## Audience Management

| Use Case | Original Classification | Final Classification | Implications for brands and media agencies | Implications for publishers and media companies |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Add a user to an audience, even if they have not visited my site | Impractical | Impractical | Interest Group creation imposes operational costs on advertisers, leading to higher overall marketing expenses. This may result in less efficient campaigns, especially impacting small to mid-sized brands with tighter budgets and limited resources. Trying to work around these limitations without proper tools or expertise can increase compliance risks. Managing campaigns effectively will demand more manual effort and time, further straining resources. | For publishers, not supporting Interest Group creation for brands has significant implications. This can lead to reduced demand for ad inventory as media owners seek more efficient audience targeting methods, potentially decreasing ad revenue. Operationally, publishers may struggle to meet the increasing expectations for targeting and personalization. |
| Exclusion Targeting | Not Supported | Degraded | Exclusion targeting optimizes ad spend by avoiding wasteful impressions and ensuring ads reach desired audiences, enhancing campaign efficiency. **There are possibilities in which exclusion targeting could be achieved within the Protected Audience framework on behalf of a brand, however all are blocked by current API restrictions.** | The restrictions for exclusion targeting may result in reduced ad revenue, as media owners may opt for walled gardens. Small to mid-sized publishers, already facing fierce competition from larger entities with superior ad tech, risk further market erosion without exclusion targeting. Losing advertising partners to rivals could jeopardize their financial stability. |
| Create and modify an audience across domains | Not Supported | Not Supported | Crafting tailored audiences and adapting in real-time ensures effective targeting. However, lacking support for flexible adjustments poses operational hurdles, especially for smaller advertisers. Maintaining audience segments is crucial for success and cost-effectiveness, amid legal and financial risks. Insufficient support complicates navigating these complexities. | Without fluid audience modification support, smaller publishers face operational challenges. Adapting to audience changes, particularly recency-based ones, is resource-intensive and legally complex. Publishers, regardless of size, must recognize the impact of not offering this feature on competitiveness, audience scaling, and operational efficiency. |
| Look-alike modeling | Not Supported | Not Supported | Look-alike modeling extends brand reach beyond existing customers by targeting new users resembling the "seed audience." This efficient approach ensures scalability while maintaining relevance and engagement. Without it, advertisers struggle to reach potential customers, especially impacting small to mid-sized companies with limited budgets. Absence of look-alike modeling risks higher acquisition costs and lower campaign effectiveness, hindering growth and competitiveness. | Platforms lacking support for Look-alike modeling risk losing appeal to advertisers aiming for campaign efficiency, particularly impacting smaller publishers and ad tech providers competing with larger counterparts. Without access to such methods, publishers may struggle to meet advertiser demands, leading to decreased ad revenue and reliance on lower-value ad networks, hindering effective content monetization. |

## Auction Dynamics

| Use Case | Original Classification | Final Classification | Implications for brands and media agencies | Implications for publishers and media companies |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Target a Single Campaign to My Online Audience | Supported | Supported | As advertising strategies evolve, it's crucial for advertisers to adapt their approach to "remarketing" to existing audiences. With the shift away from third-party cookies to cohort-based targeting, advertisers must now focus on grouping users with similar interests and behaviors into Interest Groups. This transition requires a deeper understanding of their audience and effective segmentation to align with these cohorts. | Publishers need to adjust their monetization strategies. Those prioritizing content quality and audience relationships now have to enable Interest Group owners to embed their code directly on webpages, requiring direct integration with multiple companies. |
| Budget and Pacing | Temporarily Supported | Temporarily Supported | Effectively budgeting and pacing campaigns is crucial for efficient allocation of advertising spend over the campaign duration. This ensures a consistent presence in front of the target audience and avoids early budget exhaustion or underutilization. Mastery of budget and pacing management is essential to judiciously allocate spend throughout the campaign. Ineffective management can lead to overspending, causing logistical issues and make-goods, or underspending, missing opportunities for brand exposure. Both extremes drain resources or limit market potential. Small to mid-sized businesses face amplified challenges due to tighter budgets, impacting competitiveness and growth. Real-time adjustments are vital to avoid financial pitfalls, highlighting the need for precise campaign management to ensure efficiency and prevent reconciliation complexities. | Providing tools and platforms for advertisers to budget and pace campaigns effectively is crucial for building strong advertiser relationships. Limited visibility into budget and pacing directly impacts inventory management and revenue for publishers. Overspending depletes ad inventory, inflating costs and restricting availability, while underspending leads to unused inventory and reduced revenue prospects. This lack of transparency complicates inventory allocation and pricing, fostering inefficiencies. Advanced tools and analytics are vital for advertisers, especially small to mid-sized enterprises, ensuring consistent inventory demand and aiding revenue management and strategic planning. This streamlines financial reconciliation, maintaining efficiency in the programmatic ecosystem. |
| Frequency/Recency Capping | Degraded | Degraded | The decline in advertisers' ability to control ad frequency across different creatives, campaigns, or media outlets has significant implications. Ad frequency control is crucial for optimizing advertising effectiveness and efficiency. Without it, advertisers risk overexposure and ad fatigue, diminishing returns on ad spend and potentially harming the brand's image. This is especially concerning for small to mid-sized businesses, where budget efficiency is key. Overspending on excessive impressions to the same users can quickly deplete limited budgets, diverting resources from reaching new potential customers or reinforcing messages at critical decision-making stages. | From a business standpoint, the lack of effective frequency control can result in brand dissatisfaction, inefficient ad performance, and a diminished user experience. Without proper mechanisms, advertisers with larger budgets may dominate ad space, leading to ad cannibalization and reduced diversity in ad content. This can deter other advertisers and limit the platform's attractiveness over time, potentially decreasing ad revenue. Without frequency capping tools, publishers may struggle to maintain a competitive edge, impacting user experience and their ability to attract a diverse mix of advertising clients. |
