

---

**From:** Piyush Naik </O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MICROSOFT.ONMICROSOFT.COM-55760-PIYUSH NAIK>  
**To:** Sachin Malhotra  
**Sent:** 7/24/2020 6:58:46 PM  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

Just FYI. Google is pushing back on auction time bidding.

**From:** Piyush Naik  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2020 11:54 AM  
**To:** Eduardo Indacochea <REDACTED@microsoft.com>; Dianna Wu <REDACTED@microsoft.com>  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

Thanks Eduardo. I'm glad you are holding ground.

We do know that ATB is gaining rapid adoption in SA360 though we have no way to quantify.

The biggest reason we need this is not because we need the conversion data. It is because it creates ROI disparity. SA360 publicly claims that ATB provides 15-30% lift in conversions for Google Ads. Advertisers unfavorably compare that with ours which is not using ATB and either manually or automatically shift budgets to Google. We have heard this again and again from customers and sales. Again it is not that we care about the Floodlight data in particular but the fact that this is creating a very unfair imbalance where customers are using ATB for Google and intraday bidding for Bing.

If we sign without this, I'd go as far as to say that execs will need to give us relief on headwinds due to this that we are seeing already and will only increase.

**From:** Eduardo Indacochea <REDACTED@microsoft.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2020 11:39 AM  
**To:** Piyush Naik <REDACTED@microsoft.com>; Dianna Wu <REDACTED@microsoft.com>  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

FYI – I am holding ground with Google. They want to exclude SA360 Auction Time Bidding, and I am saying that we shouldn't sign the agreement without it.

@Piyush Naik do you have an idea of size of it? My sense is that it's the majority of campaigns.

**From:** Eduardo Indacochea  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2020 11:37 AM  
**To:** Chris Weinstein <REDACTED@microsoft.com>  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

This one is worth a lot, getting conversions from them to run Auto Bidding is worth holding ground, even if it means risk to the agreement. I wouldn't sign the agreement without it.

**From:** Chris Weinstein <REDACTED@microsoft.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 24, 2020 11:04 AM  
**To:** Eduardo Indacochea <REDACTED@microsoft.com>  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

Thanks Eduardo. I'm aligned with you that this issue is important and that Joan is being disingenuous in her argument.

**EXHIBIT**  
**PSX00743**

That said, would you delay this deal further and potentially not close it over this issue? Or does the benefit of the other features still make this worth doing?

In thinking through how to proceed, I'd like make sure I understand our perspective on that balance. (FWIW, even if we wouldn't walk away on this point, I don't think we need to concede it immediately).

**From:** Eduardo Indacochea [REDACTED]@microsoft.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2020 4:19 PM  
**To:** Chris Weinstein [REDACTED]@microsoft.com>  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

I think labeling Microsoft Auto-Bidding to Microsoft Auction-Time Bidding is semantics which avoids the substance.

The substance is SA360 Auction Time Bidding delegates the Auction Time Bidding to Google Ads, passing the conversion and goal signals to Google Ads. We have to push back:

1. Precedent: they cannot say that we didn't request. We have always been talking about SA360 Auction Time Bidding with her team, so it isn't a surprise. In fact, they design it for us for a test.
2. Substance: we have always said that we want Auto-Bidding parity to Google Ads. And they have a hybrid approach of SA360 and GA Auto-Bidding. It's elusive to have parity for standard but not for the important one.
3. Impact and value: we cannot afford them confusing it, this is probably the single most important one in this discussion – includes conversions and bidding.

thx

**From:** Chris Weinstein [REDACTED]@microsoft.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2020 3:57 PM  
**To:** Eduardo Indacochea [REDACTED]@microsoft.com>  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

FYI on Joan's response. I haven't seen this tone (or speed of response) from her before in email.

I think the core point she's making is the yellow highlighted. Then I think the green highlighted is an effort to genericize the "Auction Time Bidding" phrase to delink it from the specific feature in SA360. Would you agree?

Let's connect to evaluate these and share it back with the team along with a recommendation on how to proceed.

**From:** Joan Braddi [REDACTED]@google.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 23, 2020 3:24 PM  
**To:** Chris Weinstein [REDACTED]@microsoft.com>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

Chris, what we've discussed over the past several months is building support for the standalone Microsoft bidder in SA360. While our eng teams may have discussed other possibilities in the past, your previous notes to me were very clear that this is what Microsoft was seeking. This is what you sent along on 4/22 to explain Microsoft's auto-bidding ask:

"The support will be comparable to the support SA360 provides to Google Ads bid strategies (which are separate from the SA360 bid strategies), as described in SA360 documentation: <https://support.google.com/searchads/answer/6155651?hl=en>. Just as SA360 customers should be able to use Google Ads bid strategies in lieu of the SA360 bid strategies, they should be able to use Microsoft's auto-bidding strategies in lieu of the SA360 bid strategies."

