The current policy restricts calling AdX from another yield manager or exchange when there is AdX sub-syndication (i.e., network partners) in place.
We define a yield manager as a system that automatically determines the CPM from multiple indirect channels. We define a exchange as something with RTB callouts. This definition has worked well since, even in systems with multiple functions, these can typically be turned off.

We are planning to remove the AdX sub-syndication dependency in January once we have a good track record with the full Admeld functionality integrated into AdX.

-scott

On Fri, Mar 22, 2013 at 7:49 PM, Martin Pál <mpal@google.com> wrote:

Scott,
thanks a lot for the explanation, that reasoning makes sense. Let me ask some followup questions to understand this space better.
I presume AdMeld was a SSP and they were redirecting to AdX, which would appear to be against this policy. Similarly, using Rubicon to run a private exchange and fall through to AdX for the open one is technically against this policy, right?

I am wondering what is a good working definition of an ad server, because in my mind the line between an ad server and a yield manager is fairly blurry, as these things venture into each other's territory. The reason I ask is that presumably integration with "ad servers" is presumably a good thing that should be encouraged while integration with the rest is undesirable. I'd like to tell the good and the bad guys apart.

- if it lets you book reservations, it feels like an ad server
- something that helps you manage callback chains manually is an ad server
- if it however automatically fetches CPM's and dynamically rearranges callback chains to optimize revenue it's a yield manager. But XfP also ventures into this territory with LiveCpm
- if it does dynamic backfill, it is likely an ad server but it could also be a yield manager
- if it accepts rtb bids and handles billing, it's an exchange

Thanks again,

martin

PTX0128

1:23-cv-00108

On Fri, Mar 22, 2013 at 7:16 PM, Scott Spencer <scottspencer@google.com> wrote:

This was a strategic decision.

We allow redirection from 3rd party ad servers, but not from other exchanges or yield managers. Why? Because if we did then those systems would immediately have a super set of demand - anything the SSP had + all of AdX (including AdWords). No one would sign up for AdX directly.

In addition, such a scenario is bad for buyers because every impression could potentially go through multiple RTB call outs making buyers compete with themselves.

-scott

On Mar 22, 2013 12:33 PM, "Eyal Manor" <emanor@google.com> wrote:

This is a big topic, the latest i know of , and there may have been development that i am not aware of ,
is that you can have client side back fill into adx, with out with out dynamic allocation from your adserver, but not

from you SSP, as adx is the SSP and you will pay more rev share, have less controls and more latency.

Long ago we scanned and blocked various YM refer tags we detected, not sure if this is still enforced.

30% of adx pubs queries use own adserving solution and client side redirects.

On Fri, Mar 22, 2013 at 12:10 PM, Martin Pál <mpal@google.com> wrote:

I stand corrected by Jacob: apparently we do allow browser-side third party dynamic allocation to some whitelisted publishers. The question about the policy remains, as well as whether we should be friendlier to third party serving stacks, opening up dynamic allocation to everyone and potentially offer other integration points (like allow calling AdX twice, once private, once open exchange).

On Fri, Mar 22, 2013 at 11:24 AM, Martin Pál <mpal@google.com> wrote:

A thread on adx-questions brings up the fact that AdX policy essentially prohibits the use of SSP's, yield managers or third party ad servers in conjunction with AdX. In practice, many publishers ignore that and use ad servers and all sorts of indirection anyway. What is the purpose of that policy? Wouldn't abolishing it and adopting a friendlier stance towards 3rd party ad servers (e.g. by supporting a protocol to implement dynamic

allocation, which is currently technically impossible) be good for our business?

Feedback appreciated. Thanks,

martin

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Martin Pál** <mpal@google.com>
Date: Fri, Mar 22, 2013 at 11:15 AM
Subject: Re: [adx-questions:10197] TYM question
To: Leo Masri <masri@google.com>, Rivka Spivak <rivka@google.com>
Cc: Mark Scannell <scannell@google.com>, Karina Szmulewicz
<kszmulewicz@google.com>, adx-questions <adx-questions@google.com>

Ouch. I am an eng on AdX, thinking about our integration with third party ad servers. If
dynamic allocation from third party ad servers is explicitly prohibited by our terms of
service, that seems pretty bad. Thanks Leo for pointing out that passage, I'll bring it up
with our PM's.

On Tue, Mar 19, 2013 at 11:13 AM, Leo Masri <masri@google.com> wrote:

Hey Mark,
I'm not policy expert, someone else may be in a better position to answer. But if you
question relates to dynamic allocation, then yes, there's no way to do something like that
if you're not on DFP.

Thanks,

Leo

On Tue, Mar 19, 2013 at 11:14 AM, Mark Scannell <scannell@google.com> wrote:

Leo,
Just a general question about that policy...

Doesn't that policy preclude what an Ad Server itself does?

So if a customer doesn't have DFP, but something that works remarkably similar, wouldn't that
be a "system used for dynamically or programmatically allocating ad requests to Ad
Networks based on real-time pricing information or automatic estimations of real-time
pricing information?" As that's what DFP would do with Live CPMs. And, even
without live CPMs, it seems a bit strange to draw the line between manual updating of
the CPMs from the Ad Networks and automatic updating of those CPMs.

Thanks,

Mark

On 18 March 2013 14:12, Leo Masri <masri@google.com> wrote:

This behavior is against AdX policies:

Restrictions on Passing and Redirecting Inventory. Inventory coming from a Seller Partner to the Ad Exchange may be subject to rules set within the Ad Exchange (including, but not limited to, auction rules). Thus, before sending an impression to the Ad Exchange, a Seller Partner must not first pass that impression through any system used for dynamically or programmatically allocating ad requests to Ad Networks (i.e., entities that buy on behalf of multiple advertisers, taking principal risk on the transaction) based on real-time pricing information (e.g., RTB) or automatic estimations of real-time pricing information (e.g., yield management). Further, a Seller Partner must not redirect inventory from the Ad Exchange back to its own system, if that system is used for dynamically or programmatically allocating ad requests to Ad Networks based on real-time pricing information (e.g., RTB) or automatic estimations of real-time pricing information (e.g., yield management).

On Mon, Mar 18, 2013 at 10:57 AM, Karina Szmulewicz <kszmulewicz@google.com> wrote:

Hi Team, I hope you are all doing great.
One of my publishers is an ad network using NPM and is developing an in-house TYM (Traditional Yield Manager).

I'd like to know if it is compliant for them to use this in-house TYM to scrab the AdX CPM dynamically, so they can serve the best performing ad each time.

I hope you can give me green light on this!

Best,

Karina.

Karina Szmulewicz
PBS - Online Partnerships Group - LatAm

+54 11 5530 3320
kszmulewicz@google.com

Agregá a +Google Argentina a tus círculos. Ahora en Google+

Google Latin America is hiring! Apply online http://www.google.com.ar/intl/es/jobs/index.html!

CONFIDENTIALITY. This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the wrong person. Thanks!

This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the wrong person. Thanks.

Mark Scannell | Technical Account Manager | scannell@google.com | +44-(0)78-7621-8151

This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the wrong person. Thanks.