| Bid Using a Deal ID | Degraded | Degraded | The ability to create specific deals and submit bids is crucial for advertisers and sellers to negotiate ad inventory agreements. These deals allow advertisers to customize campaigns and secure favorable terms, improving ad spend efficiency. However, if this capability is compromised, advertisers may struggle to secure advantageous deals, potentially leading to higher costs. Smaller businesses, operating with tight budgets, rely on such deals to maximize advertising impact. Degradation of this capability can hinder their competitiveness, impacting financial stability and market position. Advertisers must explore alternative strategies to optimize campaigns in this constrained programmatic advertising landscape. | The ability to create tailored deals and submit bids is vital for publishers to maximize ad inventory value and attract diverse advertisers. However, if this capability declines, publishers may struggle to negotiate favorable deals and see reduced advertiser diversity. Smaller publishers, reliant on a broad advertiser base, could face significant challenges. This degradation could impact revenue generation, competitiveness, and the overall programmatic advertising ecosystem. Publishers must adapt to a less flexible deal-making environment, finding innovative ways to retain advertisers and optimize inventory value. Small to mid-sized publishers may need to explore alternative revenue streams to offset potential losses from degraded deal-making capabilities. |
| Second Price Auction | Degraded | Removed | In these auctions, the winning bidder pays slightly more than the second-highest bid, potentially lowering advertising costs. If this capability is degraded, advertisers, especially those with smaller budgets, may face increased costs for ad placements. This could force smaller businesses to adjust their digital advertising strategies or accept reduced investment returns, impacting their growth and competitiveness. Advertisers must adapt to remain visible and engaging to their target audiences in this shifted scenario, making strategic bidding and budget management more crucial than before.<br><br>**This use cases was removed because it relates to auctions that are not widely used today.** | The traditional second-price auction maximizes ad inventory value by encouraging advertisers to bid their true value. However, if its efficacy is compromised, publishers may struggle to balance optimal inventory prices with ad space appeal. This shift could disproportionately affect small to mid-size publishers, heavily reliant on attracting diverse advertisers. Publishers must navigate optimizing revenue while adapting to auction models that maintain advertiser engagement, critical for the digital advertising market's health and diversity.<br><br>**This use cases was removed because it relates to auctions that are not widely used today.** |

| Feature | Status | Status | Advertiser Impact | Publisher Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Avoid Bidding Against Myself | Not Supported | Not Supported | In digital advertising, the inability to prevent competing bids, known as "bid cannibalization," poses inefficiencies, especially for advertisers. This occurs when the same brand unintentionally competes against itself, driving up ad placement costs without additional benefits. This inflates CPM and wastes budget, reducing campaign efficiency. For small to mid-sized businesses with limited budgets, this can hinder competitiveness and marketing goals. | While multiple bids from the same buyer may initially appear to enhance competition, they can ultimately harm the advertising ecosystem. Persistent "bid cannibalization" may lead buyers to adjust strategies, reducing bidding activity and willingness to pay premium prices for ad inventory. Preventing multiple bids from the same entity can create a more efficient marketplace, benefiting both buyers and publishers. Conversely, the absence of such mechanisms can disrupt ad auctions, lower overall yield, and raise legal concerns, potentially damaging advertiser relationships. |
| Competitive Separation | Not Supported | Not Supported | The lack of Competitive Separation support can significantly impact brands, leading to unintended placement alongside competitors' messaging. This dilutes advertising impact and confuses consumers, potentially reducing brand recognition and losing customers. Legally, it raises concerns about trademark and intellectual property rights. Financially, it wastes ad spend and inadvertently boosts competitors' visibility. Operational challenges emerge in managing and monitoring ad placements. Small to mid-sized companies, with tighter budgets, are particularly vulnerable to costly and damaging inadvertent placements. | The absence of Competitive Separation support also impacts publishers, affecting their business in several ways. Brands may hesitate to advertise on platforms lacking this feature, fearing placement alongside competitors' content, reducing platform appeal. Operational challenges arise in managing ad placements to meet advertiser demands. Small to mid-sized publishers, with limited resources, may be disproportionately affected, struggling to compete with larger publishers offering Competitive Separation assurances to advertisers. |
| Receive a "No Bid" Response from a DSP | Not Supported | Not Supported | The lack of bid request tracking and response insight disrupts advertising strategies, risking inefficient budget allocation and reduced ROI for advertisers. This challenge is particularly daunting for small to mid-sized advertisers with limited resources, potentially leading to wasted ad spend. Financially, the absence of comprehensive tracking may bias media investment towards a few publishers, while hindering revenue opportunities for others. This impact is amplified for smaller advertisers operating with tighter budgets. | The inability to track bid requests and responses disrupts operational efficiency for publishers. This challenge can lead to missed revenue opportunities, especially when bidders' behavior remains unclear. Additionally, the lack of distinction between bid response scenarios hampers campaign optimization, making resource allocation difficult. Small to mid-sized publishers are particularly impacted by these operational bottlenecks, as they rely on streamlined operations. Addressing the need for comprehensive insights into bid response rates is essential for maintaining fairness, transparency, and efficiency in the digital advertising ecosystem, benefiting advertisers and publishers alike. |

