JB: Measure efficacy of cookie matching approach and if we need to expand scope keeping privacy in mind.

Q: What is our reporting capacity for Alpha/Beta?

A: Under review. TODO Sasha/Curt/Glenn: Sync on appropriate resource request to meet Q3 deadline and estimation for remainder of 2016.

Q: Can we log in DFP if we have been "header bidded"?

A: We can detect if we've been mediated, but imperfect. Would it be useful to solve and log when this happens.

Q: Will we remove backfill LI as default?

A: For now, no. It will remain through POC and Alpha.

Hot topic discussion (slides 13-15)

Friction of opt in/out
- Opt-in ease for pubs to add exchanges: will help other exchanges grow faster without a lot of operational cost.
- Open questions:
  - How easy to make integration?
  - Charge rev share based on number of exchanges enabled?
- Cap of exchanges enabled should be equivalent or just better than HB.

201 Feb 9

Topic: Project Fidelis
Presenter: cbindra

Action Items:

1) **Data**
    Add global data, to the top 20 publisher data
    Get data of creative misclassification by advertiser by buyer [DBM, AdWords, AdX Buyers)

2) **Competition**
    Get quantifiable data on classification quality from competition
    FB, AppNexus, Rubicon

3) Plan Doom OKR for Crowdsourcing Feedback Loop/Transparency, Override
How best to use buyer classification data
How best to address when buyer declaration conflicts with google classification
How best to use publisher declaration/override
How best to improve classification with crowdsourced data
Assess how to leverage manual policy review process
Assess how to address transparency and override
Add quantified metric goals for Doom

4) Classification
Explore if we can we leverage LA team to extend to brand/advertiser classification?

5) Video
Do video rules work with xblox?

6) DLS Planning
How best to position this into commercialization packages, with first phase being announced at DLS. What is the DLS story we can tell - take into account competition, market, direct, indirect, blockers to inventory/revenue.

2015 Dec 10
Topic: PG Feedback loop
Presenters: roshank

- The issue of IAS wrapped ads not working with creative review
  - JB: This is a known issue. One instance of this issue is blank ads, @gsalem & team working on a solution (currently in beta)
- AP: Let's classify issues we hit with PG to call out ones that are programmatic specific.
- Should buyers be able to edit budget on default LI in DBM
  - If the only reason for supporting this is as backdoor to workaround sync bugs we hit between DBM and DRX, we should focus on fixing the underlying sync issue.
  - Agreement to remove ability to edit budget on a default LI.
- Creatives & Policy
  - AdX creative review two-stage being confusing and causes pub / buyer frustration - in cases of false negatives (creative initially allowed to serve and then fails after manual review).
  - Kurt continuing to push for relaxing PG policies - but this is more longer term and unlikely to have any immediate term impact.
  - Surfacing creative failures to pub in DFP is a Dr. Who OKR.
  - Also look at enabling more transparency to pubs and buyers with the two-stage review process (e.g. alert pub that creative is serving but pending manual review and may be disapproved in future).
- Hard to debug cases where DBM does not bid when detecting a creative mismatch
  - DBM investing in logging in PSI to aid better debugging.
  - Also under discussion if DBM can always bid and let AdX reject on mismatch.

- Continue to use OSI as the primary means to surface deal not pacing to goals to pub
  - Forecasting team looking at creating a "better OSI" that incorporates UDW. This is currently a Doom goal

- DBM committed in Q1 to
  - Locking down default LI editability.
  - Better logging in PSI on reason for not bidding on PG impression.
  - Pausing deal when hitting catastrophic events like DBM having to pause advertiser or partner. Pausing the deal in DBM will pause in DFP as well (this needs more discussion) - needs support from DRX as well.

2015 Nov 19

Topic 1: DRX Self-Serve Contracts
Presenters: shantanr

AIs
- Shantan: Document how DFP and AdX contract processes differ - e.g., do both require credit checks?

AP: Is new self-serve contract DFP + AdX?
- Yes - focused on DRX
- Drew: Does this help with contract migrations at all?
- Plan is not to automatically migrate everyone to new terms. But as partners come up for renewal we will migrate them to new terms. Self-serve flow will help reduce migration time/effort.
- Could also allow contract updates within UI - but not part of v1.

AP: How do you link the bug?
- Enter bug/simba ID in iCS
- AP: Could you enter the wrong ID?
  - Yes - it's possible
  - Need APIs to integrate with ICS directly in future

AP: When you create a new DFP network are you also creating an AdX account?
- Yes

Alok: Who does the account creation?
- gTech
- Have to create two accounts and link manually?
  - Today, yes - but eventually will be single account with unification work

JB: You can't assume that people who aren't authorized know they aren't authorized

- We need to make sure we're notifying the actual authorized person (e.g Legal, or authorized exec, and not anyone in AdOps) when emailing for approval
- It's our fault if we notify an unauthorized person

Drew: Any alpha feedback on self-service billing?
- Two pubs have signed up
- Will see when payment hits at end of the month

AP: Has anyone clicked on the link in the alpha yet?
- Yes - two have signed up

Drew: What happens if they don't accept / set up billing?
- We allow three months of exceeding, then convert account to read-only, then shut down
- Consider making payment-signup as part of the DFP-SB account creation/signup flow as well, so that we do not have to wait for them to exceed impressions in order to signup, but can directly charge them when they do.

JB: This is really important for product excellence

Topic 2: Native Mediation
Presenters: gargisur, yanxiong, tbender

AIs
- Gargi/Yan/Jiayao: Follow up with discussion of pros/cons for sdk-less protocols in eng review (speed vs long term cost)

Why is fill rate low?
- Driven by eBay running PA/PD only - they aren't running GDN native backfill
- Fill rate is good if pubs run GDN native backfill

AP: What is AdMob doing for native mediation?
- Planning launch in Q1
- Going for SDK-based approach
- Code complete from SDK perspective - iOS and Android (but not tested)

Is this depending on adapter work?
- Yes
- AdMob is building FB adapter
- Other networks will build adapters for us

JB: SDK-less is not launch gating

We can leverage relationships with large publishers to push networks for SDK-less

AP. Do we have size of market for the different native mediation networks?

- No - MoPub, FAN, InMobi are big players

AP: Do we need key-value targeting in mediation for this?

- Yes

MoPub may be willing to do SDK-less for DFP but not AdMob

- Not great for Google to have disparity - starting with SDK-based for both products
- May push on this later

Why can't Rubicon buy native on AdX?

- We don't let them
- We don't allow sub-syndication onto other exchanges
- Why?
    - Circle back with Drew and Gargi for details

Isn't everything in the SDK-less native spec already in the RTB protocol?

- Lots of downsides to inventing something new
- We already have OpenRTB native in beta
- In the long term this is what we want to do
- Can we just use RTB?
- Don't invent a new protocol - maintenance burden over time

What is status of SDK-less native in SDK?

- Coding has not started
- Working on design

Do we have timeline for SDK adapters yet?

- Working on this with the networks
- Q1 timeframe
- InMobi and MoPub will be building adapters

2015 Oct 29

Topic: Mediation Roadmap
Presenters: gargisur

Overall Mediation Roadmap

- mApp Mediation Beta 2 launched this week. started onboarding pubs
- Working on SDKless right now; fixed and pushing out on iOS
- Aparna: So it is fixed? Gargi: Yes

- Video mediation going to GA in Who Q1 if we can get stable soon
- What is coming? Native mediation for mobile app only.
    - Aparna: Will native mediation work with SDKless as well?
    - Gargi: We are working on it
- Web mediation alpha
    - Josh: Is that a stretch for design and coding? Gargi: Yes

Rollout Plan for mApp Mediation

- TYM now on Agave infrastruct
- Increased chain length in BE
- Aparna: It is infinite, right?
- Jonathan: Has there been any measurement on server side when you get into chain length? We're starting to talk about latency.
    - AI Gargi: When is the right time to include latency discussion?
    - Aparna: We have the data for it right?
    - Yan: We don't know when 1st and 2nd come back to us
    - Phil: Even if it is successful, calling out to client side is slow
    - Yan: Looking at dashboard to track this
- A lot of feature asks for publishers such as targeting features and custom size support
    - Jonathan: Is that post-GA?
        - AI for Gargi: What is GA gating - come up with list to make sure Sales and everyone else agrees on this list. It will be very important to make this list very black and white for GA gating vs non-GA gating. Get gTech and Sales on board.
        - Josh: Want to prevent scope creep for GA
        - Aparna: Sales was pushing for key value targeting. Aparna does not think this is GA gating because competition is MoPub and MoPub does not have key value targeting.
        - Gargi: Sales has been recommending to use key value targeting for mobile and app. For video, looked at which pubs are using key value targeting.
- Reporting
    - A big part of this is providing insights and analysis, spun off separate project for this

Video Mediation Rollout Plan

- Support VAST and VPAID formats
- Building out data collection with 4 networks
- Supporting 10 networks in video mediation
- Games and video web properties in AdX

- Fallbacks is legacy feature. Mediation chains compete with these requests.
  - Aparna: How does that work if waterfall does not have CPM. Historically, we cannot detect waterfall in DFP because they are not booked as remnant. Do we have a sense of how many queries? Could the SDK team provide this from the client side?
  - Gargi: We are working with their team.
- A lot of video pubs are using position targeting.
- Will there be mobile video mediation?
  - We support interstitial in mobile in-app

Competitive Analysis for mApp
- MoPub has strong mediation offering
- AI look into MoPub offering
  - Josh looking into 3rd party SDK adapter services
  - We're taking over adapter dev for key client
- We're looking into Native SDKless

Competitive Analysis for Video
- LiveRail offers support services
- Aparna: they provide far higher CPMs
- Gargi: We have anecdotal evidence but we don't have specific answers
  - AI: Gargi
- Jonathan: We're coming from pretty far behind on these things. GA will not be market leading product right away. We need to understand usage because they are satisfied with what they are doing.
- Josh: From AdMob perspective, it is hard to get people to switch. For us, it is different. What does it take for DRX mediation to win in mobile app mediation?
- Jonathan: Not catching up, but we need to think of what we can do uniquely and differently.
- Max L: The market is fragmented, but is that changing? FB in process of changing, and DBM working on growing more native demand. We have a way to grow before our RTB demand catches up. We're putting more efforts into SdKless.
- Aparna: Native in DBM shooting for Q1.
- Jonathan: B/c mediation just started with ad networks and waterfalls, but real time communication that is not bundled with exchanges. Rainy thinks it is client side - client is making RTB call to find out what they want to buy. Real time decision making will be important.
- Aparna: What is the use case for pub to use VPAID adapter?
  - Gargi: Tremor could give us VPAID ad, which loads script version of SDK. Gargi is talking to Benyah about this.
  - Aparna: Sounds great for desktop, but what about mobile app?

      ○   AI Gargi: Share competitive intelligence doc

mApp Mediation Market Opportunity

- Jonathan: If there is a pub using DFP and MoPub - still a great opportunity. We know we need to do more to win more apps.
- Aparna: Match rate? More generous one is probably better.
- Jonathan: Did mediation group apply? Success metric - anything not running through mediation group in mobile app, why? It should be. Once we have mediation groups in GA, this could be the future of indirect bookings. It's going to take a while, but that's the idea.
- AI: Gargi pull this for video as well.
- Aparna: We also need to figure out how to increase demand sources in our offerings.

Native Mediation

- Many asking for SDKless
- Looking into different partners they want
- Go to market fast vs build SDKless
- Which version of Native do we support in mediation? Decided on Native v1 (pub rendered)
- Callouts? 2 possibilities; client side or server side. If we do server side, we have to leverage AdX RTB.
    - Aparna: What is the relationship between version and callouts?
    - Gargi: With v1, we push to pub. This has nothing to do with RTB calls.
    - v1 supports client side, v2/v3 only support server side.
    - Alok: Native team is skipping v1 and going to v2. How will native video mediation work with v1 model? The timing does not align.
- Client side callouts: SDK or SDKless?
    - SDK adapter risks: Code freeze, getting AdMob
- Aparna: For web, we will need more ENG resources.
    - Server side is best solution - but team does not have resources for it. Can we find the resources.
- Aparna: Is Native mediation for mWeb that big of a need? Why hold something back for that?
- Josh: Even if we have same demand sources for RTB.
- Aparna: Are we making the right decision?
- Alok: Server side - will ad networks agree with it? I would be surprised if FB wants to do server side.

2015 Oct 22

Topic: eCPM in the New World
Presenters: jbannet

AIs
- jbannet: follow up with jbellack on 'MRC ad loaded' definition
- jbannet: add another row to 'common language' slide showing terms we use in the UI
- jbannet/arifeldman: clarify meaning of 'ad request eCPM' (does this include all queries or just matched queries?)
- jbannet: follow up on IAB standard term for 'Ad eCPM' – need to make sure we are reflecting industry standards
- jbannet/arifeldman: follow up on comms acceleration
- jbannet/arifeldman: follow up on consistency between DFP and AdX QTs for this change
- jbannet/pamullin: follow up on Open Labs testing for the change
- jbannet/arifeldman: check impact of this change on DT
- jbellack: make sure this change is reflected in our new indirect 're-commercialization' effort
- jbannet: sync with AdMob on alignment for mobile banner counting change

Gross vs net meaning?
- Gross = pre rev share, Net = post rev share

Does 'MRC ad loaded' = displayed?
- Yes - but unofficial term
- Follow up with JB on details

Does ad request eCPM in AdX reporting include every query that comes to AdX?
- Not sure - need to follow up

Does AdMob have 'served eCPM'?
- Yes - but not default

Why would we not call this 'rendered eCPM'?
- Rendered already overloaded within Google - means rendering in serving and on the client side
- Also has other meanings in industry

What does the IAB standard call 'ad eCPM'?
- Ad Impression
- Need to double check

Which metric is used by other networks for mediation?
- Typically scraped
- eCPM or Ad eCPM? Maybe a mix
- Could rename to break scrapers

- But don't want to break what our customers are doing

Should we just pick the 'right' CPM for mediation?
- Yes

Comms timeline?
- JB: Might be unwise to change important revenue metric in Q4
- Comms team has said 'not Q4'

JB: These are the kinds of changes we are often not good at letting pubs know are coming
- Need early comms on this to let pubs know what is happening
- Can commercialize as part of broader roadmap of measurement changes
- Accelerate comms to Q4, not Q1 (will be too late if we wait until Q1)
- Don't reach out to all pubs about this change, then reach out a couple weeks later with other changes – bundle in one comms effort

Kurt: Rubicon uses 'rCPM' metric
- Might need more investigation of this

AP: What about 'code served' in DFP query tool?
- Not touching this now
- Could make terminology consistent across DFP and AdX QTs

Pat: Have we done any user research on this new terminology?
- No
- Could be good fit for Open Labs

Will the 'app wall' format affect GDN models?
- No - this is about what we show to publishers

AP: Rollout plan?
- Start with a few pubs? Or big bang?
- Would be good to start with a few trusted pubs
- Gut check with Open Labs

AP: Which of these metrics are present in DT files?
- Need to follow up to check

Gross vs net?
- Not legal or policy issue, but don't want to make our rev share more obvious
- Gross could be problematic for AdWords

We have Yield Managers in Open Labs today! Will try to talk to them - starting at noon.

JB: Not good for AdMob and DRX to be out of sync
- Need to circle back with Arun

2015 Oct 15

Topic: Project Localhost
Presenters: tbender, krishs

- AP: Would this include a preview to the buyer?
    - For the beta and GA - yes we should. For the alpha (Dr. Who) we are relying on the pub to share a creative preview with the buyer just like they do with traditional reservations
- AP: How would DBM's impression tracking or viewability based pacing work?
    - Impression trackers - plan is to allow DBM to pass the impression tracker pixels in the bid response (as for native ads).
    - Viewability - sell-side hosted creatives wouldn't work as is for DBM campaigns that are billed on vCPM. We should figure out if we can support post-alpha.
- Drew: Critical to make it work with buyer workflow especially with DBM
    - Agree, and something we want to enable post alpha. Talking with DBM about this.
    - JB: Think of this effort in the framework of being an extension of traditional reservations and less as a new programmatic offering
- JB: We should look at extending to PD as well
    - We chose to start with PG for expediency. PA / PD posed more challenges as they are currently AdX deals. Supporting PD should be easier when PD moves over to DFP next year.
- AP: This might be interesting for Petra - YT has been wanting to serve sell side creatives on PG deals.
    - AI: follow-up with Petra
- AP: We tried to build a shared creative workflow a year or so back, but didn't go far. This might be an opportunity to resurrect that discussion next year.
- Alpha goal is to keep it so there are none or minimal changes needed from DBM. We will likely need some changes to pass the impression tracker pixels
- Saul: Should we restrict to only one advertiser per localhost deal?
    - We want to restrict to one creative per deal for the alpha. This way we can pull off enabling this without requiring work from DBM to choose a creative to send.

