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From: Prashil Fulodia
To: "Karen Crow" <karencrow@google.com>; "Tim Armstrong"
time@google.com; bisma
rck@google.com; bismac@karencrow.com; tlsh@gmail.com
Cc: "Lashika Samaresinghe" <lashika@karencrow.com>; ssfiller@gmail.com
<filler@karencrow.com>; "Jessica Bluett" <jbluett@karencrow.com>; "Ted Souder"
ted@karencrow.com
Date: 20040215
Time: Sent: 2/15/2004 1:24:37 A
Subject: RE: Trademark Policy Changes

Karen,

Here's what I understood Tim was talking about (Tim, please correct if I am
wrong):

Direct advertisers who have strong trademarks are able to derive special
benefit from use of those trademarks as keywords (given our current
policy).

By asking us to stop other advertisers from using their trademarked
terms as keywords, these advertisers are able to get top spot for very
little money (for queries containing their trademarked terms).

The example I gave on the Thursday naming was 1-800-Flowers. As of
December:

Average CPC across all campaigns was $1.44, but average CPC for the
"Brand Names" campaign was only $0.20. (This campaign included their
trademarked
terms: 1800 flow., 1-800 flow., 1800 flowers, 1800flower,
1800flowers, 800flower, 800 flowers, 800Flower, 800flowers.)

The "Brand Names" campaign accounted for 25% clicks, but only 4%
cost.

You're right about needing to know conversions to estimate true ROI.
However,
by making the simple (though incorrect) assumption that conversion
across all keywords is the same, the math indicates that 1-800-Flowers
will see a 25% drop in ROI (25% less clicks for the same amount of
money). This is a significant change, and so, in this case, Mike Gottfried
needs to know this impact to the client and what we can do to help.

Eric Filller will work with someone on his team (I think this will be
Jessica Bluett) to provide this kind of analysis for some of the clients
whom we think will be significantly impacted.
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Hopo this makes sense. Please let me know if you have questions. Thanks!

Prashant

--- Original Message ---
From: Karen Crow [mailto:kcrow@google.com]
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2004 4:06 PM
To: Prashant Fuloria; Tim Armstrong; bismarck@google.com; tish@google.com
Cc: Lashika Samarasinha
Subject: RE: Trademark Policy Changes

Tim,

As we discussed, Ted and I will work with the Ops team to identify the key clients that we think will be impacted the most, and we can take special care on communications, proactively developing keyword list additions to offset anticipated decline in clicks, etc.

However, I am not clear on the ROI piece that you've mentioned. Very few of our Premium Advertisers use our back-end conversion tracking system, so we don't have visibility into their actual conversion data. I'm sure that some of the angry advertisers might tell us that their ROIs have tanked as well, but we won't have empirical data to do analysis, measure impact, etc.

Can you clarify what you're looking for with the ROI stuff?

kc

--- Original Message ---
From: Prashant Fuloria [mailto:fuloria@google.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2004 8:18 AM
To: Tim Armstrong; bismarck@google.com; tish@google.com; kcrow@google.com
Cc:
Leshika Samaranasingha
Subject: RE: Trademark Policy Changes

Tim, Karen:

Leshika is the APMM who will provide us the product marketing support that we will need. She will work closely with Bismarck and me on this over the next few weeks.

Prashant

--Original Message--
From: Tim Armstrong <mattotim@google.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2004 7:58 AM
To: bismarck@google.com; fish@google.com; kcrowe@google.com
Cc: tutorial@google.com
Subject: Re: Trademark Policy Changes

Bismarck

I also left a message for Karen - this may turn out to change the ROI of a lot of major customers, so it would be helpful if you can be on call to help Karen if we need to do any emergency product/marketing projects - and also make sure the product people are helping us track the ad stats - thank you - I will check in when I get back to NYC tonight - TA

--Original Message--
From: Bismarck Lepe <bismarck@google.com>
To: Tim Rowsand <fish@google.com>
Cc: Prashant Futrelle <tutorial@google.com>; Tim Armstrong <tim@google.com>
Sent: Thu Feb 12 00:44:02 2004
Subject: Re: Trademark Policy Changes

Hi Tim,
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I spoke with Prashant yesterday after the trademark meeting with Tim and the sales directors. Prashant has briefed me on the specifics of the meeting and the direction of the project.

Moving forward I will keep Tim and sales management abreast of the latest developments.

Thanks,

Bismarck

--- Original Message ----
From: Tish Rowland <tish@google.com>
Date: Thu Feb 12 06:28:10 PST 2004
Subject: Trademark Policy Changes
To: Bismarck Lepe <bismarck@google.com>
Cc: Prashant Futoria <futoria@google.com>, tim@google.com

Bismarck,

Tim has asked that you take the lead (for Direct Sales) on the Trademark Policy Changes. Please work Prashant on these issues.

Thank you.

Tish Rowland
Google Inc
212-994-4824 direct
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