## Creative & Rendering

| Feature | Status | Status | Advertiser Impact | Publisher Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Render Responsive Display Ad on Web | Supported | Supported | Responsive ads improve user engagement by providing a seamless experience across devices and screen sizes. However, Protected Audience Auctions' limitations on responsive ads may lead to a poor user experience or missed bidding opportunities if exact size and shape parameters aren't met. Advertisers may feel restricted by fixed ad dimensions, hindering their ability to tailor ad experiences to different contexts. Small to mid-sized companies, with limited resources, may struggle to redesign ad creatives and adapt to these changes financially. The absence of responsive advertising could further disadvantage them in a competitive market, as creating ads in different sizes across devices can be costly and time-consuming. These financial constraints could potentially put these businesses at a disadvantage in a fiercely competitive market. | Responsive ad formats can enhance website user experience, boosting engagement and revenue potential for publishers. They can attract a broader range of advertisers seeking versatile ad placements. However, the adoption of Privacy Sandbox may require adjustments to website layout and ad strategies. Small to mid-sized publishers may face operational hurdles during this transition, especially if resources are limited. Without support for responsive ad formats, website user experience may suffer, potentially reducing engagement and revenue. Publishers may struggle to meet advertiser demands for versatile ad placements across devices. The absence of responsive ads may require significant layout and strategy adjustments, posing operational challenges, particularly for smaller publishers. This could impact their competitiveness and ability to offer effective ad placements. |
| Render Video Ads Without Content | Temporarily Supported | Temporarily Supported | Supporting standalone video ads in players, without editorial content, is crucial for impactful campaigns. These ads typically auto-close after playback, ensuring a seamless user experience. However, if this support isn't sustained long-term, especially for small to mid-sized companies, challenges may arise. Firstly, they risk losing a valuable advertising format, limiting audience engagement with compelling video content. Secondly, without auto-close, advertisers may struggle to control user experience and message delivery, potentially leading to longer exposure times or misaligned interactions. Smaller businesses, with tighter budgets, rely on cost-effective and impactful ad formats, making the absence of this feature particularly detrimental. Advertisers must explore alternative ways to create engaging video campaigns and may need to allocate additional resources for effective ad placements. | The absence of support for serving standalone video ads in players without editorial content poses challenges for publishers and media companies, especially regarding monetization. These ads are valuable for advertisers seeking impactful messages, and if this functionality is lacking, publishers may struggle to attract and retain advertisers, particularly those reliant on video revenue. This shortfall can decrease the perceived value of their ad inventory, impacting revenue. Smaller publishers, reliant on diverse advertisers, may be disproportionately affected, hindering revenue generation and competitiveness. Adapting to this environment, publishers must explore alternative strategies to offset potential revenue losses, particularly small to mid-sized ones needing to diversify ad formats or explore other monetization avenues to remain financially viable. |
| Render Ads that interact with a Website | Temporarily Supported | Temporarily Supported | Advertisers commonly utilize rich media expandable ad units to maximize brand exposure. These dynamic formats are crafted to captivate and entertain, enhancing brand awareness significantly. They offer a versatile canvas for advertisers to showcase their brand's value and deliver engaging messages. In contrast, standard HTML5 or GIF/JPEG banners often lack the space to convey a brand's message effectively. Without interactive ad experiences, there's a risk of decreased user engagement and the inability to create dynamic, relevant content for target audiences. This challenge makes it hard for advertisers to effectively communicate their messages and maintain audience interest. | The absence of support for rendering interactive ads within Privacy Sandbox can have significant consequences. Placements like homepage takeovers, known for breaking through website clutter, often command premium rates. Interactive ads are vital for boosting user engagement, leading to higher publisher revenues. When advertisers deliver captivating ads, it attracts more spending and enhances publisher earnings. Without interactive ad experiences, publishers may face challenges like reduced demand and lower revenues. Advertisers may seek more engaging platforms elsewhere, adding pressure on publishers. Additionally, publishers would rely solely on OpenRTB auctions for such ad units, potentially limiting inventory monetization. |
| Invalid Traffic | Impractical | Impractical | The lack of IVT data disrupts decision-making, leading to misguided advertising strategies and inefficient resource allocation. Legal issues may arise from unintentional involvement in fraud, risking compliance and reputation. Logistical challenges emerge in distinguishing genuine from fraudulent engagement, impacting campaign optimization. Financially, spending on invalid traffic depletes budgets and reduces ROI, hindering growth. Operational inefficiencies arise in identifying and filtering invalid traffic, reducing campaign effectiveness. | The absence of Invalid Traffic (IVT) data poses significant challenges. Strategically, it disrupts publishers' decision-making, hindering content placement optimization and revenue generation. Legally, it exposes them to regulatory risks, potentially resulting in fines and reputational damage. Operationally, the lack of IVT data creates logistical challenges, affecting ad placement effectiveness. Reliable IVT reporting is crucial for informed decisions, regulatory compliance, and competitiveness. Concerns include reliance on issuer authentication methods, API complexity, limited issuers per publisher, incomplete documentation, and vulnerability to malicious actors. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Use a VAST Tag | Not Supported | Not Supported | VAST Tags streamline ad delivery between servers and video players, ensuring seamless display. Without them, advertisers may struggle with inconsistent ad appearance and performance across platforms. Small to mid-sized advertisers, reliant on standardized solutions, may find ad delivery complexities daunting without VAST Tags. | Publishers rely on VAST Tags for efficient video ad delivery and a consistent user experience. Without this support, disruptions and a poor viewer experience are likely, leading to dissatisfaction, reduced retention, and lower ad revenue. Smaller publishers, heavily reliant on video content for revenue, may struggle to attract advertisers who prefer VAST-compliant delivery. Additionally, without VAST support, managing ad placements, optimizing inventory, and meeting advertiser expectations become challenging. |