We will just always serve the creative that is setup on the line item in DFP. Will need DBM work for post alpha.
- Tom: There are super custom creatives where we will need such support - e.g. Progressive Flo on a unicorn (or horse? ;)) native ad - something we would never be able to templatize into AdX.

2015 Oct 8

Topic: <u>Programmatic Guaranteed deals for XSM publishers</u>
Presenter: ellaliu

JB: Sales mgmt is critical for our largest pub relationships
- We are the only company that can offer integrated sales and ad serving
- The XSM impressions are smaller in volume than indirect impressions, but far more valuable to pubs
- Enables us to get accurate pricing data into DFP
- Need to consider XSM for every new feature

AP: XDSM wasn't necessarily pushing accurate pricing into DFP. Are we tracking this? Do we have real cost data in system with XSM?
- Yes - rate card structure is more managed in XSM
- Can follow up to understand what is getting pushed from rate cards into DFP

Josh: Is pricing data still relevant in programmatic?
- Pubs want to use their existing sales teams to sell prog. deals
- Integrated selling process for manual + prog. is differentiator from Operative, etc.

Josh: Is XSM support a requirement for GA?
- Don't think of this just as a box to check – think about the implications for large pubs using sales management. How will large pubs sell the feature?
- Basically, yes

George L: Does 'buyer' mean AdX seat?
- Yes
- All clients under a given seat have access to this
- E.g., all DBM or AppNexus partners under a seat have access via client access

New features in XSM - how to handle?
- Case by case
- Some features implemented by SHA/XSM team (vCPM)
- Other features like video implemented by the vertical team (video)

- Call out new features in PRD and loop in XSM team

Heather: Are there plans to take some of the XSM features and expose them to all DFP users?
- Example: Hearst wants PG but is not an XSM pub
- One option is to enable a global rate card / workflow to everyone that is simple and easy to support
- Don't want to enable too much complexity for pubs who don't want it
- There is a support cost related to some of these features – concerned about the burden that could come with just enabling XSM for everyone
- XSM generates more support than all PA/PD together

Josh: What does the integration look like with third-party sales managers?
- Operative pushes into XSM proposals
- Still using external DFP API

2015 Sep 17

Topic: Native ACUX Sprint Recap
Presenter: krylon

This sprint was focused on broader native vision – not just incremental improvements to existing roadmap

Improved native styles editor
- WSYWIG creation of native HTML/CSS
- **How frequently are users updating native styles?**
    - Probably not day to day – one time setup with adjustments
    - We will have empirical data on this soon!
    - Look at AdSense text ad customization?
- We are building at least three native style front-ends at Google currently (AdSense, AdMob, DRX)

Screen showing how publishers will represent their offerings
- Show publisher's native spec - which assets are required?

Advertiser view
- Marketplace browsing - find native offerings
- Buyer sees mirror image of publisher offering
- Important to match terminology with buy-side

Are there standard bundles of assets for native?
- Yes - we define two standard formats on AdX

- Standards still emerging
- Exposing publishers custom native ad schemas to DSPs is a tough challenge - we don't have a solution for this currently

How do we do native previews for publisher-rendered ads on mobile?
- Challenge since rendering logic is defined in app code
- Maybe can just expose pub-provided screenshots / marketing collateral instead of solving the technical problems

Collaborative workflows - does this add too much complexity?
- This could be really hard to build
- Do we really need to replace email negotiation? Maybe email is OK

Contextual relevance
- Could we help publishers structure their inventory / offers on a contextual basis?
- How does this fit with us providing real time signals for advertiser targeting?
- Three buckets:
    - Real time targeting
    - Creating the ad products
    - Sponsored content categories
- More dynamic ad inventory - not showing the same ad slots to every user

A lot of this is not native-specific (showing relevant ads)
- But the bar may be higher for native – when the ad is prominently placed in-feed, it is more offensive if it is irrelevant or low quality
- Could we just not show performance ads to users who never click ads?

go/googlethreads

2015 Aug 27

Topic: Moving DFP from Served to Rendered Impressions
Presenter: arifeldman

AIs
- **Nitin**: work with gTech to understand what's going on with pub SRA implementations, how to guide them to a better way
- **Ari and team**: eng estimates for different phases, quantification

Problem: Currently DFP counts served rather than delayed impressions. Pollutes CTRs, contributes to discrepancies.
- JB: Have we quantified the problem?
    - We're probably 10-18% discrepant in most bake-offs with pubs
    - What's the 'shrinkage rate'? Of 1m impressions, how many don't render?

Mis-configured publisher SRA tags is likely the cause of the problem.
- Jim: Maybe better to describe this as our problem - publishers copying and pasting tags seems like a reasonable thing to do from user perspective.
- We make it easy to do it wrong.
- Why is this easy? Publishers might have a templating engine with a shared header template across the site.
- AI: Nitin: work with gTech to understand what's going on with pub SRA implementations, how to guide them to a better way

Options that were considered but ruled out:
- Marking problematic impressions as spam
- Real-time request blocking
- Updating GPT SRA with validation logic

Recommended solution:
- Moving all DFP inventory to 100% delayed impressions

Does this become irrelevant due when viewability is the only currency that matters?

MRC indicated that viewability will be measured only on delayed impressions in the near future

Is there an IAB standard for delayed impressions?
- Yes - definitions for 'beacon' and 'redirect' impression counting

Two phases: backfill, reservation

What does the publisher have to do?
- TBD based on how they're managing creatives
- There may be creatives that are incompatible with beacon counting
- Should be rev neutral for backfill, and we own the formats so it's more straightforward
- Reservation is harder (creatives, revenue implications)

When will the industry go to viewable only?
- Not clear; 2017?

How do we transition existing reservations?
- Apply to new orders only?
- Some publishers have year long reservations
- Also need to coordinate with IMF

How much time would there be between finishing this and viewability becoming the standard?

Is there value in having this change even once viewability is the standard?

- Could be useful for troubleshooting, e.g., with programmatic deals
- Information is valuable

Joel: Potential IMF concern: unmatched queries
- Need to know 'would have been viewable' or 'would have been matched'

How does this work with native?
- v1 uses delayed impressions (like interstitials)
- v2/v3 works just like banners

Consensus: This seems reasonable for backfill

Reservation requires thought
- Could drag out as long as possible ... maybe viewability just replaces this
- The misconfiguration of SRA is potentially a large problem

Don't necessarily need full technical solution - we have the information and could do something like notify publishers when detected and ask them to fix

Do programmatic and/or native first rather than all manual trafficking?
- Most creative types should be relatively straightforward

Need to decide whether to take the forecasting work seriously
- Could we address this by making the change very slowly?

Should be headline in Who

If this impacts the default CPM in reporting it is potentially huge, since publishers use this to determine where we go in waterfalls

2015 Jul 28

Topic: <u>Forecasting and Insights Strategy</u>
Presenter: kurtz

AIs
- **Jeff/Max**: share the research results for insights
- **Jeff**: define the success metric for insights: When are we done?

Forecasting:
- Is the Admob solution ready to go GA in Q3?
  - is forecasting aligned?

- Why does vCPM have a separate project for mobile?
  - There is a log that is different for mobile that needs to be addressed / incorporated.
- Forecasting for FLD – is this in sync with the overall FLD Q3 goal?
  - general comment that we need to have all components in "GA" or "Beta" at the same time
- Insights:
  - note: does not include set of work for business intelligence
- Is the cost of blocks using forecasting or the AdX model
  - today, from the AdX data
  - Discussion for the future to move to the forecasting team
- Is this work for a central "insights dashboard" or should we integrate this in various areas of the UI?
  - Open are for discussion – some efforts for getting opportunities centralized. Others make more sense integrated in the workflow
  - Best practice to put the info directly into the workflow
  - UI risk of centralizing in multiple places to get an efficient workflow
  - Could be done in the home page / dashboard
  - What if the user is different?
- Seasonality:
  - why isn't manual forecasting adjustments (MFA) not sufficient?
    - pubs have thousands of adjustments
    - constraints exist on MFA
- **Migration for MFA to Chronology
  - might be good to start with video
  - worth figuring out the migration plan early
- for YT
  - Frequency capping – no evidence that the problem is real
  - YT working with the IMF team to help formulate a solution
- UX
  - Need to schedule / plan for UX review
  - Ongoing research for the update UI
- CSVs
  - do you have a data storage plan?
- 2016 planning
  - what would need to be true to get everything in Dr. Who?
  - Can we add more people to serialize the development effort
- Add ability to ignore anomalistic events
- Revenue forecasting – is that covered?
  - buyer interest model?
  - Can we get to revenue forecasting in the future? (e.g., should you accept this deal on a net dollar basis?)
  - Can we use XSM information?

Insights

> **Comment [1]:** revenue forecast/pipeline revenue available for xsm pubs (as a metric in query tool) today
>
> +kurtz@google.com

> **Comment [2]:** which should also be valuable to have for everyone using Deals so that's under consideration as well.

- Under-delivery
  - Can we get this to the query tool?
  - Can we show this in the dashboard?
- Have you thought about rounding the forecasting results?
- Is the insights framework here the same as the proposal for an "experiments framework"? – no
  - current version is Google defined experiments
  - Proposal for strategy is a user defined experiment
- Opportunities:
  - Will the opportunities changes be in the change log? yes.
  - Can any role make the change? TBD
    - also creates an issue of relative permission when we merge the users
- Clients want to define their peer sets
- How do we define success for insights?

2015 Jul 21

Topic: Alcohol and Whitelisting
Presenter: ssheth@

AIs

- P1: Shyam: Be sure that the admin (who/when) who accepts is logged and easily accessible
- P2: Shyam: Consider an addition to the agreement that specifies actions Google will take if we discover violations
- P4: Shyam: Follow up w/ Max and determine GDN participation in alcohol impressions. And what they do currently (WRT responsibility of the publishers).

Notes

Note that we are starting w/ Alcohol, but this model can be used for other sensitive content

- Today - 4-6 weeks to get publishers onboard and highly manual
- Buyer verification process will be removed (Jonathan claps) but still need to declare alcohol content
- Pubs will self declare.
- This is part of a new lifecycle to move from whitelist, to product w/ declarations, to product w/o declarations.

UI - review
- Admin-only operation for allowing X ads (X = alcohol for now) in Policy
- Jonathan - Add actions Google might take if you violate (SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT)

- Be sure the log includes who confirms (IMPORTANT)
- Policy tab: should this be part of DFP admin? (Answer: probably w/ unification, but not before, as this is specific to AdX content)

Comms guide: need to include pitches on Alcohol
Please get DBM on board at some point, coordinate with Kurt/Roshan
GDN alcohol: Follow up w/ Max and determine its participation. And what they do currently (WRT responsibility) (NOT BLOCKING)

In conclusion, Product will question working on additional, large effort features until revenue picks up.

2015 Jun 30

Topic: DPF-SB Self-service billing (aka credit-card billing)
Presenter: shantanr

AIs
- **Shantan** to update requirements

Notes
- DFP-SB Paid and DFP-Premium do not have the same feature-set though both are under paid contracts.
- Can we do adjustable rate-cards?
  - Legal: potentially a requirement if we extend the signup/self-contracting service for DFP-Premium
- Alert Escalation framework
  - Consider having an alert for 80-90% threshold, and have the first alert be a more friendly less-aggressive tone. As the escalation increases, the tone can get aggressive.
- Transaction history
  - At some point in the future (unified world of DRX), we should consider a unified transaction history so that if a DFP-SB publisher owes us money for exceeding thresholds, but also earns money (via say AdX/AdSense backfill), we should only charge the net amount to the payment-method
- Currency/Country selection: Default list of country/currency should be localized to the region. We should not show default of USA/USD for all pubs.
- Rate-cards
  - Perhaps not in scope for v1 of this project, but we should definitely explore designing a db schema and incorporating the rate-card trix into a database that can be updated in real-time (by relevant teams) via a UI and also read by other systems (such as for this project).

- Maintaining the trix as a source of truth is not scaleable.
- Will also benefit the use-cases of variable/adjustable rate-cards
- Can consider including this in ICS tab with ACL'd access to specific users who can edit/update db, and specific users who can view rates.
  - Consider allowing publishers (admin users) to view the rate-cards that they accepted.
  - Discounted rate-cards (as is the case for Premium and some DFP-SB paid pubs) is out of scope for v1 of this project for DFP-SB.
    - To explore/TBD: If publishers want to negotiate rates they will be directed to a support form to contact Google (Sales/AM).
- Click-to-accept contracts
  - Need to build alerting + re-accepting workflow each time the rate-cards change i.e if rate-cards change, publisher should be notified and be presented with a link to view new rate-cards and re-accept contract. Failure to do so should result in stopping ad-serving or some such escalation measures.
- Payment errors
  - Need to have a red-button (on DFP side) to stop all ad-serving/take action on account if we feel the need to do so (e.g we detect fraudulent payment activity).
- How do we extend this to DFP-Premium
  - Contracting workflow can be extended; need to consider adjustable rate-cards; order
  - A separate copy of this PRD has been started and shared to address DFP-Premium use-cases - work in progress; follow up discussions to happen.

2015 Jun 9

Topic: Mobile Video End Slate PRD
Presenter: hgaron

AIs
- **Haskell:** Follow up with legal on whether this is 'modifying the creative' or requires special language
- **Haskell:** Follow up on video app download strategy with GDN team

Buyers
- MdotM, Applovin are our biggest AdX mobile app spenders
- They want a better mobile video 'end slate' solution
- Applovin expects to spend $70m on mapp video

Solution: End Slate via InfoCard End Caps
- InfoCards: interactive video templates developed by YouTube team

- End Caps are one type of InfoCard
- YT hopes to standardize InfoCards with IAB

Competitors
- MoPub offers video end slate via companion section of VAST
- **Scott: We don't have the right to modify the creative of the advertiser. Check legal implications.**

How this works on AdX
- Bidder still responds with VAST
- We convert companion banner to InfoCard
- **Aparna: What if people don't have the IMA SDK?**
  - All video today has either IMA SDK or GMA SDK
  - IMA JS is used in GMA SDK
- Should be no work for pubs or bidders

Pub controls
- end_slate_optional default
- Possible future controls: end_slate_forbidden, end_slate_required

User experience
- Don't show end slate if user skips ad
- **Aparna: What is the user's intent with skipping? Do we need an experiment where we show the end slate even if the user skips the ad?**
  - Show context with metadata elsewhere? 'Learn more', 'install'
  - We don't have great metrics on how this actually affects the user experience
  - **What metrics are you tracking for rollout?**
    - Number of installs might be a good proxy for UX

Could we show an app install ad at the end?
- Conversation needed with GDN team
- We do not expose the GDN template for this at all to third party buyers
- Larger strategic question about

Need more work on general strategy for how/if formats are shared between GDN and DRX

What happens if you click on the video?
- Almost all clicks on video on mobile are mistaken
- Clicking the video ad now pauses on YT
- This is why we require an explicit Learn More button

Work required
- Mostly with SDK team
- Serving work for RTB protocol and tracking

- **Do we need a pub control?**
  - Not necessarily. Most supply is AdMob, which will have no control. Revisit if pubs complain.
- Logging / reporting

What if performance decreases with this change?
- Will monitor rollout with a holdback
- Buyers can opt not to provide a companion

Timing?
- Q3 OKR
- Strangelove candidate

2015 May 26

Topic: AdX Video buyside roadmap review
Presenter: benyah

Als
- **Benyah**: Follow up with list of things we are missing that competitors have

Strengths / opportunities: high viewability, TVs and OTTs, content metadata, mobile

Buyers want non-skippable, VPAID, mobile video

What are the main drivers of LiveRail's success compared to us?
- Signals. Example: video initiation signal (click to play vs auto-play) - this is on the list of signals to expose
- If there are reasons someone is using a competitor instead, need to knock these out
- LiveRail is promising full cross-device support using FB data

2015 focus: grow mobile, expand buying signals, improve UI, sales activation

OTT is small but growing faster than mobile
- **Does this include cable box VOD?**
  - No.
- **What is VOD growth relative to OTT? Is this a bigger opportunity?**
  - OTT is growing faster. But VOD is large opportunity. Challenges with indirect.

