

From: Jonathan Bellack <jbellack@google.com>
To: Aparna Pappu <apappu@google.com>
Sent: Mon, 17 Oct 2016 19:26:03 -0400
Subject: Fwd: [Sam specific] Jedi++ deck -- feedback and suggestion for action

- others, A+J alignment

FYI below -- I am asking Sam to take it up a notch on getting this Jedi++ plan and deck in shape. I think this is a key step for him to pivot from idea guy / bizdev guy to senior product leader. He may struggle with this but it is hopefully a learning process and he'll improve from here. (All of my leads have had some challenge shaping this stuff the first time around.) I wanted you to have the context in case his behavior changes observably this week. 8)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jonathan Bellack <jbellack@google.com>
Date: Monday, October 17, 2016
Subject: [Sam specific] Jedi++ deck -- feedback and suggestion for action
To: Sam Cox <samcox@google.com>

- others, just Sam:Jonathan

Hi, Sam. I want to be clear and early with feedback, sorry it's over email from a plane but I didn't want to wait.

I do think your ideation is fantastic and valuable to Google. The deck shows you have definitely put a bunch of time into thinking Jedi++ through and laying out challenges & opportunities, and you have a strong vision for a positive end state.

That said, I expected the supporting data, level of organization in the argument, and the depth of forward planning to be significantly further along six weeks after the strat summit and the big dinner with Eisar where Jedi++ was coined. In particular this is somewhat more concerning since this is the first time I am seeing a Jedi++ plan and we're only a week from VP review. What you shared would be a pretty good first cut if we were a month out for something this new & previously undefined. I have found over the years however that new projects on the right track get the foundational thinking out well in advance, and are pretty well structured by the time they're in the last week of prep.

I recognize that is a pretty high bar, but senior product leaders at Google are expected to go beyond the analysis / insights that suggest action, and craft the actionable plans that big teams can get on board with and have impact in the market.

I would recommend really clearing your decks of everything external facing and non-essential internal between now and the review, and put the time into the core PM'ing work here -- grinding out the data to back up the Jedi++ story and play out the impact of the go-forward plans, organizing and consolidating the ideas about what to do next into a few internally consistent, buildable options that are easy to explain; co-planning with Jim about how this could actually get to market in 2017; and especially vetting this extensively with cross-functional teams so their views are taken into account, and you can go into the review with confidence

PTX1543

1:23-cv-00108

about where you've got support, or where there are remaining open questions, and how you are going to get those issues resolved in timely fashion.

I really can tell that there's depth in the thinking in the deck, I think it's more about taking this all to the next level as a senior product leader. Think of it this way -- Seuss planning for 1H 2017 starts in a matter of weeks, so this is crunch time for working out the details so that your PM team, eng partners, and sales stakeholders can pick up the work and execute to succeed.

I hope this makes sense. I feel like email is not the best communication medium for this, so I'd be happy to talk directly at the earliest mutually agreeable time, if you'd like, and spend the time needed to work through this and help you succeed with this project.

Thanks.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jonathan Bellack** <jbellack@google.com>

Date: Monday, October 17, 2016

Subject: Jedi++ deck -- feedback

To: Sam Cox <samcox@google.com>, Max Loubser <maxl@google.com>, Jim Giles <jimgiles@google.com>, Aparna Pappu <apappu@google.com>

Hi Sam, Max, Jim (Aparna cc'ed). Thanks for sharing the draft Jedi++ deck. There has clearly been a lot of thought that has gone into it. It is going to need a good amount of work to be ready for a VP review. I am confident you'll be able to get it into good shape. Here are some thoughts.

- 1 - Overall -- needs fewer words and a more from-the-basics approach. Need to assume Paul & Eisar do not remember past decisions, and do not have a grasp on the fine details. Suggest you start with a couple of brief remedial slides that explain again what is going on in the market, what we decided to do, what has happened since then, and why we are back talking about something more.

- 2 - Data slides. There are a few data points in the early slides, but should really be at least one slide laying out the current data on HB adoption and use. Including especially backup for what you're claiming. If you really think HB is costing \$350mm ARR, how do you know, what's the math on that? What's the trend on HB adoption? Etc. A good data point to include would be AppNexus pulling AdX spend when they have their HB installed.

- 3 - Tone. The deck has a hyperbolic, advocacy tone -- claiming HB is totally superior, etc -- that will get a strong backlash in a meeting. The Decision Quality framework that Paul has asked us to use explicitly pushes back against the idea of argument by advocacy, and instead wants a more sober and systematic presentation -- here is the situation, here's the data; now here are a set of options that we could take going forward, with analysis of opportunities and risks of each; now let's discuss together which option we want to pursue. I recommend going over the Decision Quality stuff, I shared a couple slides on it at the DRX strat day in June, and/or get the book Decision Quality.

4 - HB vs EB. This is going to be a hard topic to explain clearly to the VPs, I suspect Eisar will derail quickly if this is not presented very clearly. George and Gargi did a good table of features of HB vs EB in the original EB planning decks. I would recommend going back to that kind of format and putting together a slide explaining the key feature differences now / as HB has been developing. A pre-meeting with Eisar might also be helpful to ensure he understands this clearly.

4a -- HB drawbacks. As an example of the tone challenge, there's not much in this deck about HB's drawbacks. There's some stuff about the operational challenge, but nothing about latency, technology, or fraud risk. There's the whole work stream with Catchpoint, AMP doesn't support HB, etc.