| Render a Video Ad Alongside Video Content | Not Supported | Not Supported | Supporting various video ad placements is crucial for optimizing campaigns, especially for small to mid-sized companies with limited resources. Without this capability, advertisers risk missing out on engaging potential customers effectively. Smaller businesses rely on cost-effective video placements to maximize impact, and the absence of this feature can hinder their competitiveness and marketing objectives. In such cases, advertisers must explore alternative methods, potentially diverting resources from other critical aspects of their strategy. | Supporting pre-, mid-, or post-roll video ads alongside content is crucial for small to mid-sized companies with limited resources. Without this capability, advertisers risk missing out on a valuable channel for engaging potential customers. Smaller businesses rely on cost-effective video placements to maximize impact. The absence of this feature can hinder their ability to compete effectively, forcing advertisers to explore alternative methods, potentially diverting resources from other critical aspects of their strategy. |
| Render Native Ad on Web | Not Supported | Not Supported | The lack of support for non-HTML ads, such as JSON, MP4, or JPGs, and 'seller-rendered native' scenarios, significantly impacts advertisers' strategies. Advertisers rely on diverse ad formats to reach their audiences effectively. Without support for non-HTML ads, creating engaging campaigns becomes challenging, potentially reducing audience engagement and conversion rates. Additionally, in 'seller-rendered native' scenarios, the lack of support can cause delays and misalignment between buyers and sellers. Small to mid-sized advertisers, seeking cost-effective solutions and creative flexibility, may face challenges. Moreover, the inability to support diverse ad formats hinders their innovation and competitiveness against larger advertisers. | The absence of non-HTML ad support and 'seller-rendered native' scenarios hampers publishers' monetization and efficiency. Flexible ad formats are crucial for attracting advertisers and optimizing ad spaces. Without non-HTML ad support, publishers may struggle to meet advertiser demands, limiting premium placements and rates. The lack of 'seller-rendered native' support disrupts publisher-buyer collaboration, causing inefficiencies. Smaller publishers, relying on streamlined processes, face heightened challenges. Inability to support diverse ad formats impacts competitiveness and revenue potential. Publishers may need alternative monetization strategies to align with advertiser expectations. |
| Creative Quality Assurance and Malware in Creative | Not Supported | Not Supported | Advertisers might face delays in getting their ads served on a publisher's site, particularly without support for publishers to assess ad quality. This can make it challenging for advertisers to ensure their materials meet publishers' high standards. Such caution could lead to pacing and budget challenges, especially for time-sensitive campaigns like product launches, where delayed ad delivery could have significant consequences. | The inability to directly access and analyze ads within Privacy Sandbox can greatly affect publishers. Each publisher has its own ad guidelines, some stricter than others regarding image types, ad copy, and other criteria for inappropriate content. Publishers must also ensure ads don't disrupt user experience or overload web pages. Without pre-approval and previewing capabilities, publishers are exposed to risks like malware, leading to financial disputes. These challenges, with legal, financial, and operational impacts, can affect user experience and financial stability, especially for smaller publishers. To ensure ad compliance, publishers may need to establish extended processes, leading to inefficiencies and delays. |
| Loss of Runtime Data for Brand Safety | Not Supported | Not Supported | The lack of dependable top-level page URL data for brand safety decisions carries significant business and operational consequences. Without this vital signal, AdTech companies may face challenges in accurately assessing whether to display an advertiser's creative on a webpage. This heightened risk of brand misalignment can damage the advertiser's reputation and effectiveness. For small to mid-sized companies, this absence of support can be especially daunting, as they may lack resources to implement alternative solutions or navigate complex workarounds, potentially resulting in missed opportunities and revenue losses. | The lack of dependable top-level page URL data presents significant challenges across business, legal, financial, and operational domains. Publishers rely on this information to ensure brand safety and compliance but may face legal issues and reputational damage without it. Financially, reduced demand for their inventory due to advertisers' concerns about brand safety measures can impact revenue streams negatively. Operationally, the absence of this data complicates integration with AdTech partners, necessitating additional efforts for alternative methods. Small to mid-sized publishers may face even greater burdens, lacking resources and bargaining power with AdTech vendors, potentially disadvantaging them in the digital advertising ecosystem. |

**Reporting**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Second Price Auction Reporting | Temporarily Supported | Removed | The removal of transparent auction reporting profoundly impacts advertisers, hindering informed bidding decisions and potentially leading to suboptimal outcomes. Small to mid-sized companies, with limited resources, are particularly affected by inefficient bidding. Legally, this deficiency may raise concerns about auction fairness and transparency, triggering regulatory scrutiny, which can be time-consuming and financially burdensome to address. Financially, advertisers may miss opportunities to optimize ad spend efficiently. Operationally, the absence of comprehensive bid data hampers campaign performance analysis, making it difficult to fine-tune strategies.<br><br>**This use cases was removed because it relates to auctions that are not widely used today.** | The absence of support can impact publishers' ability to accurately assess the value of their ad inventory, potentially leading to undervaluation. Small to mid-sized publishers heavily rely on ad revenue, so bid evaluation discrepancies directly affect their bottom line. Legally, this may raise transparency and fairness concerns in ad auctions, possibly resulting in disputes with advertisers or regulatory challenges. Financially, publishers may miss revenue opportunities by not optimizing pricing strategies effectively. Operationally, the lack of insights into losing bids hinders inventory management and content strategies, affecting revenue and user experience.<br><br>**This use cases was removed because it relates to auctions that are not widely used today.** |
| Publisher Revenue Accrual and Impression Validation | Temporarily Supported | Not Supported | Not applicable | Publishers heavily rely on firing pixels to log ad events directly into their database for business and operational purposes. If this capability is lacking, it has significant implications, particularly for small to mid-sized companies. Without the ability to independently track and log ad rendering events, publishers must depend solely on ad tech partners for this data. **Per Public Comment this was changed from Temporarily Supported to Not Supported, because anything that makes publishers reliant on their ad tech partners is considered not supported.** |