Biggest mobile video complaint from buyers is that it's hard to make skippable creatives. They aren't against skippable ads, it is just technically difficult / annoying to enable.

How do buyers interface with mDialog today?
- Via Deal IDs
- Can solve the discovery problem with Marketplace

Why don't we allow pubs to set a higher reserve price for non-skippable video?
- Interesting idea - need to make complexity tradeoff

Video buying signal buckets: engagement, content, inventory type

Any discussion of estimating revenue opportunity of signals with sales?
- Yes - some signals have clearer revenue number than others
- Need to make sure sales has a plan to bring these features to market

Better to build these signals and release as a package? Or release incrementally?
- Can commercialize as a package

Buckets for making UI more useful: serviceability, marketplace / discovery, reporting
- We get buyer feedback that we are the most difficult to integrate with

Sales activation buckets: signal adoption, differentiators, build stories

In general, what does buyer adoption look like for various signals?
- Uptake with video is very slow - a couple quarters or longer
- There are ~10 video signals that aren't being consumed at all
- Our signals are also different than other exchanges (OpenRTB)
- **Need to prioritize things that we know will increase spend and be careful about allocating resources to things that may not**

JB feedback: Explain how the items on the roadmap help us beat LiveRail (commercial outcomes resulting from the work)

If we do a premium consortium-style feature, could we throw in cross-device?
- Might make sense for publishers to share this data if they are pooling inventory

Filtering is a large problem
- ~80-90% filtering due to mismatched creatives, etc.
- Seems similar to filtering/policy issues with deals that led to RTB breakout, deal check, deals policy relaxation
- **What are we going to do to cause a high success rate? Seems like a promising area to focus on.**
    - Working on some aspects (scanning VPAID for SSL compliance)
    - Other things are harder (VPAID on YT)
    - **Maybe look at success rate excluding YouTube**

2015 May 19

Topic: <u>Deal Check V2</u>
Presenter: krishs

AIs
- Tom/Max: Schedule review on deal behavior (serving logic / ad selection)
- Krish: Follow up with Chealsea and team for info on reservation health UI learnings (simple way to indicate deal health in a table)

V2 is for tam testing EQ2.

Scott: Should all the deal check metrics be in QT? Krish: Long term, yes.

What happens when multiple deals are eligible for a single impression:
- For different bidders, highest price PD wins. Tie break is arbitrary.
- There is a limit to how may deal ID's are sent to a single bidder on a single impression
- With second-bite, bidder can omit deal-id and adx will choose. This will be deprecated.
- ...

Max's FLD doc covers this.

George: Are buyers doing proactive classification tickets because they don't know that the creative is already classified correctly? This may be resolved by creative classify.

Jonathan: Plan deal check features based on future relaxed block override policy.

Jonathan: More buyer visibility into creative status will help reduce buyer issues.

Jonathan: Build dashboard in DRX as an incentive for adx pubs to unify with DRX. Use learnings on XFP side for how to present deals, etc.

Jonathan: Can we ask pubs to enter their expectations (e.g. # impressions) for a deal and report on that? Krish: Waiting for QT and shadowfax to be able to support this.

Jonathan: Pub expectation is that we will work out issues before the deal starts.

Tom: Working to improve page and creative classification.

Jonathan: At least solve this for DBM.

Is publisher use of AdX more sales driven than ad ops driven?
- Some pubs have a dedicated programmatic team
- But trend is for sales team to sell both direct and programmatic
- Example: Time has dedicated programmatic ops team, but the sales team is selling everything

Is this info also available in the query tool?
- Some of it
- Long term, want to get all of these metrics into query tool

How does AdX make a decision if you have multiple deals that could serve?
- Deal CPM
- We send multiple deals in the RTB callout (max of 10 for one impression)
- JB: set up review on deal behavior

Access to dashboard widget for deal health could be incentive for account linking

Creative misclassifications are also a big problem outside of deals (specifically category misclassifications)

2015 May 5

Topic: Auto-Refresh
Presenter: cbindra

AIs
- Chetna: Follow up with JB with details on who was in beta, current status, new beta transition plan
- Chetna: Follow up with simplification of refresh taxonomy
- Brenda: Set up UX review on policy features
- George/Chetna: Loop in policy team for next week's NSE review on refresh
- Chetna: Follow up with shantanr on reporting
- Chetna: Add UX review, VP approvals to launch timeline

All teams are in line with us, up to this point. See issues/blockers later

Dailymotion to Rubicon, getting 9 second refresh with no value; trying to move back.

Transparency is key from start to end.

Betas are being consolidated

One data point: CBS Local lost revenue after refresh was disabled (-79% revenue)

Example of auto-refresh sticky ad in rail on Time
- Not independent of sticky ads; Policy requires a different URL for infinite scroll
  - REQUIRED to get this example working
- Sticky Ads PRD

Four types of refresh: action-based, event-based, time-based, combination
- **Reduce types of refresh to pub-triggered and user-triggered?**
- Feedback: this seems complicated, recommend trying simpler version - can always add more complexity later (hard to come out complex and back off later)
- **Does event-based need a time threshold?**
- **AI: Rework to (possible) lower # of options and re-spec**

New 'Policy' rule type with auto-refresh control
- Separate from policy dashboard
- Need to think about the DFP/AdX common publishers who use the UI
  - Is this appropriate (to be in a New Rule)?
- **AI: UX review on policy features**

Experiments / optimizations
- **Can we defer this to more general projects for pub experiments? Try to limit scope as much as possible.**
- GDN wants an experiment for this - can they run this rather than DRX?
- Refresh without GDN is still better than no refresh; could launch with no GDN; Rubicon doesn't have Google demand

When was decision made to shut down betas?
- Betas are still running
- There are pubs who have received deductions for bad behavior; they will be added to the beta with addendum
- Several betas will be consolidated into single beta
- **AI: Follow up with JB with details on who was in beta, current status, new beta transition**

Is the signal independent of session depth?
- Thinking about session depth as follow-on project
- Define in bid request now?

Will we validate that refresh cycle is correct?
- Yes - ad spam already monitors today to detect invalid refresh

How does refresh work for forecasting?
- Just looks like another impression

Can we put date on AdMob/AdX refresh consistency for mobile apps?
- On NSE agenda for next Thursday
- **AI: Loop in policy team for this review**

Does reporting gate the launch?
- Needs further discussion
- JB: Have discussion with reporting team early before locking in plan; if you're going to give pubs a feature that affects RPM, they need to be able to report on it

Timeline
- Add NSE and UX reviews
- Note - this is not a headline

Auto-detection / phase 3
- Could detect in GPT / SDK rather than requiring declaration?
- How precise will this be?

2015 Apr 28

Topic 1: Policy: OCR Update
Presenters: gsalem
- This should be uncontroversial
- New AdX features
    - Support for JavaScript tag
    - Stop adding 'attribute 7' when we find referrer URL is non-empty
        - This prevents data collection
        - Making change for AdX now that we know there is no data collection
        - **What does it mean that we know there is no data collection?**
            - Went through certification process, asked Nielsen about process
            - Now Nielsen is a partner and we are convinced they don't do data collection
            - Nielsen provides anonymized demographic info to advertiser; they use the pixel call to confirm the demo, but don't use the data to add to list for subsequent targeting
        - **Not sufficient for GDN?**
            - Correct. They want no calls going to Facebook.
        - **Does this matter for AdMob?**
            - No.

- Can think of this as giving GDN publisher controls, just like we give our publishers controls
- New scanning logic
  - Add new vendors to various pixel formats
- Chart of pixel treatment by publisher
  - **Why do we allow VAST?**
    - It is scrubbed
- **How will this be commercialized / explained?**
  - Need to update various OCR comms documents
  - It's the sell-side we need to convince, not the buy-side
  - Sellers need to opt-in
  - Can just tell buyers to check for vendors 551/615 (rather than breaking down by publisher) - simpler message
- **Do we have the ability to scan JS OCR tags, or is this the first time we're doing this?**
  - No, checking the calls
  - Looking for the 200 call vs. the 302 (basically)

Topic 2: Alcohol
Presenters: ssheth
- Have launched alcohol to 'low-risk countries'
- Now launching to 'moderate-risk countries'
  - Only for PD (not PA or OA) as next step
  - In the deals environment, Google is like a message board
  - In auction model, we are brokering the transaction
  - **Jordan included?**
    - Yes.
- Separate initiative to relax policy for PA
  - Possible this will look closer to deals, but is separate initiative
- Entering world where certain transactions can only be done with deals, depending on end user location and publisher location
- **What happens when requests come in via proxy?**
  - Proxy's location rather than end user - have to go where we think they are
- Pushing legal to remove publisher location. Might have mix of locations for a given publisher (billing, XRM, etc.)
  - Ultimately end user location is the right thing to look at
  - Billing address is not a proper ad serving entity
- No changes required from publishers
  - Initiative to automate publisher onboarding
  - **What UI is this in?**
    - Currently a betabot with a Google form (manual gTech/policy process)
    - **Can this work with the policy dashboard?**
      - Working with UX team on plan to automate
- **What is the SLA policy has given for the review?**

- Automated process should be same day
- Current process takes 4 weeks altogether (2 weeks review, 2 weeks implementation)
  - **Why is there a code change to add new domains?**
    - Not in AdWords FE (requires flag), add domain/age data to F1
    - Didn't want to build any tools until we knew what the right solution was
- Impact to buyers
  - Need to update RTB protocol to indicate whether inventory is eligible for alcohol ads
  - **Why require buyer declaration? Can't we auto-detect?**
    - Why trust the buyer instead of setting the field automatically?
    - Legal wasn't happy with us auto-detecting, wanted buyer declaration
    - Can we auto-flag based on creative submission?
      - API not used by every buyer
      - Could auto-set if buyer has declared at some point in the past - but this would apply to everything, not just alcohol
    - What happens when it's misdeclared?
      - We disable it
    - **Can we have some more principled approach to declaration? Cycle of declaration -> detection**
      - We can't do good detection in this case
      - Still need to know where creative is eligible to serve; don't know this without declaration
  - Close to 100% coverage on manual review - just invest in more reviewers and get rid of declaration?
  - UX: in deals, currently hard to know which sellers are eligible for alcohol
    - Can add search / filtering? Not in inventory discover yet.
  - **Will we follow the same model for gambling?**
    - Yes. But some gambling types may have age restrictions.
    - Isn't gambling more country specific?
      - Depends on type of gambling (offline, online, social)

2015 Apr 21

Topic 1: Channel Fill Optimization
Presenters: cwierbonski, nitish, maxl, mbortnik

Goal of project: allow YouTube to retain high-quality content (premium channels)
- Advertisers want to buy this content during upfronts
- Example: Bethany Mota (8.5MM subs, median video has 4M views)
- FB is going after these content providers

Google Preferred
- YT program designed to help Google win TV upfront dollars
- Reservation-only inventory
- YT organizes channels into 'lineups'

Why do we need channel fill optimization?
- Important to maintain strong relationship with 'diamond partners'
- Want to deliver them as much revenue as possible
- **Has there been data work to estimate uplift?**
  - In progress; developing algorithm to see how much lift can be generated
- **Have we considered just increasing the rev share of these partners (finance solution vs. serving solution)?**
  - Was considered, but is not an option for YouTube
- **Will reevaluate plans if this doesn't deliver revenue as expected. Goal is to deliver revenue to these partners.**

How this fits into serving
- When a request comes in, have to score preferred line items higher
- This is adding another factor in our line item scoring algorithm
- 'Affinity' between preferred line items and certain inventory
- **Does this require special forecasting adjustments?**
  - No; bias towards special partners is accounted for in real time; availability of impressions for them is bumpy
- **Is this one variable or multiple? Could you optimize for fashion-to-fashion, news-to-news?**
  - Generally one line item targets one lineup
  - This problem is solved with line item targeting
- **How are GP line items flagged?**
  - They target a special key-value
  - Effect of this feature is restricted to YT's network
  - **Need to document which O&O networks get this feature somewhere**

Method
- Goal: instead of 50% fill rate for all channels, fill high-value partners with >50% GP LIs
- How? Open to discussion.
- Problems
  - Non-GP line items may be eligible for GP inventory; not all line items bias to p-score
  - **Is there any reason not to bias towards non-GP line items as well? Any reservation will likely be priced higher.**
    - JB: Advocate yes for this.
    - This situation doesn't exist in US due to 'strict partition'
    - **Why does strict partition exist in the US?**

- Had to solve the problem of non-GP campaigns eating GP inventory
- Bad situation if big GP buy comes and inventory is already allocated to non-GP buys
- Can't use priorities because of cross-sell
- There is a feature request for 'soft partitioning'
- Good economic rationale for strict partitioning: price discrimination for a special class of line items
- Data: get daily mapping of channels to p-score
- Working on detailed design doc
- Open questions: Viral, relative importance of VTR optimization
  - **If Viral drives up CPMs, may effect lift of this feature**

Topic 2: Deals Policy Relaxation
Presenters: gsalem, ssheth, kspoerer

Experiment of bringing topic that is under discussion to this review.

Summary
- Potential scope change around our deals policy differentiation
- Can keep proceeding in current plan to release policy diff to all new and existing PDs

Background
- Multi-quarter effort to treat PDs more like platform/DFP deals from policy perspective
- Decided to remove restriction that we need to wait for a landing page quality scan - adds too much latency

Issues with plan came up during review of rollout
- Inconsistent AdX blocking execution
  - Get category signal from LPQ scan
  - In first 24h, might not enforce a pub category block
- Significant comms effort required
  - Changing the policy for every PD entails a lot of customer outreach - feels like migration
- Some policies on the relaxation list might actually be valued by pubs
  - Some differences between use cases for handing DFP and AdX creatives

Proposed solutions
- 1) Make deals policy diff per-deal
  - Allows go-forward rollout
- 2) Combine deals policy diff and block overrides into one setting
  - Prevent possibility of inconsistent blocking execution
- Upon further investigation, found creatives scans actually produce an initial scan for ad category (addresses issue with (1))

- Don't see a future need for per-deal policy settings

Resolution
- Found that no change in implementation is actually required
- However, full comms effort on the change is important
- **What is gTech's take on this? Feasible to roll out?**
  - ○ Risk that some things will seep through (bad ads) and cause new tickets.
  - ○ Unknowns about what will go through now - need to monitor carefully.
- How do we measure the effects of this feature?
  - ○ Transaction rates
  - ○ Ticket volume and customer feedback
- If someone still wants the policies to apply, they can use PA
- Malware is still fully enforced
- **Is rollout per-buyer?**
  - ○ Yes - but rollout may still be challenging for publishers (they may have multiple buyers with different policies)
- **Architecture diagram may be helpful in understanding this?**
  - ○ Almost no one understands the full system
  - ○ Could we publish a whitepaper explaining how this works? ('How to run a deal')
  - ○ Competitors are saying 'Google is too complex, we'll just make it work for you' - whitepaper may make our system seem more complex (here are a hundred things you need to understand to run a deal)
- Philosophy for deals is that you don't get to pick and choose policy enforcements from a menu. But have an opportunity to at least inform pubs about behaviors.