We have agreed to support what you requested by building the ability for SA360 customers to use and manage the MSFT bidder in SA360, just as we support use of the Google Ads bidder described in the article you cite

above. Floodlight data is out of scope for the standalone Microsoft bidder we've discussed SA360 supporting. That data is not shared to any standalone bidder, including for Google Ads. So we'd strike the last sentence added in item 1 of the appendix.

Your note from last evening suggests something very different. You share a different article describing an integration of the Google Ads bidder into SA360 bid strategies, not support for your bidder that is "separate from" and "in lieu of" SA360 bid strategies. That's a different and much more complex new feature than what Microsoft requested during this process.

Lastly, regarding the "Auction-Time Bidding" language, given that the bid strategy settings in item 1 of the Appendix are auction-time bidding settings, we'd propose removing "Auction-Time Bidding" from the body of item 1 and modifying the header of item 1 to read "Microsoft Advertising Auction-Time Bidding".

Hope this helps clarify. Let me know if you have questions.

Joan

On Wed, Jul 22, 2020 at 7:07 PM Chris Weinstein <[REDACTED]@microsoft.com> wrote:

Hi Joan –

Following up on our conversation, I checked with the team here on the Auction Time bidding issue and the Floodlight conversion point. Let me try to articulate what we are looking for here as I believe they are related:

- Today, SA360 customers who select that their campaigns have Auction Time bidding will have the SA360 autobidding objectives sent to the Google Ads autobidding solution and the SA360 Floodlight conversion goals and data for all campaigns sent to the Google Ads autobidding solution. This behavior is described at <https://support.google.com/searchads/answer/7553026> and the video at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\\_continue=1&v=mckBYJI8Jz0&feature=emb\\_logo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=mckBYJI8Jz0&feature=emb_logo).
- The Bing Advertising autobidding solution should have the same access as the Google Ads one. Specifically, that when SA360 customers select Auction Time bidding, the SA360 autobidding objectives are sent to the Bing Advertising autobidding solution and the SA360 Floodlight conversion goals and data for all campaigns are sent to the Bing Advertising autobidding solution, just like they are sent to Google.

I believe your engineering team is aware of this implementation as our team has been discussing with Amit Varia to implement a test last year.

Hope that helps clarify. Happy to chat if you have questions.

Thanks,

-- Chris Weinstein

**From:** Chris Weinstein

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 22, 2020 12:39 PM

**To:** Joan Braddi <[REDACTED]@google.com>

**Subject:** RE: Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

Hi Joan –

Thanks for the time earlier. To confirm that I was understanding:

Other than minor clean that might come from Google's legal group, Google is ok with the draft that I sent on Friday with 3 potential exceptions:

1. The addition of "Auction-Time Bidding" in item 1 in the Appendix. Your team thought this was unneeded and potentially redundant (although conceptually not objectionable) and might adjust the language to clarify it. Can you forward how you all would adjust the language here so we can resolve this one?
2. Google isn't willing to provide the Floodlight conversion data per the final sentence Microsoft added to item 1 in Appendix 1. You said that that data isn't provided to any of the standalone autobidding solutions, even Google's own Google Search one. It is, however, provided to the 'native' autobidding solution within SA360. Google's proposal to resolve is to delete this final sentence.
3. You'll confirm the date we provided for the delivery of the Priority Features or offer a counter proposal. You'll check with Don on when you can provide that.

Let me know if I'm following everything correctly here.

Thanks,

-- Chris Weinstein

-----Original Appointment-----

**From:** Chris Weinstein

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 22, 2020 10:27 AM

**To:** Chris Weinstein; Joan Braddi

**Subject:** Google Feedback on Microsoft Draft

**When:** Wednesday, July 22, 2020 12:05 PM-12:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

**Where:** Microsoft Teams Meeting

---

## Microsoft Teams meeting

**Join on your computer or mobile app**

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

**Or call in (audio only)**

[+1 323-849-4874,,807584217#](#) United States, Los Angeles

Phone Conference ID: 807 584 217#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

---

--

This email and the information it contains are confidential and may be 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.

The above communication may include discussions or proposals of a potential business arrangement, and if so, are provided solely as a basis for further discussion, and should not be intended to and do not constitute a legally binding obligation. No legally binding obligations will be created, implied, or inferred until an agreement in final form is executed in writing by all parties involved.