| Measure Viewability of an Advertisement | Temporarily Supported | Temporarily Supported | Without robust support for measuring ad visibility percentage on a screen, advertisers face uncertainties in assessing campaign effectiveness. The compromised measurement data impacts strategies significantly. Additionally, if the winning ad is served within a fenced frame, lack of access to dimension and position information hinders viewability measurement, affecting ad performance evaluation and optimization. These challenges impact businesses of all sizes in the competitive advertising landscape, necessitating effective navigation. | Legal and operational challenges may arise, particularly regarding contracts and agreements with advertisers. Disputes over ad viewability and performance metrics could lead to financial repercussions for publishers. Smaller and mid-sized publishers, heavily reliant on advertising revenue, may face significant difficulties if they cannot ensure accurate ad measurement and viewability to advertisers. The planned removal of support for iframes (expected by 2026) also impacts publishers, limiting their ability to provide valuable metrics and potentially affecting competitiveness. In summary, the failure to support ad resolution within fenced frames poses challenges across business, legal, financial, and operational aspects, affecting companies of all sizes in the advertising ecosystem. |

| Feature | Status | Status | Advertiser Impact | Publisher Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reporting by Deal ID | Temporarily Supported | Temporarily Supported | Without detailed insights into impressions, wins, and other key metrics associated with Deal IDs, advertisers may struggle to optimize campaigns effectively. This lack of granularity impedes the ability to assess specific deals' performance, potentially leading to inefficient spending and missed opportunities. Smaller to mid-sized businesses, with limited resources, may find it particularly challenging to compete without this data, causing financial uncertainties, operational hurdles, and difficulties in troubleshooting technical issues related to bid outcomes or winning auctions. | Difficulty in providing transparency and value to advertisers can strain relationships and lead to revenue loss. Financially, revenue streams may decline as advertisers hesitate to invest in ad inventory without robust reporting. Operationally, maintaining strong partnerships becomes challenging, especially for smaller publishers, who may struggle to meet advertisers' transparency demands and address technical issues related to bid outcomes or winning auctions. |
| Billable Metrics - CPC | Temporarily Supported | Temporarily Supported | Cost-Per-Click (CPC) remains a common billing metric in advertising campaigns and affiliate programs. However, incomplete support for tracking and attributing clicks to specific sources can have serious implications for businesses. Click data is crucial for advertisers to measure ad performance and allocate budgets effectively. Adherence to industry standards, including robust Invalid Traffic (IVT) filtration, is essential for billing based on clicks. Privacy Sandbox's opacity in measuring clicks may leave advertisers with incomplete understanding of their click volumes and return on investment, potentially leading to suboptimal budget decisions. In affiliate marketing, link decorations are vital for accurately attributing clicks to sources. Inadequate support for these decorations can lead to challenges in attribution and disputes over compensation. It highlights the importance of robust mechanisms for preserving link decoration in the affiliate marketing landscape. | Charging advertisers based on clicks is essential for publishers and affiliate partners to demonstrate their value and ensure fair compensation. However, incomplete support for passing auction-time information can create challenges for affiliate partners in proving their contribution. Adherence to industry measurement guidelines, including filtering Invalid Traffic (IVT), is crucial for accurate click billing. These limitations can lead to disputes over payment terms, impacting the financial stability of publishers and affiliates, especially smaller ones relying on CPC-based compensation. The lack of comprehensive support for click attribution and industry standards compliance may strain relationships and trigger contractual disputes, complicating operations in the affiliate marketing ecosystem. |
| Reporting Impressions by Host Domain | Temporarily Supported | Temporarily Supported | This enables advertisers to track the websites or domains where their ads appear, vital for assessing performance and optimizing campaigns. Larger firms benefit from streamlined decision-making, gaining a competitive edge. Meanwhile, small to mid-sized companies can better allocate budgets, ensuring efficient spending. Legally, such reporting aids in resolving placement disputes and maintaining compliance with industry regulations, preventing ads from appearing on inappropriate domains. | Operationally, implementing domain-level reporting infrastructure demands accurate data capture and transmission to advertisers. This can strain resources, particularly for smaller publishers lacking technical or financial capacity. From a business standpoint, domain-level reporting can enhance publisher appeal, especially for those with high-quality, brand-safe domains, potentially increasing revenue by attracting premium advertisers. However, smaller publishers may face heightened competition and quality standards to attract advertisers. Legally, publishers must obtain rights and permissions to share domain-level data while adhering to privacy regulations to safeguard user information. |
| Bid Price Reporting for Winners | Degraded | Degraded | Knowing the extent of overpayment is essential for optimizing advertising spend and maintaining competitiveness. Compromised functionality can cause inefficiencies and resource wastage, affecting both large corporations and small to mid-sized businesses. It may also raise concerns about transparency and fairness in advertising auctions, potentially leading to legal disputes affecting companies of all sizes. Financially, overpayment can strain budgets, and operational efficiency can suffer when analyzing campaign performance and making adjustments, particularly for smaller companies relying on cost-effective strategies. | Publishers rely on accurate reporting and fair compensation for their ad inventory. Disruptions in reporting the highest losing bid price can lead to disputes with advertisers, impacting revenue streams for all publishers. Legally, this can raise concerns about contract compliance and compensation agreements, potentially leading to industry-wide legal disputes. Financially, inaccurate reporting can result in revenue losses, affecting media companies of all sizes. Operationally, publishers depend on transparent and efficient auction mechanisms, and any degradation can disrupt workflow, particularly for smaller players reliant on stable revenue streams for growth and survival in the competitive landscape. |