2015 Mar 31

Topic 1: Brand & Advertiser
Presenter: dbradstock
Notes: cbindra

Brand and Advertiser are different
- General Mills are the top level advertiser (parent company), and that is what we currently have in DFP and AdX as blocks, and can eliminate URLs
- GM owns 100s of brands. Want something more granular than just blocking at parent company. Another example is advertiser - Clorox, but brand is hidden valley ranch
- Started classifying hidden valley as advertiser. For instance Pepsi and Coke sell a brand. Coke doesn't want to see advertisements from Frito Lay (because it is Pepsi).
- Advertiser - global company that owns everything.
- Brand - is what you tend to buy in the store.

Reservations are often on brands, not parent companies.

Labels are good to get pub protection.
Freeform labels can have issues like Coke, Coca Cola, Minute Maid, CocaCola.

Classifications only go so far.
- Most of them are very small entities (within AdWords).
- There will always be an "other" section.
- When eBay sees "other", they assume it is Pep Boys.

Why brand classification matters - 21% of impression volume not classified.
Don't need to improve classification. Want to give pubs comfort that they can block advertisers if they want.

Creative comes in, submitted through RTB. Scans landing page, they will look at additional information that points us to landing company (privacy policies).

GRM - top 60,000 advertisers (for AdWords)
- Maintained by sales and sales ops.
- Advertisers is the top level holding company (VW owns Audi, etc.). Rather than taking the bottom level, went up to the divisional level of the brand and make that where things get cut off.

We block by advertiser, and the mix between brand and advertiser is really messy. Wanted one UI, without any knowledge, so pubs can figure out the brand and advertiser. This is still in the AdX rules UI. Different project to bring this into DFP trafficking.

AIs
- Run through this with Kurt and team for programmatic guarantees, when they want to connect to adx buyers
- Continue to work with UX
- Check on how current the list of advertisers is
- How does this work for mApp? in-app promotion? mWeb?

Advertiser list is 9465. 17230 brands currently classified

'Other' advertiser impact
- For instance eBay, 12.8% of their total impressions volume is "other" and 12.9% of their revenue.
- 35.6% of other is from GDN for ebay. ⅓ of GDN is seen as unknown.
- Change from "other" to "unclassified".
- Large revenue risk from pub blocking other. Blocking long tail advertisers hurts Google the most.

Topic 2: SDK-less Mediation
Presenter: imalkovitch

Bulding a way for publisher to integrate mApp ad networks without having to use an SDK. The original focus is for networks that are not available on RTB.

Publishers have said they want a direct relationship to their networks, not through RTB.
- Not practical to install SDKs from all networks.
- We want to make sure we are the first call.

How does it work?
- It is a new API, that allows our GMA SDK to call direct to the network servers.

AIs
- Greater investigation of the 5 second timing and understand the latency impact of the daisy chaining effect.
- What was the decision making process of what API to use? Need to reevaluate this decision?

Networks will always prefer to do SDK based mediation.

Lat/long is not included - as soon as we get privacy approval, then go back and get lat/long.

Are we creating an alternative to RTB that has no rev share?

MoPub does server-to-server, similar to open RTB. We chose not to mimic that mediation.

Going to implement OpenRTB in some form in Q2.

2015 Mar 24

Topic: Multi-Size Pricing
Presenters: cbindra, davidmao, xiaoyong

AIs
- Chetna/Tom: Clarify interaction between multi-size backfill/pricing and BigCity flexible size ranges for commercialization – need to make very clear in docs

Current state
- Single price floor applied to slot regardless of what creative serves
- Pub can accept multiple creative sizes in an ad slot with multi-size ad requests or BigCity flexible sizes - but only single min CPM applies
- Example: slot in rail that can accept either 300x600 or 300x250
- 3000+ pubs currently have multi-size ad requests in DFP (opportunity for multi-size backfill / pricing)

Who cares?
- #1 product reason why the majority of our top 25 pubs are moving inventory to Rubicon

Experiment on rev impact
- Average uplift due to multi-size backfill for eBay: 5% (not multi-size pricing)
- Estimated opportunity for multi-size backfill (based on all DFP multi-size ad requests): $60MM ARR

Enablement
- Enable multi-size backfill in DFP
    - Currently internal gTech setting on DFP network
    - Should this be enabled by default? Yes, but need to test first in closed beta
    - Configuration of AdX backfill line item
    - Publisher control is required to not send all sizes to AdX (either opt-in or opt-out)
        - NLBF model is opt-out (exclusions)
- Set up pricing rules in AdX
    - Open-auction pricing by inventory size
    - No difference to how this is done today, except that the floors now apply to the size that fills (currently Rules matching is done by the largest size only)
    - Does this also apply to Rules other than pricing (like category blocks?)
        - Yes - but this will apply to pricing only initially, then apply to all rules; end state is that all Rules types apply based on filled size
        - This may be confusing during the interim period when matching behavior differs by Rule type.
        - Are there actually blocking rules targeting size today? Can pull data. As practical matter, this behavior may only matter for pricing.

Eng review
- This is a change in serving logic, not UI
- Current logic: apply pricing floors based on Rule priority - don't look at size in multi-size ad requests
    - Want to make pricing rules conditional on size
- Required work
    - Rules matcher: not only boolean; conditional on size
    - Auction module: Filter candidates based on new size selector
    - Targeting servers: Return candidates based on new size selector
    - Forecasting: Run simulated auction correspondingly
- Out of scope for now:
    - Send extra information to RTB bidders
        - AdX has plan to stop revealing CPM floors to buyers
        - Don't want buyers to value the query based on the reserve price
    - Apply flexible size range (BigCity) rules for multi-size ad requests
    - Add size selector for matched blocking rules (rules other than price floors)
        - Implementing is incredibly hard

- Each blocking rule has its own implementation in each targeting server
- Does it make sense for size to be used in blocking rule targeting at all?

2015 Mar 17

Topic: Unified TYM mApp
Presenters: gargisur

Three main highlights
- Mobile first (in-app)
- Self service for pubs
    - Streamline UI
- Third party price competition

Yield Management
- Maximizing rev for pubs across demand
- Optimize yield for imp to max yield

Why Do we Need TYM?
- Current market
    - over 50 ad markets active in mobile
    - Highly fragmented market
    - 650,000 pubs
- AdMob
- How did Gargi gather competitive data?
    - Earning
    - Secondary research
- Takeaway: If we don't mediate them, we will get mediated

Mobile App TYM:
- Onboarding process to integrate SDK
- Manual CPMs to set up mediation
- Auto data collection (gather reporting data - rev, imp, eCPM)
- Historical perf so we can dyn serve
- TYM, mediation, and AN) - are there standardized definitions?
    - TYM competing with AdX in dynamic allocation
    - total of 35 ad networks that can be selected to serve
    - 15 will do scraping
    - optimizing all 35+ (some manually supported CPM, some scraped CPM)
- Talk to marketing for AdMob & Mediation names (ANO vs TYM vs other names)
- AdMob has great perception in market
    - We can do better by trying to be like them and pushing ourselves to be better

Focus on Self Service

- No gTech management account
  - Go to market quickly
  - Increase adoption
- No rev share

Why 3rd Party Price Competition
- Competition across demand sources

How does mApp Unified TYM work?
- Pubs install SDK
- SDK adapters for 3rd parties
- Mediation workflow in DFP
  - AdX picks winner on eCPM bases
  - Offline process, runs 3 times a day, get active CPM and create dynamic playlist
  - Ads SDK callout to 1st network in playlist, fills if possible or moves on to next network
  - Networks have option to passback
  - Network playlist is not great user experience
    - 3-4 latency per ad network
  - If RTB Google wins, we always fill
    - No one is after us in the chain
  - eCPM (CPM and fill rate) determine
- First network fills 40-50% of time
- Second fills rest of time usually
- AdMob has 5 second timeout, we have 3 second timeout
  - Timeout does not make big difference here

Current Usage
- DFP mediation set up
  - 600 pubs use
  - 20 pubs have more than 100 waterfalls
  - Creating waterfall for every combo of ad units
- AdX ANO for web and mobile
  - 3 pubs set up mobile mediation, but paused

TYM Offerings
- Reporting (to understand yield)
- Mobile centric
- Automatic data collection (Scraping)

TYM vs AdMob
- No rev reporting in AdMob
  - Imp and clicks in AdMob reports right now
- Core yield value

- Ad unit based workflow
- But DFP has more complex use cases
    - Multiple ad unit, sizes and networks (targeting)
- Caution on reporting:
    - Explicit upfront about where rev reporting shows up and is sourced

Roadmap
- Launch TYM alpha Q2
    - Tag based UI
    - Support 35 ad networks mediation
    - 10 networks with scraping (ADC)
    - Sample from AdX ANO and DFP SDK for sample feedback
    - Support for more ad networks
    - Limited availability to 2+ publishers
- Go GA, deprecate SDK DFP mediation
    - Insane # of targeting combinations
    - TYM has limited number of targeting
    - Mediation units are conceptually similar to line items (in targeting)
        - But line items have much more complexity that we don't want to integrate in mediation
        - Mediation is simple targeting
- TYM Beta launch in Q3
    - 10 pubs whitelisted beta
    - Then open beta or GA
    - DFP SDK will still be available

What could go wrong?
- TYM is a little late
- Setting goals and OKRs
- Major risks
    - UI not originally designed for mobile
    - Eng: need more eng to catch up on FE and BE
    - Testing: end to end tests have discovered many issues
    - Back end: reliability of original APIs are requiring re-writes
    - 3rd party networks: Dependency on AdMob for ADC/scraping. No in house scraping capability right now
    - Video: Platform requirements are quite different than mApp
- Product launch slipping is not an option
    - TYM will evolve - mobile, video, and web
    - Urgently asked for this for a long time
- Josh:
    - Similar story for video and desktop
    - RTB vs mediation better for mobile? how great is the need for video and desktop?

- AdX ANO works well for desktop
- Video is a challenge
    - DFP waterfall for video
        - Yahoo and Facebook competitors
        - We are behind in video
- Q2 focus on mobile
- Planning for video
- Q3 full focus on video
- Other ad networks have a lot of reach
    - Facebook launching competitive products
- Desktop about CPM
    - We can compete
    - Evolving away from pubs putting inventory in one exchange
    - Starting to treat each exchange as more network
    - Demand shopping
    - Trying to get closer to auction
        - Rubicon @ 3, PubMatic @2, AdX @ 1
        - If PubMatic @ 3, and we can pay at 2.80, did we really lose?
- mApp we need to be more tactical
    - pubMatic mobile strategy is to partnerships
    - Rubicon is going with partnerships

2015 Feb 24

Topic: OKR Planning - Q2 '15
Presenters: nicoleblank

Action items
- **PMs:** Start having conversations now with engineering so you are ready for the Collect Phase on 3/13.
- **PgM**: Add tracking bug field indicating the appropriate DLS that a project is targeted for: NA, EMEA, or other timeframe.

Q: If bugs are created during collect process, success metric won't be known until later on in the process.
A: Yes, creating shell tracking bugs in the collect stage is fine. The success metrics, launch type, quarter goal, etc. will need to be populated during the commit stage.

Q: Where does the single list from sales and gTech come into this process? Can it be part of the Collect phase?
A: gTech and Sales asks will be part of the Commit phase per Jonathan.

Q: How do we deal with Code Yellow?

A: There will be more clarity in the next few days from Aparna and Jim. Suggestion from Drew is to error on the side of worst case scenario.

Q: Is indicating that something is part of DLS part of OKR headlines?
A: The headlines for Q2 will all be DLS goals.

Q: Can we add a field in Buganizer for DLS ready?
AI for PgM: Sure, we will add a field indicating the appropriate DLS that a project is targeted for: NA, EMEA, or other timeframe.

Q: Is a score of 7 on OKRs still a good/acceptable score? Has this changed?
A: The goal is to have 7/10 OKRs 100% complete rather than 10 OKRs 70% done.

Q: Are these more PM OKRs? Eng should potentially build OKRs to meet these goals a quarter earlier?
A: These should be thought of as DRX OKRs. The definition of done needs to be the ability to ship a product by the end of an OKR cycle.

2015 Feb 3

Topic: DRX Billing Unification
Presenters: joshcohen

Action items
- Design review of billing for private auction and programmatic deals (how do these overlap?)

Josh went over the current state of billing by going over all of the billing pipelines (xFP, AS/AW, TYM, Jordan) and owners etc.,

There were some questions on Jordan Monetizer functionality. Is it possible that we could piggy back on AS/AW monetizer instead of Jordan Monetizer. we know Adwords does not support deal-id. Are there any plans in Adwords to support deal-id. Need to delve more in depth on Jordan monetizer.

As of now, since Adx private auction billing goes via AS (Adsense) monetizer and programmatic deals billing goes via Jordan Monetizer, will there be any scenarios where we will be limited by building a functionality because of possible overlap of private auction with programmatic deals. Need to identify those realistic overlapping scenarios.

2015 Jan 13

Topic: Audience Extension

Action items
- All: Please sign up for review topics! go/drx-spr

Audience Extension update
- AudEx allows pubs to use first-party data to purchase their users off-site
  - Example: NYT has data on an audience enthusiast, can offer them to Ford off-site (CNN or Wall Street Journal) – arbitrage
  - Publishers use this to expand reach, or when they have line items that are under-delivering
  - Publisher acting as agency
- Have had the feature for several years
- Current state: three different versions
  - DBM v0
  - AdX v0
    - Ability for publisher to share first-party segments with linked buy-side account
    - NYT has AdX buy-side account, can push in first-party segments from DFP
    - DBM: same thing but with DBM account
  - AdX v1
    - UI integration in DFP
    - Trafficker can control in DFP rather than AdX
- Reevaluation of project
  - Several quarters worth of work to be successful with UI integration
  - Unclear whether our largest publishers will do this with AdX instead of going directly with DBM
  - Have to prioritize against other projects
  - Decision: sunset v1, push v0 offerings to GA
- **Scott:** Pubs can still do same use case through DBM or AdX buy-side?
  - Yes.
- **Patrick:** Difference between AdX and DBM?
  - AdX buy-side is free (no buy-side rev share)
  - DBM is paid, has more features (access to other exchanges)
- **Jonathan:** AppNexus built their 'DBM' and 'AdX Seller' UIs on same platform
- Bigger pubs (LinkedIn, Collective, etc.) are doing this on DBM, which makes case for AdX buy-side work harder
- **Jonathan:** AudEx is important; this is a question of relative priorities (AudEx was 21 / 26 from sales)
  - Thanks to engineers who worked on this. These are tough decisions.
  - We need to experiment and try new things, but also need to be careful about not wasting effort.
  - Need to explore.

- Next steps
  - Completely sunset AdX v1
  - Move segment sharing into GA
    - No feature enhancements, just broader rollout
  - Message to publishers: integrate with one of our buy-side tools
  - 26 publishers who signed up for v1 over lifetime, 11 spenders in last year, 4 current users – not huge impact
  - About 77 pubs have linked buy-side accounts with DFP accounts
  - Clear definition of what AudEx offering is: segment sharing
- **George:** If a pub buys via AdX buy-side or DBM on their own inventory, do we detect this?
  - We do have a feature for 1% rev share on own inventory.
  - But pubs have separate seats for AudEx (different type – called 'Networks Seat' in DBM world). You wouldn't buy your own inventory.
  - May need to clarify behavior.
  - **Jonathan:** Some pubs may not want different buying accounts for AudEx.
- Our focus from audience perspective: how can pubs best monetize their data across the DoubleClick platform?
  - Not trying to be a full-on DMP
  - Focused on targeting, expanding programmatic opportunities
- **Jonathan:** Financial analysis showed there was a revenue opportunity here, but not big enough compared to other projects.
- **Scott:** What is DDP story? (DoubleClick Data Platform – internal tool for data sharing)
  - Need to decide which use cases we want to support
  - Might be able to get some of this for free from buy-side
  - For AdX and DBM, current way to use third-party segment is to bring it in through DDP (since DMPs aren't allowed for buying on GDN)
  - Some workflows outside of this; some publishers want to license segments to another buyer, etc. Pubs can do what they want with their data. But focus on making it easy for sharing within DoubleClick channels.
- **Jeanne:** Timeline?
  - Aggressively trying to sunset v1 by end of Jan (Feb at latest for active campaigns) – doing outreach this week
  - Can't move v0 into GA until we've shut down v1
  - v0 GA by end of quarter (ideal would be end of Feb)
- What % of rev to pubs typically make from AudEx?
  - Studies say about 5% for average pub
  - Other data-intensive pubs (LinkedIn) have much higher %
    - **Jonathan:** Their business starts to look more like an ad network where they happen to own some of their properties.
    - This kind of user is more likely to be on DBM (which allows access to Facebook inventory)
- **Drew:** Can our competitors use this against us?
  - Most AudEx today done through managed services.