5 - Options. I think what you've got now is really v1 of the options -- all the different things that could be done / should be done. It is too much detail and too fragmented, though -- to be honest I couldn't even read through the detail slides on every option. I suggest you pull this back and up a level, and try to characterize a few macro options, with the risks and opportunities of each. For example, maybe the options are: 1) EB as planned; 2) EBv2 (adding Deals and other stuff that has always been planned); 3) Jedi++ meaning add more to EB and DRX to attract more players; 4) Open DRX -- every possible change to try to bring in all of the demand; and 5) Hybrid -- what if Facebook or Amazon or Omnicom refuse to ever go back to working through our pipes.

6 - Product/eng specificity. It would be good to have a more grounded view of what would actually be built and how things would actually work under each option. You need this for credibility -- you don't want to come across as a sales team saying "just build something better than HB and we'll win!" A good example of this would be -- the conversation under way about first price and other auction dynamics. That's not really clear in here. Another example -- what's the roadmap on this stuff? Is this doable in Seuss? All of 2017? Will this take through 2018?

7 - Buyer reaction. The deck does not really speak to how the buyers will react to each of these options. I get the goal to create something they can't say no to, but you do not present any evidence that any/all of these changes will actually bring OpenX or AppNexus or Omnicom or Amazon or Facebook to the table. You want to make that logic very clear and be able to back it up with some specific examples. Another piece of this -- many of the exchanges out there look weak, even AppNexus laid people off. Are we confident that the real HB impact is as big as the hype? What does our buy-side sales team think?

8 - Paul's Facebook scenario. Paul told me he thinks Facebook may never agree to go through our pipes for strategic reasons, and asked what our plan would be in that case. I think that needs to be considered and addressed directly.

9 - Analytic rigor of the impact. There are a ton of ideas here. I know you're not going to be able to predict everything about the impact. But it would be good to have at least a basic analytic tool for what's going to happen if/as we do these things. GeorgeL had a basic model for the original EB decision, maybe that can be updated. An example of why this matters -- if HB right now is \$350mm, is it growing, and at what pace? Is doing Jedi++ defensive to hold the revenue we have, or an opportunity to win back that \$350mm? How much will we actually win

back with this plan? When you talk about bringing networks into Jedi, what's the revenue impact of that (loss from OA / gain from Jedi)?

10 - Commercialization plan. How would all this stuff come to market? Is any of it GA-gating, that we believe current EB will not be credible in the market without it? Is this all just the EB roadmap post-GA? Do we need to make big marketing pushes around this? What does Sales say?

11 - Intersection with other DRX projects. There's a big implication in the deck that the growth of HB is powered by Deals options. Paul is a linear kind of guy and is going to want to understand how that relates to our overall Deals strategy. Eisar has strong feelings about PA and PDs, he will apply that bias to whatever deal types you are talking about here. Both will want to know how these kind of deals relate to what DBM is doing in deals. Which leads to really vital final point:

12 - Stakeholder participation. This deck is still mostly in a vacuum of DRX PM+eng. It really needs to reflect active discussion and agreement with GDN and DBM leadership, and our sales partners. For example -- the deck just says "Force GDN & DBM to share bid landscapes." Have they agreed? We have agreement for some experimentation, is that under way yet? Have ChrisL and Dan Taylor agreed that this is a good strategy for sales, or are there points of difference to work through?

Here's a rough idea of an exec summary (and parallel deck structure) that I think would be effective:

- A year ago we reviewed header bidding and decided to pursue Exchange Bidding (server-side) with a goal to be "slightly better" than HB.
- HB has continued to grow rapidly and is measurably impacting our revenues (data)
 - Tech providers, buyers, and sellers are now innovating on HB (examples, education on what good new things HB can do)
 - Major rivals FAN and Amazon have made big bets on HB, to avoid our pipes (data)
 - Industry does not seem to care about the latency impact (yet -- analysis of why?)
- Our project is hitting internal targets (per prior deck), however
 - Large buyer adoption is moving slower than hoped (data, buyer quotes)
 - Continued HB innovation means our launch product will be inferior to header bidding (show the feature chart red/yellow/green, how it's different now than planned before)
- We need to decide on our course of action forward.
 - 1 - Stay the course (launch EB and iterate) -- EB will have some impact since pubs are enthusiastic about it, but will not slow HB dramatically
 - 2 - EB acceleration -- do more of our planned EB features faster (list, discussion of trade offs needed to move it faster)
 - 3 - Jedi++ -- rethink EB as a "much superior" offering (what gets added to option #2 to make this happen, the estimated financial impact of Jedi++, where are the tough choices in policy or whatever)

4 - Jedi triple-plus, basically a fully open DRX -- what gets added to option #3 to make this happen, the further financial implications, the drawbacks/questions

5 - Change course and productive HB -- did we back the wrong horse? If FAN and Amazon and AppNexus and Omnicom will never join HB, should we cut our losses and go back to our original idea to productize HB, build it into GPT tags and add DRX features to make it work better? We get many of the data benefits, and can still try to convert things to server-side where they do authentically make sense.

Each should have a common format, for example stuff like: timeline; revenue potential; risks; etc.

That isn't a fully considered outline so could be missing stuff, but I hope it is directionally useful.

--

-- Jonathan Bellack / jbellack@google.com
Director, Product Management / Publisher Ad Platforms

--

-- Jonathan Bellack / jbellack@google.com
Director, Product Management / Publisher Ad Platforms

--

-- Jonathan Bellack / jbellack@google.com
Director, Product Management / Publisher Ad Platforms