| Billable Metrics - CPM | Degraded | Degraded | Billing and compensating based on Cost Per Thousand (CPM) impressions is a longstanding practice in advertising campaigns. However, incomplete support for accurately counting and attributing CPM impressions to specific sources, like exchanges and publishers, can have significant implications for businesses. CPM data is crucial for advertisers as a key performance indicator (KPI) for evaluating ad efficiency and budget allocation. Adherence to industry standards, including robust filtering mechanisms for addressing Invalid Traffic (IVT), is essential for billing based on CPM. The challenge lies in the lack of transparency in how Privacy Sandbox precisely counts impressions, leaving advertisers with incomplete insights into their impression volumes. This lack of clarity may lead to suboptimal decisions in budget allocation, potentially impacting advertising campaign performance. | Accurate counting and attribution of impressions are essential for revenue generation and fair compensation, adhering to MRC/IAB guidelines, particularly in programmatic advertising where CPM varies dynamically. Publishers heavily rely on this data to demonstrate their value to advertisers and ensure fair payments. When this capability is lacking, publishers, especially smaller ones, face hurdles in justifying their contributions and may encounter payment disputes, affecting financial stability. Moreover, the absence of standardized industry approaches to noise levels and aggregation methods complicates matters, making it difficult for publishers to validate impression counts independently. This lack of validation, along with the absence of accreditation from trusted third parties, creates operational and financial uncertainties within the publishing landscape, in line with industry standards. |
| Attribution Reports | Degraded | Degraded | The Attribution Reporting API (ARA) revolutionizes digital advertising by tracking user interactions and actions like purchases. However, its adoption poses significant implications across various domains, especially for small to mid-sized enterprises. ARA restricts DSPs from setting impression cookies, limiting access to crucial conversion data, which can impede cost-effectiveness assessments—critical for smaller businesses with tight budgets. The inclusion of noise in event-level reports adds unpredictability to decision-making. Limited browser support further reduces campaign reach, disproportionately affecting smaller enterprises. Additionally, the shift towards summary level reports requires adjustments in assessing campaign effectiveness and ROI, demanding adaptive analytical approaches. Despite challenges, ARA presents opportunities for businesses of all sizes to adapt and maintain competitive advertising strategies in the evolving digital landscape. | Limited attribution reporting not only impacts advertisers but also affects publishers and media companies. Advertisers may divert their investments elsewhere if they lack confidence in the effectiveness of their ad placements. This shift could reduce demand for ad placements, resulting in lower ad revenue for publishers. Moreover, without detailed attribution insights, publishers may struggle to attract advertisers and could lose valuable partnerships. Overall, degraded attribution reporting can hinder the financial success and growth potential of publishers and media companies in the competitive advertising landscape, emphasizing the importance of maintaining robust attribution standards for all industry stakeholders. |
| Mulitple Attribution Reports Recipients | Degraded | Degraded | Advertisers must manually register multiple recipients for the same impression, allowing for a detailed understanding of the attribution process. This enables tracking of attribution events from various sources, aiding in campaign optimization. Legal compliance with privacy regulations and user consent is crucial when sharing attribution data. Financially, more detailed reports can enhance budget allocation and ROI. However, smaller companies may face operational challenges in implementing and managing this level of attribution tracking. | Publishers opt to share reports with multiple recipients for each impression, fostering collaboration with advertisers and offering in-depth insights. This can strengthen partnerships and boost revenue potential. However, publishers must ensure legal compliance and data protection. Financially, advanced reporting can attract more advertisers and boost revenue. Yet, smaller publishers may face operational challenges in implementing and maintaining these features, requiring investment in technology and staff training. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Measure Multiple Conversions from Multiple Ads | Degraded | Degraded | This primarily impacts advertisers managing multiple brands that may convert on the same domain. Chrome's Attribution Reporting API (ARA) algorithm tends to under-report conversions when customers convert for multiple brands on the same site, resulting in inaccurate attribution and loss of insights. This can lead to resource misallocation and missed growth opportunities, affecting competitiveness. The degradation of algorithms can also lead to incorrect credit allocation, potentially skewing optimization efforts and causing budget misallocation, resulting in suboptimal performance and missed opportunities. | Advertisers' difficulty in attributing multiple conversions from various ads can reduce demand for publishers' ad inventory, impacting their revenue and business performance. Publishers may struggle to remain profitable and competitive if advertisers cannot attribute multiple conversions across ads accurately. This issue extends beyond general attribution challenges; conversions for specific campaigns or creatives may be inaccurately reported, leading to a disconnect between perceived performance and actual contribution to conversions and revenues. Such discrepancies can financially impact publishers, making it difficult for them to bid accurately and attract advertisers. |
| Bid Loss Reporting | Not Supported | Not Supported | Without insights into unsuccessful bids, advertisers may struggle to optimize bidding strategies effectively, potentially resulting in inefficiencies and wasted ad spend. This lack of transparency can also hinder customer support, especially for small to mid-sized companies reliant on responsive solutions. The absence of clear bid data may raise compliance issues, exposing companies to legal risks. **As the use case does not relate only to the winner of the auction, but all auction participants including those that lose, this use case is considered as Not Supported.** | Lack of transparency jeopardizes publishers' business opportunities and revenue. Financially, setting fair pricing becomes challenging, impacting profitability. Operationally, understanding auction dynamics and optimizing yield becomes difficult, hindering competitiveness. Overall, the absence of detailed bid information has far-reaching consequences for both advertisers and publishers, with small to mid-sized companies particularly vulnerable. |