- Might be some level of disappointment among some pubs, but probably not a critical feature for us to have.
- Most pubs do not have buy-side expertise.
- **Jonathan:** We've seen that pub interest in their own data is higher than that from advertisers.
  - Buyers have their own data.
  - Maybe less about pitching advertisers than using their own data for native, etc. – kind of like marketing for their own property (sponsored content).
- **Scott:** If it's low hanging fruit, consider shared logins
  - App switcher is on list for next wave of DBM enhancements
  - AdX buy-side works with app switcher

2014 Dec 9

Topic: Unified Reporting
Presenters: arifeldman

Action items
- **Ari:** Follow up with evaluation of QT + exploration approach

Summary
- There is a desired end state for unified reporting, but it is unlikely to be achieved in 2015
- Need to agree on proposed path

End state
- 'Platinum' option in PRD
- 'Uber query tool': unified reporting UI
- New workflow with identical functionality for direct and indirect
- Uses MIND2MIND to enable cross-product reporting

John: Would you also implement 'reverse' MIND2MIND?
- Won't matter, because end state will be one query tool

Drawbacks of attempting to reach the end state in 2015
- Massive undertaking, especially for FE eng
- Competes against other DRX reporting initiatives
- Many dependencies to resolve
- Additional UX research needed to flesh out use cases

Unified DRX reporting will take some time to evolve
- We have to keep existing tools running to support business continuity – publishers still think in terms of DFP and AdX, not DRX

- Publishers are wary of big migrations

The minimum we will build in 2015
- 'Silver' option
- DFP and AdX reporting side-by-side using MIND2MIND for cross-product reporting
- Standardized UI: feature parity between DFP/AdX QTs
- **Wendy:** How does two separate tabs address cross-product queries?
  - ○ Can select AdX data from DFP tab and vice-versa
  - ○ Our publishers are not structured like DRX is organized: half are siloed between DFP/AdX
- Bare minimum approach
- **John:** Are you proposing both FEs implement functionality to plug holes?
  - ○ Choose one platform; have two side by side initially but start to merge
  - ○ Get there gradually

Stretch goal for 2015
- 'Gold' option
- Get features publishers have asked for (interactive visualization), but retain side-by-side QTs
- **Josh:** Gold standard is not distinct release; gradient of features
- Prioritize workflow changes above unification

Aparna: Will new reporting features be available via DFP query tool UI?
- Yes. Publishers need new features in existing QT for business continuity.

Aparna: How important is new UI? Power users who want everything, maybe just give them SQL-like interface or API? Seem to redesign query tool every couple years.
- May need to push largest publishers (~10%) towards DT or API
- **Stacy:** New UI will help users work through complexity of choices in easier way
- **Aparna:** Quick view is what we started out with, but latency was never good enough. Need data showing how we will obtain improved performance to support UI.
- **Jonathan:** We will stretch whatever gains we get from speed improvements with new features, etc.
- **Aparna:** Does reporting team feel that an interactive UI can be obtained?
- **Wendy:** Interactive piece is limited to what can be shown quickly
- **Jonathan:** Is model limited interactive piece + slower more flexible QT?
  - ○ QT as we know it today goes away.
  - ○ **Aparna:** Is this still the right UI if only 25% of queries can be interactive?
  - ○ **John:** 60-70% of reports return in 5s. Things like KVs cause you to run into slower reports.

John: Is this too incremental? Plan feels status quo. Have to make tough decisions.
- **Aparna:** If we say no new metrics and dimensions until unifications are done, that is strongly problematic.

- **Jonathan:** Big part of our roadmap depends on new reporting features.
- Have ambitious end state, but reporting is in a difficult spot due to constraints.
- **Josh:** Need to make investments in MIND2MIND, Shadowfax as down payments on future reporting
- **John:** Hybrid solutions often lead to technical debt. Need one code base to realize efficiencies.
- **ScottJ:** May be able to commonize UI code first

Jonathan: What would be the business impact be if we completely deferred the new UI?
- From DFP side, aside from speed issues, query tool is fine ('QT justifies their job'). Primary issue is inability to run reports.
- From AdX side, completely different. Moving away from AdSense-style reporting was a mistake. User goal is to explore data and decide how to allocate inventory to the exchange. Not immediate threat, but don't want to give customers any reason to leave.
- Need to make incremental improvements + address stability.
- **Jonathan:** Is QT + Shadowfax + AdX data sufficient for DFP, plus separate project to enable visualization?
  - Publishers would be happy with QT + visualization tools. Needle in haystack + exploration.
  - Reports heavy + reports lite
  - **Jonathan:** Why require a rebuild of something very heavy and feature rich if we don't have to?
  - **ScottS:** How much work is it to put AdX metrics into DFP query tool
    - Not a lot

Can we decouple QT rebuild from dashboard / exploration project?
- Retain DFP QT for power users
- Exploration: replicate AdSense reporting as new project (data shows this is what publishers want)
- **Aparna:** Why make DFP reporting better?
  - **Scott:** Minimum is getting AdX data in (but this is straightforward)
  - **Jonathan:** New facts have to go into QT; but don't need to reinvent QT UX
  - What happens to AdX query tool?

Proposal: DRX has one query tool based on DFP query tool with every fact; DRX also gets data exploration system (starting with AdX data first?)
- **Stacy:** What about Reports/Queries distinction in DFP?
  - You can run ad-hoc report, or create and run query
  - Most users don't understand distinction
  - **Jonathan:** Don't want to improve things just because we have data showing they could be better. Need to focus on solving urgent business problems.
  - **John:** Latest gTech deck shows QT usability is top issue with reporting
- **John:** Danger is that we end up with UIs that are ancestors of previous tools
- **ScottS:** We want to converge the data, but diverge the use cases

- **ScottS:** Seems like two options:
  - ○ One binary with QT + visualization on top of it with subset of data
  - ○ Two binaries: QT, visualization
- **Francois:** FE doesn't necessarily need to reflect under the hood division

Josh: Need to define what is an 'acceptable' query tool
- **Jonathan:** Can we do a 'UI scrub' to address low hanging fruit for serviceability? Can say DFP QT is 'done.'
- **ScottS:** It's OK if we end up in a world with two tools
- **Noam:** Are we just delaying a decision?

Noam: What metrics and dimensions can we drop?
- Jonathan: we can't – nature of QT is that it lets you report on arbitrary metrics/dimensions
- **Noam:** All metrics/dimensions aren't equally important
- **Drew:** To get to something really fast, you need to limit what you're exposing

2014 Dec 2

Topic: Network-Level Backfill (NLBF)
Presenters: dbradstock

Action items
- **Drew/Tom:** Follow up on API concern. Are there publishers who will want/need the ability to set backfill exclusions using the API (or via third-parties using the API)?

What is NLBF?
- Network-level backfill
- Moving away from backfill line items
- Backfill by default, set exclusions for inventory that should not be backfilled

Why build it?
- There is a lot of inventory that is not set up for backfill today – we make it hard to set up backfill by requiring backfill line items

Major NLBF tasks
- Assess, plan, get buy in
- Remove migration barriers
- Automated migration tooling
- Beta in phases

Timeline

- Q4/Q1: Migration preparation
  - Remove blockers
  - Develop migration tools
- Q2: Batch migration
- Q3: Special cases migration

Ad ops hates migrations
- **Jonathan:** DFP is very unlike other Google ads products. DFP pubs make most of their money by selling their own ads. We don't have the leverage to force migrations.

Make big decisions early
- Assume no services support: design for self-service
- Migration does not mean it's perfect: doesn't have to be 1:1
- Automate the migrations
- Show pubs why they need to move: show them the money and make it safe

NLBF is not 1:1 to LIBF
- New backfill targeting will be a simplification of existing line item targeting
- Ad unit, placement, geo, size, format, kv
- Validation with pubs has gone well

Automate FE & BE migration tasks
- Exclusion targeting
- Detect issues in server (example: size mismatch)
- Add some publisher declarations for things that can't be automated

How do we get pubs to move?
- Show them the money
- Quantify rev impact: we can make you money safely
- Give default rules for common exclusions
- Let pubs test with experiments

Jason: Sometimes pubs don't want to move even after we've made it easy and showed impact. What then?
- There has to be an end date that is communicated early
- Forced march
- Doing tour with most difficult pubs now
- Date is not set yet

Jason: Do we expect things to turn out OK if we have insufficient gTech support?
- No. Work with services early to plan and minimize burden.

Neutralizing Risks
- Multi-size support

- We should be able to backfill every size, or hide complexity
- Need to resolve rules issue for multi-size backfill: price floors based on size
- Multi-size needs to go to GA
- Speak to grumpiest pubs first
- Don't assume service support
- Recognize that things will break
- Close policy issues early: get agreements in writing
- Show sales why this matters

John: Is server-side latency a big risk?
- Hitting GDN takes ⅓ second
- GDN delay * ad slots on page (9 ad slots means 3 seconds)
- Latency is on radar as blocker, but don't have solution yet

Does supermixer single request architecture address latency concern?
- No

John: Have heard answers for how we could fix this, but none seem like quick developments. Need to get in front of latency concern early.

Tom: API access for exclusions?
- No plans for API access
- This is designed to be a one-time setup
- Need to discuss more
- Can get data on who is accessing AdX line items using API

Aparna: Aren't we retiring AdMob backfill line items?
- Yes

Aparna: What are things we can stop allowing new pubs to do?
- In SB, can we turn off the ability to create LI backfill now?

How does this impact you?
- Don't assume LI backfill will be around in 2H
- Rules changes will be minimal in 1H
- Pubs won't want to make other big migrations
- Services is going to be tapped out for non-app projects

Aparna: What is the timeline?
- Want to get 90% by Q3
- Can extend to Q4, do last batch in Q1
- Too risky to migrate in last couple months of Q4

2014 Nov 18

Topic: RTB Privacy
Presenters: foox, roybryant, myl, emilo, glevitte

Action items
- **Igor:** Follow up with Aparna for discussion on opt-in RTB callout fields experiment

Data flows
- User interacts with pub
- Pub sends data to Google via tag
- User sends data to Google via tag
- Google sends data to bidder (rtb callout, offline data) – focus today
- User sends data to bidder (rendered ad pixel)

Privacy risks
- Points of control over data
  - Transmission of data to bidder (T)
  - Internal usage of data for ad purposes (I)
  - Externalization or non-ad usage (X)
    - **Jonathan:** Do we have any knowledge of whether bidders are reselling their data?
      - No known examples for selling RTB data.
      - There is a distinction between selling data resulting from the showing of ads vs. RTB data.
- (T) is easiest to control
- (I) is what we care about most

Bad things we want to prevent bidders from doing
- Top things:
  - (T) Sensitive information leakage from URLs (PII, sensitive websites)
  - (T, I) Cross-session correlation
  - (T, I) De-anonymization by linking pseudonymous ID / quasi-ID to PII
  - (I) Building user profile using data in RTB callouts (unwon traffic)
  - (see deck for full list)
  - **Scott:** Legal team is reworking the policies around data usage, hoping to roll out in Q1

Prior work
- Do not track
- COPPA
- Encrypted per-buyer cookies
- (see deck for full list)

- Prior work addressed top risks, but at limited scale

Drew: How are we notifying pubs about violations?
- Ramping up process
- Have identified publishers who are sending us PII
- Two initial rounds of rollouts to pubs to flesh out process
- Have internal UI that policy team uses

Scott: What is the financial impact of addressing these risks? Loss in terms of spend?
- Changes are launched as experiments that get evaluated
- We can run experiments in isolation, but total effect with complete rollouts might be larger

Short term work (Q4 / Q1)
- Spend based quota, quantizing cookie age, reducing granularity of user agent, ... (see deck for full list)
- **Aparna:** How does sensitive category work interact with deals?
  - **Jonathan:** Need to make OA / deal distinction with policies.
- **Aparna:** Opt-in RTB callout fields goes contrary to other stuff we're doing on RTB. Requires sales effort to reach out to buyers.
  - **Scott:** If you want the field to do bad things, you'll opt in anyway.
  - **Ilia:** Makes us different from others. And everyone can say they're interested in everything.
  - **Aparna:** Why are we even investing in the design doc for this?
    - Want to understand what fields are adding value.
    - **Aparna:** What problem are we solving? Don't agree with this project.
      - Understanding how bidders are valuing the information we're sending to them.
- Plan is to get most short term items launched in Q1
- See roadmap: https://docs.google.com/a/google.com/document/d/1f_B3O0wCRQT4-IKSzQJRkXSoYhiqVeTWLI0bd7V_qb4/edit#heading=h.fmiag1pbx240

Drew: Are we holding back data from DBM as well?
- Not clear yet

Aparna: Are you treating AdWords separately? They have full URL.
- Have not considered AdWords yet.
- **Jonathan:** We cannot assume that AdWords gets special treatment. Need to approach first as overall policy for AdX and talk through implications with AdWords team.
- **Drew:** Or, do we assume Google is safe?
  - In AdWords, you can't target people specifically based on sensitive categories, etc.
  - But want to be a fair marketplace.
- **Jonathan:** If concern is (T), include everyone including GDN.

- ○ **Scott:** Or give certain buyers the ability to become as trusted as GDN according to some criteria? Can we define why GDN is more trusted?
- ○ If concern is (I), hard to pretend we don't know what GDN does internally.
- ○ Need general privacy principles about what is and is not OK.
- ○ **Scott:** What is the end state? When are we 'done'? Could continue cutting off stuff forever. Need principles on what we actually want to achieve.
- ○ **Ilia:** If you cut off too much stuff, it's no longer useful for RTB bidders on mobile.

Jonathan: The difficulty in figuring out what buyers are actually doing with data we're sending makes this tough.
- Example: companies pooling print mailing lists. How do you know whether they're using your list without paying you? Control by putting fake names on list so owner of list can monitor.
- Is there more we can do with this kind of technique?

Medium term work
- Record based query fuzzifier: implementation in progress by DAPT team
- Deeper privacy analysis
- Dropping callouts
- Watermarks + auditing
  - ○ What Jonathan described above
  - ○ Tough because we mostly send data, not ingest
  - ○ Could provide tools to auditors
- Incentivize hosted creatives
  - ○ More about 3PAS ads than RTB
  - ○ Make it easier for bidders to do well with hosted creatives

Long term work
- Removing cookie data from RTB in favor of other structures
- Conditional bidding/tiering
- Fully hosted, sandboxed bidders
  - ○ A way to bring the external closer to the internal
  - ○ **Scott:** Telling Amazon to do this isn't realistic. It doesn't work in the market.
  - ○ **Jonathan:** We are not the only inventory source they have to deal with.
  - ○ **George:** But we could give them access to other data that is currently considered Google confidential.
- Market strategy

Jonathan: Most supportive of auditing / watermarking projects. How can we use technology to better police what's going on in the world of RTB, rather than just cutting out stuff?
- **Scott:** There is distinction between policy violations and privacy. This is all privacy stuff.

2014 Nov 11

Topic: Deals E2E workflow
Presenters: ellaliu@, yinyingao@

Action items
- null

Goals
- Unified workflow for manual and programmatic deals
- Seamless experience for XSM users

One workflow
- Combine: Manage offers & pricing
- Invest: Marketplace++
- Combine: Sales workflow for negotiating deals with buyers
- Automate: Trafficking
- Innovate: Buyer Choice, PD, Jordan, PA

UX
- Group features into tabs centered on roles
  - Inventory manager: DRX Inventory tab
  - Sales workflow: DRX Sales tab
- Every DRX publisher will have a Sales tab
  - Additional features if XSM is enabled
  - **Drew:** Premium only, or also SB?
    - SB + Premium

Advanced sales features will 'just work' for programmatic
- Templating tools
- Rate cards
- Internal workflow / approvals

Workflow for managing offers and pricing
- Nomenclature (still finalizing)
  - Offer: pub-defined; the inventory for sale
  - Deal: agreement between buyer and seller with a term
    - Similar to line item in DFP
  - Proposal: agreement between buyer and seller for a group of deals
    - Similar to group of line items in DFP
  - Order: a proposal becomes an order when it's finalized (execution)
    - Retaining this concept for now even though the goal is to minimize trafficking work
  - **Saul:** What about RFP from buyer?