| Billable Metrics - CPA | Not Supported | Not Supported | Cost Per Acquisition (CPA) is a crucial metric for advertisers, shaping where they allocate resources and gauging campaign effectiveness. The absence of reliable conversion data hampers informed budget decisions, potentially leading to suboptimal spending, especially for small to mid-sized companies with limited budgets. CPA serves as a vital yardstick for these businesses, justifying advertising investments and impacting competitiveness and growth potential. Ultimately, CPA guides advertisers in strategically allocating resources for efficient and effective advertising campaigns in the competitive digital landscape. | For publishers, especially in affiliate marketing, compensation based on Cost Per Acquisition (CPA) is fundamental. Their revenue often depends on delivering tangible acquisitions for advertisers. However, without true conversion data, publishers struggle to demonstrate their value to advertising campaigns. Whether transacting based on CPA or other models, publishers rely on proving their contributions to advertisers' goals. The lack of such data can lead to disputes over payment terms, endangering publishers' financial stability. This is especially challenging for small to mid-sized publishers heavily reliant on CPA, facing increased uncertainty and revenue risks, making it difficult to sustain operations effectively. |
| Multi-touch Attribution | Not Supported | Impractical | Limitations in the Attribution Reporting API (ARA) pose significant challenges for advertisers. **Advertisers can use the Shared Storage API alongside the Private Aggregation API to achieve this use case. However, similar to other use cases involving the Private Aggregation API, there are several limitations and drawbacks. The Private Aggregation API lacks support for event-level notifications, introduces delays and noise, requires an aggregation service, and restricts the aggregation key to 128 bits. The removal of IP addresses significantly impairs the ability to track a user's journey across devices. Additionally, the Shared Storage API does not support Web to App conversions. The Attribution Reporting API also has limitations, as it does not currently support multiple touchpoints and only allows for the prioritization of a single event during a user's journey.** | The lack of key support in the Attribution Reporting API can impact publishers in several ways. Firstly, it may strain relationships with advertisers due to inadequate reporting, potentially leading to disputes over ad performance and budgets. Smaller publishers may face challenges attracting advertisers compared to larger platforms with better reporting capabilities, putting them at a competitive disadvantage. This can affect their ability to secure advertising partnerships and grow their businesses. Publishers may need to allocate resources to adapt to evolving industry standards and compliance requirements, with larger publishers having more resources to navigate these changes, while smaller ones may struggle to stay compliant and competitive in the dynamic digital advertising landscape. |
| Measure Bot Impressions | Not Supported | Not Supported | The absence of support for verifying impressions from data centers, headless browsers, or bots has significant implications across various fronts. Advertisers strive to reach genuine human audiences, and without the ability to detect fraudulent impressions, they risk paying for placements that never reach real people. This challenge is particularly harmful to smaller companies with limited budgets, leading to wasteful spending. Legal disputes over payment for non-human impressions could ensue, resulting in costly litigation. Financially, budget constraints may hinder advertisers' ability to achieve desired outcomes. Operationally, the lack of support complicates resource allocation and campaign optimization, hampering overall advertising efforts. | The lack of support for verifying impressions can have significant repercussions, especially for small to mid-sized publishers. Without mechanisms to confirm genuine human impressions, publishers risk damaging their reputation with advertisers, hindering their ability to secure partnerships and revenue. Legal disputes over payments could lead to financial losses and strained relationships. Additionally, the absence of reliable filtering may deter premium advertisers, resulting in revenue declines. Operationally, publishers may struggle to meet advertiser expectations for transparency and authenticity, impacting their competitiveness. Overall, the implications of not supporting impression verification affect both advertisers and publishers, with potential business, legal, financial, and operational consequences. |
| Reporting by URL | Not Supported | Not Supported | From a business perspective, lacking insight into the full page URL where ads are displayed limits advertisers' context assessment. This opacity raises brand safety concerns, especially for small to mid-sized companies unable to afford robust brand safety measures. Legal risks may arise due to non-compliance with ad placement regulations, particularly in regions with strict rules. Financially, it leads to wasted ad spend and diminished ROI, hindering effective campaign optimization. Operationally, the absence of URL data hampers decision-making and overall advertising strategy. Advertisers prefer browser-passed URLs for enhanced transparency and trust in ad placement. | The lack of URL reporting support can significantly impact publishers across multiple business facets. From a business standpoint, the inability to provide advertisers with full page URL data may deter those valuing transparency and brand safety, particularly affecting smaller to mid-sized publishers facing intensified competition for ad partnerships. Legally, publishers risk contractual disputes and legal consequences if unable to fulfill transparency commitments, potentially leading to legal ramifications. Financially, the absence of URL reporting may impede negotiations for higher CPMs with advertisers seeking such URLs, limiting revenue potential. Operationally, it may necessitate additional systems and processes to meet advertiser transparency demands, potentially straining resources. |
| Report on Information Gleaned from Macros | Not Supported | Not Supported | The absence of support for this report could impact advertisers significantly. It helps assess ad campaign effectiveness, optimize targeting, and allocate budgets efficiently by providing insights into key value pairs driving results. Legal disputes may arise between advertisers and publishers over billed impressions and promised results if this feature is not supported. Financially, without this support, especially small to mid-sized companies, may waste ad spend due to insufficient data for campaign fine-tuning, affecting ROI. Operationally, the inability to generate reports with Macros may lead to a less streamlined process, affecting smaller players' competitiveness in the industry. | The lack of support for generating reports with Macros hampers publishers' ability to offer detailed insights to advertisers, risking loss of trust and revenue as advertisers may turn to platforms with more transparent reporting. Legally, this may trigger contractual disputes with advertisers expecting accurate reporting. Financially, smaller to mid-sized publishers, heavily reliant on advertiser trust, may suffer revenue loss. Operationally, without this support, publishers may struggle to stand out in a competitive market, risking market share loss. Addressing this issue is vital for ensuring a fair and thriving advertising ecosystem. |