- This would be a proposal
- Inventory tab: manage offers & pricing
  - Inventory manager defines an Offer
    - No separate 'Product' concept as in XSM today; merge with Offer
    - Single object that describes what can be sold
  - Offer creation
    - XSM off
      - Manually define targeting criteria, deal type, price, buyer access
      - Access offer creation form under Inventory tab
      - Preview, then publish to marketplace
    - XSM on
      - Bulk management of offers and channel/pricing (offer templates, rate cards)
  - **Oliver:** When you're setting up an offer, is that for *all* inventory that matches the targeting, or is there a limit (e.g, 1M impressions)?
    - No limit currently, but something to explore
- Sales workflow
  - Use cases
    - Programmatic (through Marketplace)
      - Buyer initiates Proposal
      - Seller responds to RFP
      - Deal types: PD, Jordan, Buyer Choice, PA
    - Traditional RFP response
      - Deal type: traditional guaranteed reservation
  - Initiate a proposal
    - Initiated by buyer or seller
    - Inbox in Sales tab for new proposals
  - Negotiation
    - Both sides can propose changes and approve
    - Same flow as PD today, except that this is Proposal-based (may include multiple deals)
    - Versioning and commenting to track Proposal changes (will discuss details in UX review)
    - Special cases
      - Auto-finalization: finalization immediately after buyer approves seller-initiated proposal
      - Buy it now: finalization immediately after seller approves buyer-initiated proposal
      - Explicit buyer approval: Buyer approves after seller approval (for when buyer is negotiating with multiple sellers)
    - **George:** How does the buyer actually specify a proposal?
      - Seller defines conditions under which a proposal can be approved by buyers
      - Proposals are seller-defined; targeting is set up beforehand

- Will later add free-form targeting
    - Re-negotiation
        - Two levels of in-flight changes:
            - Deal terms (require re-negotiation)
            - Internal changes (do not require re-negotiation)
    - Internal approvals (XSM on)
        - Goal: Trigger internal approvals at publisher-defined points during negotiation
        - Will start with:
            - Trigger validation rules any time before finalization
            - Trigger internal approvals upon proposal finalization
- **Jonathan:** At user groups, found ~80% of pubs plan to have their existing salesforce work on programmatic deals; XSM will be the tool that pubs use to do that
- Milestones
    - Q1
        - End-to-end workflow for Jordan
    - Q2
        - BC, XSM, complete workflow
    - Q3
        - PD, PA, enhancements
    - **Tom:** XDSM deprecation timeline?
        - Want to sunset by end of next year, but not formally communicated yet
    - **Drew:** Might want to frontload some of the workflow enhancements early on. Might speed adoption (based on Marketplace issues). Need hooks for early adoption.
    - **Jonathan:** Think of this as the future of what XFP was born to do. Want the sales use case to become the main one – get rid of ad ops / manual data re-entry.
        - Could eliminate GRP waste via programmatic deals; can use trafficking info you can't use for manual reservation due to privacy concerns.

2014 Nov 4

Topic: Pub experiments - DRX SPR - Nov 2014
Presenter: maxl@

Action items
- Max: Take publisher experiments to serving design review
- Max: Follow up with IMF team on forecasting implications
- Max: Follow up with GA team on potential overlap

Publisher Experiments

- Allow publishers to experiment to find changes that increase performance and revenue
- Why experiments for DRX?
  - Very difficult to find optimal settings – DFP has hundreds of variables
- **Aparna**: What granularity do we want to offer?
  - Does this just add to confusion and complexity?
  - Focus on communications: propose things that are good for publishers, on their terms
- Make it easy: handle experiment setup for publishers
- Many use cases:
  - Enabling NLBF
  - AdX rule changes
  - DFP targeting experiments
  - Backfill to AdX instead of AdSense
  - Video ad load
  - etc.
- **Aparna**: Allow publishers to run more than one experiment at once?
  - Yes, eventually.
- A full-featured framework is a >1 year project
- Phase project into three buckets:
  - Pre-run
    - Run experiments in the background, then prompt publishers to accept a change
    - Publishers don't start/stop experiments – just review report and accept/reject
    - How does this relate to the optimization experiments framework?
      - It builds on top of it
      - This is the 'pre-run' bucket
      - Should take this to serving design review
  - Predefined opportunities
    - Google-defined experiments that are ready to execute
    - Examples: change AdX rules to unblock category, turn on NLBF, yield changes for 'first call' requests, backfill to AdX instead of AdSense
  - Publisher-defined
    - Custom experiments for more sophisticated publishers
    - Benefits us less than Google-defined experiments
    - Example: trying out different creatives, pub-defined AdX rule changes, video rule changes for ad load optimization
- Proposed v0: DRX-wide backend framework
  - Schema, serving work, permission model, reporting (including statistical significance)
- **Oliver:** How does this relate to forecasting?
  - It depends on the experiment
    - Some don't affect DFP reservation forecasting (e.g., AdX rules)

- May need to know that the publisher is running an experiment on a highly booked IU – it may affect delivery
- We can advise publishers about the traffic split
- A 50/50 split could heavily affect forecasting
- Proposed v1: predefined opportunity for NLBF
  - **Aparna:** What is that goal?
    - That publishers become comfortable with NLBF by limiting its 'damage' in a trial
    - **Aparna:** This is a concern, because this is the end state we're going to with the NLBF product – there is no alternative.
- UX
  - Present opportunity in modal
  - Then taken to experiment UI in Admin tab (for NLBF traffic allocation)
    - **Aparna:** Where do you get the modal? Only the Orders tab?
      - Whenever you log in
        - **Aparna:** How often are users actually logging in?
      - **Scott:** Seems like a good time to use the notifications framework
      - Historically, used modals for query tool
      - Need to follow up on details of modal behavior
        - Need to show it to users who are in a position to make the decision
        - Do we have stats on Admin user logins?
  - After experiment, present modal with results
    - 'Increase experiment traffic' prompt
      - **Aparna:** Should we prompt them to enable the feature instead? Why continue to push traffic up and down instead of just enabling?
      - **Aparna:** Do we allow publishers to set timeframes, or is that system-defined?
        - Will not expose to publisher in this version.
  - Reporting in DFP Query Tool
    - For every experiment, some dimensions will make sense
    - **Aparna:** Will you see an annotation saying that an experiment was running when reporting on non-experiment things for a given ad unit?
    - **Jason:** How do we present negative results?
- Possible to integrate with similar GA efforts?

2014 Oct 21

Topic 1: TYM Reporting
Presenter: dbradstock@

Topic 2: GRP

Action Items
- TYM
  - **Drew/Yan:** Look at what's in the OpenRTB spec for per-impression price data. Investigate whether we can support floor prices (need to see which partners accept)
- GRP
  - **Florent:** Talk to Ragnarok team about about Nielsen pixel detection

TYM Reporting
- Existing yield optimization products
  - AdX: Ad Network Optimization (ANO)
  - DFP: Live CPM
- Goal: Get all line items into TYM and let AdX compete for everything. Make the most money for the pub.
- Reporting is crucial. Currently, pubs don't have good info on performance of Criteo, Amazon, etc.
  - Show pubs the real value they are getting
    - **Aparna:** How do we know data is accurate?
      - We will scrape using pubs' credentials
      - Some retargeters don't want true pricing in DFP
    - **Scott:** What is the incentive to not cheat?
      - Networks want to make it as hard as possible to figure out real eCPM
      - We know the fill rate
      - We need to rely on them for info on revenue
      - We will need the publishers to verify that numbers are accurate
  - How will this work with publishers who have outsourced to a yield management vendor using the DFP API?
    - Look at API usage data
  - We currently have ANO reporting in AdX – how do we expose this in DFP?
    - Partner performance is a black hole
    - If we don't show pubs the money, they won't move; we have to prove it
    - Just moving ANO reports into DFP isn't enough
- What do we need to do?
  - Expose partner performance in query tool
  - Expose comparison of partner performance
    - Pubs don't know this today
    - Who has the best yield? What do fill rates look like? Pubs are sold on CPM without fill rate info – they don't know what they're really getting
  - Expose 'Did You Know' reporting: what could you be making?
    - DFP has historically been neutral as a platform
    - In DRX, we need to start giving pubs monetization advice

- 'You should move this line item into TYM'
    - 'Here's what you could be getting'
    - Show alerts in main UI
- **Question**: Is the report supposed to motive publishers to migrate? What is the sales pitch?
    - Yes; long term goal is to get everything into TYM.
    - Sales pitch will be reporting:
        - 'You could be making 12% more'
        - 'Try 5% of your traffic'
    - If you can't show them how they can make more money, they'll stick with their sub-optimal waterfall
- **Question**: If it's a regular price-parity line item with an ad network that does not pass back, is there any benefit to moving this line item into TYM vs. Live CPM?
    - Live CPM didn't really get used
    - If they don't pass back at all, the goal is more about getting AdX a shot at backfill than letting that line item compete in TYM – this would be a 100% fill line item at the bottom of the chain
    - Moving this in would not be a priority
- **Ari**: This could be a big investment for reporting. Estimated revenue is a hugely popular metric in AdX reporting. TYM metrics are not. Is this worth the investment in reporting given the current low usage?
    - The purpose of TYM is to get a shot at the 17B impressions we're not looking at
    - It has a different purpose than the old ANO
    - The usage rates will be fundamentally different than ANO was
- **Yan**: Could the exchange pass us per-impression data?
    - Should look at what's going on in OpenRTB
    - **AI: Drew/Yan**: Look at what's in the OpenRTB spec
    - **Yan**: What about floor price? Can we set this for different networks to get more leverage on pricing?
        - Most networks don't support it; some exchanges would
        - Amazon does accept a min
        - Would have to check partner by partner and potentially add to spec
- **Drew**: What about integrating reporting into line items? Does this seem reasonable?
    - Example: you have a Rubicon line item. You'd now see a bar at the top giving TYM insights.
    - **Aparna**: We should do this.

GRP (Nielsen & comScore)
- Why are we investing in GRP?
    - Publishers are eyeing TV advertising budgets – these budgets are gated on GRP measurements
    - Enables high CPM
    - GRP is table stakes for TV advertisers – it is an existing currency
- Early on, we tried to build our own GRP measurement and didn't get traction

- Two existing providers:
  - Nielsen
    - Has already partnered with Facebook
    - We're planning to launch Nielsen reporting in Nov
  - comScore (vCE)
    - We are partnering with them
    - Launched reporting in Sept
- GRP measurement is complex
  - Data sources
    - User panels
    - Cross-device (PPID)
    - Demographic data
  - The Nielsen integration is a lot lighter than the vCE integration
    - Nielsen just provides reports to us
    - We are integrating more deeply with comScore: tagless, reconciled impression counts, go beyond age/gender segments
- Design principles: the measurements should be effortless, actionable, and trusted
- How do we make vCE actionable?
  - Q4 + Q1
    - Reporting
    - Forecasting & Pacing
  - 2015
    - Optimization
- vCE commercialization is in progress
  - 9 DFP publishers
  - 14 DCM publishers
- For GRP, hard to go mobile first and programmatic first
  - Mobile
    - Working with Nielsen, who works with Facebook – risk of data leakage between us / Nielsen / FB
  - Programmatic
    - Started with reservations because that's important to YT
  - Somewhat painful to admit we've built a desktop-only, reservation-only product for GRP
- Currently working on pacing
  - There is currently a two-day delay in the data pipeline
  - We will use forecasting at the beginning to set expectations
  - There is a chance that sampling based on cookies will cause some skew
  - Will try to rely on actual delivered impressions once we have reporting data
  - Expectation is that vCE reports will be refreshed every 4-6 hours by the time we launch
  - Latency should go down to 1hr
  - Is there anything we can do specifically for demographic data?
    - In v1, will not be relying on forecasting data heavily

- For Nielsen, there is no forecasting data
- Want v1 to address both Nielsen and comScore
- For comScore, could call forecasting and adjust pacing accordingly
- For vCE, long term plans from serving to do more native pacing rather than relying on current system
  - **Aparna:** How persistent is the data? Do you have it at ad serving time (the cookie label)?
    - Eventually will be impression-level labelling
    - Can use label at serving time, but is more complicated than initial solution
    - **Aparna:** 2 day delay is only for new cookies we haven't seen?
      - No, 2 day delay is for impression count
      - **Aparna:** 2 days is not ideal
        - Working to get to 1hr
- Targeting and optimization
  - Important part of reducing waste
  - Not approved to use GDN demographic labels for non-Google buyers
    - **Aparna:** So pure reservations would not benefit?
      - Correct; manual reservations outside of the O&O network would not benefit
      - **Aparna:** Strategically that seems wrong; if we're hoping to make our metrics the currency, doesn't this fail to do that? Do NSE need to make a call on this?
        - It's a Neal call
        - Something we can revisit in the future
        - No data leakage here. More about channel conflict – we get a high share of media for buyers who buy on demographic data on GDN
        - Idea is to separate Jordan reservations from manual reservations
        - **Aparna:** Worth going back to VPs to say this is not good for publishers; not clear that GDN is true channel conflict
        - PPID coop could help solve the problem
        - **Scott:** Think of Jordan as temporary. Buyer Choice will replace that. So the exception for Jordan may not hold.
- Nielsen
  - **Scott:** Are we stripping out the FB call?
    - Web: stripping out referral URL
    - Mobile: don't have approval to share IDFA with Nielsen yet; with Sridhar currently
    - At serving time, when we generate creative, if Nielsen associated line item we strip out referring URL
    - **Scott:** could we do this for anything that has a Nielsen pixel?
      - In next quarter, could detect Nielsen pixels in creatives

- Talk to Verna and Ragnarok team: they've been working on this
  - Web only, desktop only, reservation only: lots of limitations currently
  - For business reasons, Nielsen will be the ugly duckling; comScore is the shining star

2014 Oct 14

Topic 1: DRX Native v2
Presenters: kalashnikov@, tbender@

Topic 2: DART Tag Deprecation Update
Presenters: kkundu@

Action Items
- DRX Native v2
  - **Tom:** Sync with David Goodman on stripping out 1x1 pixels that may be used for native ads
    - Already have a thread on this with David and Allister
  - **Maksim:** Follow-up with George and Drew on buyer ad tech requirements
  - **Patrick/Laura:** Schedule native v2 for UX review in the next 2-3 weeks
  - **Maksim/Tom:** Follow up with details for indirect native demand
  - **Maksim/Tom:** Follow up on native policy challenges with Jonathan/Brian
- DART Tags
  - **Konkona:** Make sure we've got a comms plan in place to announce at user groups on 10/28

Jonathan on meeting ground rules
- Decks not required. If you've got a PRD to review, fine to walk through it
- Meeting is not required and if you're here just doing other work, better to skip and read the notes
- Meeting is not intended to be "gotcha" so try to keep feedback constructive and make these projects more successful.

DRX Native v2
- v1 is pub-rendered for mobile app inventory supporting both direct and indirect demand for app install and content ads
  - Currently in beta with ~50 pubs with a combination of both indirect and direct ads
- v2 is Google-rendered for desktop and mobile web
  - Q: what about XSM? Pubs on DSM will expect any new features to be supported.
    - Some initial discussions with tentative plans for design in Q1 2015
    - comms team should ensure current lack of DSM support is communicated to pubs we onboard

- Publishers want an easy way for a creative to take on multiple presentations. They want a native creative that is appearance agnostic
  - Today pubs do this in several ways, e.g., custom JS that calls the pubs CMS and inserts into the DOM, user defined creative templates to match each page, screenshots as banners, third parties, etc.
    - AI: Sync with David Goodman on stripping out 1x1 pixels that are used for native
  - All of these have different downsides including no backfill, inaccurate forecasting and/or reporting, etc. plus pubs want a DFP solution
- Key difference in v2 is how do we separate creative from presentation where creative is advertiser defined and presentation is publisher defined.
- Concept 1: Creative as set of unstyled elements
  - already part of v1 (for supported ad types), works across demand sources and creative can flow into different presentations
    - How will third party ad tech ad things like tracking pixels, etc? If we don't support it, there won't be demand.
    - Specs are similar to what MoPub and FB offer and buyers seem to be open to it although those networks may have advantages since buyers are desperate to get access to that inventory.
    - AI: Follow-up with George and Drew on buyer ad tech requirements
- Concept 2: Native presentations
  - publisher provided html + css which is associated with inventory and not creative, e.g., "make app install ads look like this for ad units x, y and z"
  - Policy aligned with Styleframe with Google-controlled rendering
  - Going forward, may make sense to support any targeting and not just ad units, e.g., device targeting, age, gender, etc.
    - You'll be able to view in both directions -- which presentations are associated with which ad units and which presentations are associated with a given ad unit
    - Could this be done via Rules?
    - How would this work with Creative-level targeting? They could work together, but you'd only be able to target on the native fields and not the actual creative.
    - How does it work with GPAs? Unclear, but that sounds like it's more about adjusting the content of the ad vs. the presentation.
    - Workflow will be that an ad request will ask for a native ad and then the ad unit will be associated with a presentation and call the appropriate template and then render the creative
- AI: Get this in for UX review in the next 2-3 weeks
- AI: Need to ensure programmatic demand can flow at launch or at least call out where it doesn't flow
  - AdWords and DBM will already have native assets. Need to have a plan to convert text ads into native assets

- What about TYM? Baked into plan for v1, but not clear it's a priority for v2
- Are people going to have exclusive native slots? For v1, we'll have different slots, but the roadmap envisions slots that can take either type of ad.
  - Will be important to have them work the same way everything else does so it can work with NLBF, etc.
- Lots of risks that need to be addressed:
  - Significant challenges with policy constraints
  - Bad native ads that are deceptive
  - Could be too complex or simple based on pub needs

DART Tag Deprecation Update

- Top 50 pubs are 75% of DART impressions, e.g., ESPN, eBay, Amazon, etc.
- DART tag deprecation scheduled for Q1 2016
  - Need to collect updates from TAMs on top 50 and figure out a communication plan
- Eng still needs to provide an estimate on costs of maintaining DART tags
- By Q3 2015, all DCLK tags will need to be HTTPS compliant
- AI: Make sure we've got a comms plan in place to announce at user groups on 10/28
- What about plans for AdX tags? If we're going to kill both, should look to see if it makes sense to have a unified effort.
  - Important to understand for DRX plans re: merged inventory. Key question is whether pubs using AdX tags would lose functionality or if things would actually break.

2014 Sep 23

Topic: *Tag Strategy for DRX*
Presenters: *kkundu@, rredwood@*

AIs (shown in context in blue below):
- **AI(Konkona, Scott):** Can we have a date strategy (agreed approach for picking a date) by next week? All the big AIs that need to be closed out for us to pick a deprecation date and announcement strategy need to have deadlines on them (eg getting agreement from Eng)
- **AI(Konkona, Rob, Scott):** [DART deprecation date] Follow up with commercialisation about what we're specifically committed to, but waiting until Jan to announce is a non-solution
- **AI(Konkona, Rob):** Produce concentration picture for DART publishers
- **AI(Konkona, Scott):** Further develop the strategy around big publishers who need custom work and whether/how we will hand-hold them
- **AI(Konkona, Rob):** Surface to Aparna existing explanation of the carrots in GPT (inc. whether they are *actually* carrots yet)

- **AI (Rob, Aparna):** Sync up on explaining the eng effort associated with having many tags (and share with JB)
- **AI(Rob):** Sync up with Masha to check whether we can definitively tell how often an AdX tag is directly on-page
- **AI(Konkona):** Speak with Drew about GPT lite versus adsbygoogle
- **AI(Konkona, Rob):** Surface to Aparna existing reasoning for using GPT lite over adsbygoogle
- **AI(Aparna, Konkona, Rob):** Reach consensus on GPT lite versus adsbygoogle as the passback tag

Summary Notes:
- Overview of tag landscape
- Deprecation of DART tags
- GUT and GAM tags
- Merits of GPT / migration drivers
- AdX tags
- Action item recap

Detailed Notes:
- **Overview of tag landscape**
  - DFP:
    - Several tags currently active for DFP
    - GUT tag has been deprecated already
    - GPT passback tag has a lighter footprint than GPT
  - AdX:
    - show_ads tag and adsbygoogle: They have the same implementation, but we expose these two different APIs to the publisher
  - DRX:
    - Aims: Have fewer tags to support and handle
      - Need a tag for web, in-page
      - Need a tag for web, passback / serve into the page
      - Need some offering still for a non-JS environment
      - Mobile apps and video SDKs remain unchanged
    - The priority of deprecating older tags varies based on the tag
- **Deprecation of DART tags**
  - So far
    - 'Carrot' approach so far, convincing publishers to move on the merits of GPT
    - There's been an organic shift to GPT as a result, but we know there will be hold-out publishers
    - We've been working to resolve known items that block publishers from migrating to GPT from DART
    - As well as features however, Eng resources have been diverted into

- generating code samples and documentation, and this would be better serviced by a Dev-Rel component of a migration team
    - ○ Sunset date
        - Konkona: We can set a tentative internal date, and announce it externally early next year
        - JB: It's very hard to get publishers to agree to a deprecation within one calendar year, so if we wait until 2015 they'll be pushing for 2016
            - Can we announce in the holiday season? For publishers (especially those who don't want to move), we can't spring it on them in Q1
            - Pandora example: They've been requesting more advanced notice of what changes are coming. Asking for notice in June about changes for the following calendar year
        - Rob: Eng nervousness remains about announcing a date externally and tying our hands before surfacing individual publisher requirements
        - AP: If you wait until Q1, you won't get people off GPT in 2015
            - AI(Konkona, Rob, Scott): Follow up with commercialisation about what we're specifically committed to, but waiting until Jan to announce is a non-solution
    - ○ Tag insights dashboard now gives us good business intelligence in this area
    - ○ DART migration blockers list
        - This is a moving list - new items do arise. gTech provides us with items on a separate list, and we prioritise/filter/review
        - Major challenges of changing a tag: Environment provided
            - GPT provides an environment quite different from that provided by DART tags
            - AP: Have we quantified the impact of cross-domain IFrame, async, etc?
                - ○ It's difficult to figure out - many custom creatives, not clear which ones even need to break out from the IFrame
                - ○ We can mitigate some of the impact, eg by providing creative templates that 'just work' for publishers
            - AP: Is there a loss of signal to the advertiser?
            - JB: [Clarifying] If the publisher is working with an advertiser who doesn't support this already, and the advertiser can't be bothered to implement and just pulls their spend, that's the impact
                - ○ IFrame busters are one option, already commonplace
                - ○ People are already doing this with GPT, so it can be done
        - Major challenges of changing a tag: Custom publisher code
            - Publishers write custom code for eg responsive design. They want to move away from that custom coding with DART tags
        - Ask from gTech: Improve the tag generator (Chealsea Conroy)
            - Publishers need help migrating?
            - AP: Is it that the existing tag generator needs to be enhanced, or

is it that it needs to be embedded in the frontend?
- JB: We can ask to see more data from gTech, but we need to bear in mind global priority order when thinking about this
- Chealsea: We're already working on this

○ AP: Is latency / the impact of latency quantified somewhere?
- Konkona: If you have 10 ads on a page, and you're using SRA, it's very difficult to compare 1 SRA request with 10 Non-SRA requests. It's not apples to apples. Similar situations with comparing POST to GET, JS-execution to no JS-execution, etc
- Rob: We can't predict ahead of time, but we can measure (somewhat)
- AP: Do we have median latency on all GPT across publishers?
  - Measured internally, in aggregate
  - Things are improving, we're not there yet, there's a lot to do. We can't measure against DART tags though, so this is not for migration, it's orthogonal to that

○ JB: How concentrated are the hold-out publishers?
- Many publishers do their migration piecemeal (eg BBC after some years is 20% done)
- JB: It would be good to have a concentration picture of this
  - AI(Konkona, Rob): Produce concentration picture
- Example problem in Germany:
  - JB: Is this based on crazy cases with 19 levels of redirects? We should be engaging on good and bad UX practices. We'll have JB's support for putting business at risk if the conversation is centered around work needed to support bad-UX use cases
  - Brian: There's a culture of building JS libraries on top of DART tags. eg the Seven-One example. The challenge is to wean some publishers off their own code
  - Pandora for eg was very against a DART deprecation
    - JB: It seems like the story might be "So you're making us go through this giant hassle for no benefit?"
    - JB: How many engineers does unification save? We've heard this qualitatively, but quantitatively would be good too. What is our level of support for DART tags, and our threshold for supporting issues?
      - Rob: A significant part of the engineering tax is associated with Security/Privacy/Legal issues where we don't have the option not to implement for all tags (not shiny new features)
      - AP: This isn't just our team. It affects BOW, gTech, etc - but the picture isn't clear to sales right now. We should provide figures just like they estimate revenue opportunity
    - AI (Rob, Aparna): Sync up on this

- For those publishers who want to roll their own, do the items in the blocker list constitute an alternative?
  - We can't necessarily support the wild customisation
  - We need to ensure they don't do some stuff for GPT
- Konkona: Worth noting that formats in Germany can be spammy too - eg wallpaper formats that cause spammy/accidental clicks
  - AP: In this case, detecting the spammy clicks is best?
    - Accidental click != spammy click
- We don't have an end-date yet
  - We need one - the AI is noted below
- **GUT and GAM tags**
  - GUT - this tag was successfully deprecated
    - We actually killed it (hard deprecation versus soft deprecation)
    - But it took a long time, and a lot of effort, illustrating how hard this is to do
  - GAM - usage is slowly declining organically
    - We don't allow publishers who joined XFP after GPT was launched to generate GAM tags
    - We point towards GPT heavily in the Help Center
    - There is no forced retag planned here (unlike for DART tags)
    - But the planned DFP SB → AdSense push will likely play into this plan
    - The Eng necessity/value for deprecation is much less here
  - JB: Have we thought about forcing a fast migration for GAM tags?
    - There's a plan to move DFP SB publishers to AdSense - that itself will reduce GAM tag usage - the timeline is thus-far unclear
    - Will they end up on GPT or show_ads?
      - If they are moving back to AdSense, it's possible that they should move to the AdSense tag
      - Chelsea: We haven't gotten as far in the conversation as planning what tag they'll use post-migration
- **Merits of GPT / migration drivers**
  - JB: Is there anything else we can do to make GPT more advantageous to publishers? (If we're making people give up their custom JS libraries, disallowing custom formats etc, what are we giving them in return?)
    - JB: Pandora is one of our highest growth, most valuable customers who doesn't like surprises, and so the current plan is obviously not going to work. We don't want to go them with bad news ("you're losing DART tags"), we want to go to them with good news ("we're making a dedicated effort to give you something better")
      - Rob: It's clear some folks need specific handling. Is you're feeling that it's 10, 20, 100 pubs that we need to hand-hold?
        - JB: That depends which are the biggest hold-outs. That's why we need the concentration data
    - Florent: Some of the carrots are taking a while to *really* become carrots
    - JB: Everyone is agreement that DART tags should go away. But what's

the Eng impact of the date being Sep'15 vs March'16?
- Josh Cohen: Is there actually a direct impact?
  - AP: Every feature becomes more complicated
- Drew: SSL with DART tags could be a big risk
  - Scott: There hasn't been any tag specific break-outs for what will be allowed. This could be used as a migration hook - if search starts to rank based on SSL then publishers will want to move anyway?
  - Rob: Publishers can move easily ("http", add an "s"). But the point is they need to change it, so we're at their mercy, and we can't predict the impact or run experiments
- This is half the challenge of figuring out the right date for when it's done - there's lots of resistance

- **AdX tags**
  - Publishers are using adsbygoogle tags to paste into a third party ad server
  - AP: AdSense will use the AdSense tag always, so it's not going away. We'll move to one BOW. Can the tag just 'die on the vine'?
    - Konkona: Yes, the tags will continue to work. But from now on, we'll create a fresh start, so we don't have two tag generators in the UI, etc
    - AdX tags need to remain supported in ad-serving
  - If we're doing migrations already why don't we take this as an opportunity to push everyone to GPT?
    - Konkona: Yes, all new tags should go to GPT
    - JB: It should be easier to change too, for trafficked tags
      - Rob: We're not sure how often the tag is pasted directly in-page
      - AP: We could work with Masha to know how often it's on page
      - AI(Rob): Sync up with Masha to check
    - Scott: We can organically move people over, monitor, see how big the remnant is, then see how important it is to push people
  - AP: Is the proposed tag GPT lite, or is it GPT?
    - Konkona: It's GPT lite. 'Full' GPT has features which don't work or make sense in a passback context
    - The next step is to make it even faster (eg eliminating parts of the impl)?
    - The underlying tag is the same, but less API is exposed
  - AP: Why isn't the proposed tag adsbygoogle rather than GPT?
    - Konkona: The implementation is completely different. It would be good to do an infrastructure project to make the AdSense tag more similar to GPT, but that's a big effort
    - AP: Aren't we just adding to the tag proliferation? Why not just use adsbygoogle?
      - Konkona: GPT passback tag is running live traffic in DFP already. it's more work for us to do it that way round. We have to do work either way, either to make GPT AdX friendly, or make AdSense tag DFP friendly

- AP: We don't want to make GPT lite feature heavy. The existence of the tag is primarily because you're using another ad server. Why not just use adsbygoogle?
  - Konkona: We'll be able to get new features for both desktop and passback version
  - AP: Not convinced.
    - The AdSense team is thinking about what they need to do for YM
    - It's the exact same use case. Not convinced that both need to exist
- Rob: There's also the rich media case - existing DFP publishers are using the passback tag to serve rich media which will break if adsbygoogle is used
  - AP: But if you want to do Lightbox or Engagement Ads in GPT - the same is true in visa versa?
  - JB: We know we have a strategy around GPT as the primary decision maker. But we shouldn't be driving an independent strategy for these tags - it should be defined by how important to the main strategy is this
    - We should be talking more with Drew
    - What's the role of the tag going forward?
    - Everything you get in that situation should be carefully considered - not for free
    - Second look better than no look, but it's not first look
- AI(Konkona): Speak with Drew about GPT lite versus adsbygoogle
- AI(Aparna, Konkona, Rob): Reach consensus on GPT lite versus adsbygoogle as the passback tag

- **Action item recap**
  - AP: Scott and Konkona - do we need weekly standing tags meeting?
    - Scott: There are some big questions, like "What are we going to do with these big guys who need custom work?", but we don't need weekly meetings yet
    - AI(Konkona, Scott): Further develop the strategy around big publishers who need custom work and whether/how we will hand-hold them
  - AP: Another big result is a DART deprecation date
    - AI(Konkona, Scott): Can we have a date strategy (agreed approach for picking a date) by next week - all the big AIs need to have deadlines on them
  - AP: Are the carrots sufficient in GPT?
    - Scott: That's not a two minute answer
    - AI(Konkona, Rob): Surface to Aparna existing explanation of the carrots in GPT (inc. whether they are *actually* carrots yet)
  - AP: Building out GPT lite versus just using adsbygoogle and getting it over with?
    - Konkona: We already have GPT lite

- - AP: Can we kill it though?
    - Scott: There's a convincing argument for GPT lite
    - AI(Konkona, Rob): Surface to Aparna existing reasoning for using GPT lite over adsbygoogle
  - Rob: Do we need an Eng review for a closer look at the roadmap?
    - AP: No. But we do want to ensure we narrow down the number of things the team has to focus on
    - AP: We also owe Jonathan a more detailed explanation of the engineering cost (AI already noted above)
  - Rob: There's already an upcoming meeting for discussing Spam and SafeFrame - we can cover more of GPT lite versus adsbygoogle discussion there

2014 Sep 16

Topic: First look deals
Presenters: maxl@

Action items
- Primary group to continue discussion and schedule additional DRX SPR slot if necessary.