| Reporting by Creative URL | Not Supported | Not Supported | The lack of support for Creative URL reporting poses challenges in troubleshooting and identifying problematic creatives, especially in programmatic advertising. This complexity makes it difficult for advertisers to pinpoint redirects and manage multiple creatives within a single tag, increasing operational complexity and risking wasted ad spend. Smaller to mid-sized companies, constrained by resources, are particularly vulnerable to these challenges. | The lack of Creative URL reporting poses legal, financial, and operational risks. Identifying problematic creatives becomes more challenging, requiring additional resources. This absence not only hampers troubleshooting but also presents significant challenges for smaller to mid-sized companies, impacting their budget decisions, revenue streams, and operational efficiency in digital advertising. |

## Technology & Interoperability

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Managing Infrastructure Costs | Not Supported | Not Supported | Failing to streamline infrastructure costs can notably increase operational expenses, especially for smaller companies with constrained resources. Uncertainty surrounding the infrastructure required for Privacy Sandbox compliance may lead to legal disputes with partners. Depending solely on Google or Amazon for Trusted Execution Environments (TEE) could prompt concerns over market dominance, particularly for smaller players. Inefficient infrastructure management can compound operational costs and resource strain, posing sustainability challenges for smaller businesses. Resolving scalability and cost issues related to infrastructure is vital for advertisers and agencies to sustain competitiveness and prevent heightened financial burdens. | Insufficient resource scaling and ineffective infrastructure management can inflate overhead expenses. Legally, uncertainties around cost projections for new infrastructure adoption may trigger disputes, particularly burdensome for smaller publishers with limited legal support. Dependence on specific TEEs from Google or Amazon can create financial reliance and weaken bargaining leverage for smaller firms, possibly resulting in less favorable terms. Moreover, the extensive duplication of data mandated by TEEs can strain operational efficiency, impacting service quality. |
| Privileged Signals | Not Supported | Not Supported | The once-confidential pricing rules, including sensitive bid rates and purchase prices, are now openly accessible to competitors and partners. This shift not only compromises confidentiality but also levels the playing field, making it harder for advertisers and agencies to maintain a competitive pricing edge. Transparent rates pose challenges in negotiating favorable terms, potentially leading to higher costs for ad placements, particularly in preferred deals, private marketplace deals, and automated guaranteed deals. Moreover, transparency within the browser may diminish the effectiveness of pricing strategies in ensuring brand safety and suitability. These changes prompt legal considerations and may require contract renegotiations. | The newfound transparency in previously confidential pricing rules, like sensitive rates, presents challenges for sellers. While it fosters transparency, it may also lead to unintended consequences, such as pressure to justify pricing structures and potential decreases in rates paid by advertisers who gain insights into competitors' strategies. The introduction of hierarchical top-level auctions and component auction systems by PAAPI raises data security concerns for publishers. They may encounter challenges in maintaining data integrity and confidentiality, especially when partnering with entities lacking similar security measures. Publishers may need to reassess operational practices and invest in enhanced security measures to safeguard their data. |
| Data Guarantees | Not Supported | Not Supported | The absence of contractual and commercial mechanisms within the Privacy Sandbox and its APIs presents a complex legal landscape. This includes issues related to liability, warranties, force majeure, compensation, indemnification, non-disclosure, data usage, ownership, and legal compliance. All parties involved - advertisers, publishers, ad agencies, ad tech firms, data providers, and measurement companies - typically have agreements in place to define responsibilities and address accountability. However, the lack of direct mechanisms with Chrome and its Privacy Sandbox APIs can lead to uncertainty regarding liability for issues like glitches, reporting discrepancies, and operational challenges. Clarifying these mechanisms is crucial to address potential legal uncertainties among parties. | The absence of contractual and commercial mechanisms within the Privacy Sandbox and its APIs creates legal complexities, including liability, warranties, force majeure, compensation, indemnification, non-disclosure, data usage, ownership, and legal compliance. While parties like advertisers, publishers, ad agencies, ad tech firms, and data providers typically have clear agreements with their partners, the lack of direct mechanisms with Chrome's Privacy Sandbox APIs leads to uncertainty about liability for issues such as glitches, reporting discrepancies, and operational challenges. Clarifying these mechanisms is essential to address potential legal uncertainties among parties. |
| Algorithm Integrity Guarantee | Not Supported | Not Supported | When utilizing services from external parties, contractual agreements typically govern data usage, providing assurance. However, within the Privacy Sandbox, uncertainty arises regarding the adherence of algorithms like PAAPI to specifications and instructions, raising concerns. Many lack resources to verify algorithmic compliance, risking campaign effectiveness and triggering legal issues. Economic consequences are significant if algorithm errors affect revenue generation, prompting questions of liability. Determining responsibility can be intricate, involving Chrome, platforms, and regulatory bodies. Comprehensive safeguards and transparency in the digital advertising ecosystem are vital not only for business ethics but also for global economic stability. | In traditional service agreements, contractual obligations ensure data usage compliance, offering reassurance. However, within the Privacy Sandbox, uncertainty arises regarding algorithm adherence, like PAAPI, to public specifications, raising concerns. Many lack resources to verify compliance, risking campaign effectiveness and triggering legal data privacy issues. Economic consequences are significant if algorithm errors impact revenue generation, prompting liability questions. Determining responsibility can involve Chrome, platforms, and regulatory bodies. Comprehensive safeguards and transparency in digital advertising are vital for business ethics and global economic stability. |