Notes
- Goal of meeting
  - To get sign-off to build a first-look auction feature
- Overview
  - Network competition is broken – we are losing in RMKT
  - Mediation is significant problem: AdX is often not first call
  - Other problems: missing signals, network setup, etc.
  - Addressing first look today
- What is Criteo's advantage?
  - Not that they have access to better inventory; same inventory, but have access to it first
  - Their first look places every other remarketing vendor at a disadvantage
  - Kim: Do we have data to prove this story? There are other possible reasons why they could perform better.
    - Effort is underway to quantify (parse tags)
    - Yandex, Amazon, others use same strategy to get first look
- Why are pubs doing first look deals?
  - High CPMs for remarketing, remarketing demand is different (volumes are low), inventory control (Criteo viewed as 'higher quality')
- Why should we address this?

- Level the remarketing playing field: better access for all RMKT buyers, including AdWords
- Josh: Is the idea that CPMs will go up enough to justify our cut?
  - Yes; experiment in progress.
- Proposed solution
  - Set up first look auction (FLA)
    - Ahead of everything except 100% sponsorships
  - Everything on FLA will compete with DFP ads on price, or only with a specified floor
  - If no FLA winner, normal EDA auction runs
  - 100% sponsorship > FLA > EDA
- Arun: What prevents Criteo from going back to pub and saying 'book us with 100% sponsorship'?
  - Nothing. Up to us to show benefit of competition.
  - Criteo would have to raise their price – which would increase the amount of money that pub makes from this.
- Kim: is this an empty threat if Criteo can just raise their price?
- Kim: several potential issues:
  - Still charging 20% rev share
  - Using second-price auction
  - Less cookie matching
  - Does TYM solve this?
- Ilia: this sounds like second layer above TYM
- Arun: have we talked to Criteo about this setup?
  - Scott: They're happy to do anything that gets them access to more inventory
  - Kim: Criteo has said deals don't perform well for them
    - Deals could do first-look separately from this; distinct issue
- Arun: What is the next thing all the remarketing players would do if this is released?
- Kim: Have to argue this approach against TYM
- Ran out of time; need further discussion

2014 Sep 2

Topic: Client Access Overview
Presenters: glevitte@, saullondon@

- Problem
  - Deals need to be more scalable; currently, lots of manual effort required.
  - AdX buyers design for scale – small number of large buyers.
  - Unlike OA, deals still require significant ad ops effort.
  - Lots of big buyers (DSPs) are requesting 'delegated access': the ability to let discovery and negotiation fall through to their clients.

- Agencies and advertisers need access to Marketplace – not just DSPs.
- Whose UI?
  - Could let DSPs build UIs – but that would take years and lead to fragmentation.
  - MediaMath has started building their own UI.
  - Don't DSPs need to update the bidder only?
    - Updated bidder may be easier than restructuring UI.
  - We already have a UI built and can just open it up to agencies.
- Proposal
  - See PRD for details.
  - The buyer is authorizing another entity to act on its behalf in browsing the UI and striking deals – but the deal is still between the pub and the buyer.
  - Does the pub see the buyer's clients?
    - Optionally.
  - JB: Is there enough demand for deals that we could have leverage over buyers? Example: you must expose agencies.
    - The concern is that buyers see their client roster as a strategic thing they don't want to expose.
    - That requirement might cause buyers to opt out.
    - Drew: we tried this, buyers freaked out. Might be worth another run at it, but can't be used as stick.
    - Many agencies work with multiple DSPs – so the hope is that the agencies pressure the DSPs into doing this.
  - Buyers can grant permissions to each client for various features.
  - How are clients defined?
    - Option 1 (PRD): Client is any user of the DSP regardless of entity type. One level down from buyer.
      - Affiliate is one layer down from Client.
    - Option 2 (Advertiser-labeled): Advertiser refers to actual advertiser, even if it is only one layer beneath Buyer.
      - AP: Is there a reason to allow 'Client' as an ambiguous entity type?
        - We could give the Buyer a list of specific entity types.
        - We need visibility into the exchange – this might be an opportunity to incentivize Buyers to give us entity data.
      - Are buyers disincentivized from providing accurate entity information?
        - AdX entities project – idea is to ad extra stuff in bid response saying that the bid corresponds to some entity
      - JB: Better to have inaccurate data or 'other' field when asking buyers to provide entity classifications?
      - Krish: carrot could be reporting.
      - The agency does not want obfuscation; the buyer does, because they don't want to be cut out of the transaction.

- Won't provide cross-DSP reporting on advertisers from day 1, since DSPs would panic – but would like to eventually.
- There is an incentive for DSPs to declare their client list, so that they can access the UI, but not for them to classify the clients.
  - Could relevancy be a carrot for classification? Customize UI based on client entity type.
- Details of entity / type specification
  - AP: What specifically would you enter for a client? What string?
    - "American Airlines"
    - "Digitas"
    - Whoever has the direct relationship with the buyer.
  - Can use same list of entities WAT is using for entity project.
  - Could you ask agencies to self-declare their type on login, rather than asking the buyer to specify?
    - Seems better than buyers declaring.
  - How many agencies?
    - About 600 globally.
    - 8,900 advertisers.
  - Few enough that someone from Google could apply a classification.
    - Some operational and legal cost to this.
    - Validate can be separate from de-dupe.
  - From publisher perspective, duplicates are painful. We should make sure the names make sense – there should only be one 'Criteo US'.
  - Users can no longer submit arbitrary strings – would need to choose from our list, or escalate to add a new entity.
    - GTech would have to handle entities not already in list.
  - JB: We don't have a ton of market power here – middle ground on improving categorization might be more reasonable than trying to lock down the list completely.
    - We'll never be able to respond within hours to a buyer who wants to buy right now.
    - But this isn't stopping business for happening – if you need to buy within an hour, you can do without second-level UI access.
  - What is the goal?
    - To get deals to transact.
    - To get client list? This is just implication of capturing data from buyers.
    - To show publishers clean display of which advertisers are transacting.
  - Once we have agencies using the UI via multiple DSPs, we could allow them to merge those accounts.
  - JB: autocomplete would encourage people to canonicalize without requiring that you select from our list.
  - AP: can we try typeahead now with some fallback for missing entities?
  - This is one-time account setup – not per deal.
  - We're already moving to a maintained canonical list for DFP, TYM.

- - - Already did knowledge graph canonicalization in DFP.
    - Kim: the more non-overlapping structures you have, the less you can do with the data. Feels like this solution might be too narrow – need to get to a single, solid view of the buy-side.
      - The concern is creating more unstructured data.
    - JB: worth circling back to make sure the proposal builds off our existing canonicalization versions.
      - Everyone agrees we want to move towards canonicalizing buyer entities.
      - Take a look at other canon. efforts and make sure this is consistent.
    - Saul: one implication is that a random advertiser can't browse the Marketplace.
      - We could say everyone can discover, but can't transact unless you're a known entity.
      - Buyers could create "browsing" accounts.
        - This is covered by permissions.
    - Kim: give serious thought to whether you are identifying business entities or legal entities. Example: geo split. Not 1:1 – hard to resolve if we have a mix.
      - Decide which you are trying to represent.
    - Do we need a structure that allows for >3 levels?
      - Probably not if we intend to have a single canonical list.
      - What about sub-agencies / teams?
      - JB: what is the revenue impact of this feature? Is this needed to start with?
      - What if we build code allowing for multiple layers without showing, just allow us to expand later? Shouldn't build functionality that we don't want to expose.
- Coordination with DDM / DBM
  - DBM will embed the Marketplace buy-side UI
  - In the DBM case, the client can approve their own deals
  - JB: With skyray, will DBM and AdWords have single list of buyers?
  - DBM is the buyer entity, Coke is the advertiser entity.

Action Items
- George: make sure the proposal is in sync with our other canonicalization efforts.
- George/Gregoire: estimate gTech support effort required for list maintenance.

2014 Aug 12

Topic: Core Team Sellside Review (creatives and forecasting)
Presenters: tbender@, apasha@

Creatives (Tom)
- DRX will support creative management for manual and programmatic ads in one product

- Feedback from JB:
  - 3PAS: should we be reviewing and blocking creatives from 3PAS in the same way regardless of if it comes from RTB or direct?
  - There are a lot of pubs that make a lot of money from having really custom creatives
  - Give users the option to go with their own custom creatives, but offer them in-product creative formats?
  - You shouldn't have to use manual trafficking because of a given format; think about canonicalizing formats
  - Need to split data into direct sales vs deals
  - Do we have a recommendation on tab structure?
    - We do on Creatives, but not overall; the reason it's not a top-level tab is because that's not where a lot of users spend most of their time; creatives are a part of Orders; consider pulling out the ARC feature and maybe move it to live with blocking and other buyer rules
    - Are we going to do an AdSense style pub controls area?
  - What needs to happen in Q4 to move us faster?
    - Need a more detailed roadmap slide
  - Need some metrics on % of creatives coming from buy-side
    - Need clarity on what's actually serving for indirect ads (not just DFP creative types)
- From Scott:
  - Is concept "reactive creative"? Creative comes to them and they verify, where as now, they get the assets together and create the creative code
- From Aparna:
  - Do you create creatives and formats? On GDN, they have standard formats that they launch and they look really great; can we do the same with DRX creative?
- From Drew:
  - What's the timeline for blurring the lines between direct and indirect creative?
    - No date for this; need to do more research whether this makes sense; not sure if direct sold creatives should be shown in ARC
- Should pull creative data not by creative type but by domain in the redirect
- Creative formats in DRX:
  - Support successful GDN formats in DRX; focus on high value, mobile first formats with programmatic support; also Native and rich custom formats

Forecasting (Ali)
- Not part of sell-side review
- In DRX, Forecasting will play a key role in getting publishers excited about programmatic
- Show pubs where value is and why they should move to programmatic
- Help them realize that their existing business can exist with programmatic
  - Programmatic means both RTB/indirect and Deals
  - JB suggestion: change the wording (programmatic does not mean indirect sales only and direct sales does not mean manual trafficking only)

- Forecasting can add a lot of value because most people run experiments or use reporting for this
  - Cold start problem → don't have data, don't know what it's going to say; makes using reporting difficult
- Two things focused on:
  - Programmatic alongside direct sales
  - Impact of withholding inventory from RTB
- From JB:
  - How much of the AdX LI backfill forecasting work is throwaway given the desire to get rid of LI Backfill for NLBF?
  - Backend work is def not throwaway; some FE work may be throwaway but given timeline for completely removing LI backfill, we think it makes sense to support LI backfill supporting
  - On 5b: think about something that's lousy but serviceable
  - Indicate time series plan so people know what else you are working on
  - What happens in post-banner world; GRP, viewability, true view, etc, and how to support the new currencies that are coming out
  - Is the sequence of work, shift to programmatic, time series and new currencies? Customers need time series
    - Clarify this in deck
- From Drew:
  - Will numbers match on buy and sell side? Wants to make sure they are close enough
  - Ali's understanding that numbers don't need to match 100%;
- From Aparna:
  - How does the ability to forecast on revenue rather than goals impact the roadmap and work being done here?
    - Revenue forecasting is being handled as a separate discussion as part of upfront/YouTube conversation
  - Does not see YouTube as the third priority; in the context of video that's fine, but not sure they are the model for everyone
- From Scott:
  - Account for the preferred deals/private auctions so we know how much inventory is being taken away; here's the amount of money you would have lost and what's to be expected

2014 Aug 5

Topic: Core Team Sellside Review
Presenters: joshcohen@, arifeldman@, cwierbonski@

Summary
- Josh presented on overall DRX unification
  - DRX core is a set of shared services that support our big bets
  - Core team is responsible for making sure DRX works as a coherent, unified product
  - Phased unification over time
  - More discussion needed on intermediate app switcher approach
- Ari presented on DRX reporting
  - Goal: unified reporting system across all products and sales channels
  - Further iteration needed on success metrics. Can we connect to revenue? Can we present distributions instead of averages?
- Chealsea presented on DRX inventory
  - Goal: unified module for defining and allocating inventory, and controlling buyer access
  - Need to follow-up with plan for defining building blocks of inventory management
  - More detail needed on representation of "buy-side entities"

Action Items
- **Ali/Tom:** Schedule standalone follow-up session on forecasting (next week?)
- **Tom:** Schedule standalone follow-up session on creatives (next week?)
- **Ari:** Hold brainstorm with Jonathan on success metrics for reporting
- **Josh:** Hold breakout sessions on app switcher and admin
- **Tom:** Hold breakout session on API
- **Core team:** Revise slides based on feedback below

DRX Migration Plan (Josh)
- Unification Goals & Issues
  - Data on overlap of AdX / DFP publishers
    - Are percentages by number of publishers or revenue?
      - It's publishers weighted by revenue.
    - Update to include numbers for AdX-only and DFP-only publishers.
- Phased Unification Options
  - Two approaches: separate containers (two products with shared services), or shared container (core set of shared services with DFP + AdX tabs for non-shared functionality)
  - Recommendation: Start with separate containers, migrate to shared container
    - Example: identical Insights tab for AdX and DFP
  - Why is it worth launching anything new in separate containers? Example: query tool.
    - Depends on number of elements that are shared – could be confusing if you need to use a different UI for a single shared element.
    - How do you communicate to users that the query tool is a shared service? How does this work when you go between DFP and AdX tabs?

- Another possible approach: shared container in which you can switch the tabs out based on product selected
  - Example: once Admin is unified, it becomes a fixed tab
  - "App switch without doing a page reload"
- To what extent do we want to communicate DRX as a new product to users?
  - One approach: boiling the frog (gradual merging)
  - Another approach: there's a new "third thing" that contains the shared elements
    - App switcher between DFP, AdX, and "Shared" could be awkward
- What are the benefits of interim steps?
  - Can get feedback and iterate on components as they are ready, without needing everything to be ready at once
- **AI / Josh:** hold breakout session on switcher approach

Reporting (Ari)

- How we will get there
  - John: the AdX query tool does not have a fast UI; this may be something that needs mitigation
  - Need to add chart showing capabilities of DFP and AdX query tools
- Success metrics
  - **AI / Ari:** brainstorm w/ Jonathan on success metrics for reporting – how can we relate to revenue?
  - Need to understand distributions for metrics – not just averages
  - The user experience should be limited in terms of how bad it can be – e.g., 95% of reports run in under N seconds

Inventory (Chealsea)

- Unified Inventory Goal
  - Jonathan: Need to separate defining building blocks of inventory from allocating inventory – two different things, need to resolve separately (otherwise taking on too much)
    - Focus on building blocks for the Sellside Review
  - Scott: One way to break down: inventory definition pieces, unified controls at inventory level, deferred controls on deals/indirect side
- Today: Fragmented inventory structure with some overlap
  - Jonathan: good level of detail here; add highlight colors to show overlap
  - Important to understand what comes from the tag vs. what is derived
  - Important to have unified understanding of buyers and advertisers ("buy-side entities")
    - For example, would enable us to connect aggregate blocks of a common advertiser across networks
    - Should all entities go to a standardized list, or should certain things be network-specific? Default thinking should be Ford is Ford – not defining repeatedly for every network.

- At minimum, prompt people to connect a new advertiser with a system-defined name – build more carrots into the UI for this
- Today in DFP, some people create copies of advertisers to represent different regions
- Roadmap: Phased approach to end goal
  - Need to make decision on "shared container" approach
  - Need to standardize pickers: i.e., here are the objects that make up DRX
  - Scott: While we have two separate worlds of inventory, unify the objects first – then becomes easier to flatten
    - Arun: you can use AdX tags and DFP ad units at the same time today – they are orthogonal
  - Jonathan: are rules a "timeless truth" that apply to everything, or are they specific to indirect sales?

Follow-up
- Didn't cover: forecasting, creatives, admin, orders, API
- Forecasting should be its own session
- Creatives should be brought back (half hour next week)
- Admin without full group
- API without full group
- Orders – need to resolve in-progress stuff with XSM
- Need to share homepage plans

Additional notes
Notes from Aparna