

To: "heather gillette" <heather@youtube.com>  
From: "Steve Chen" <steve@youtube.com>  
Cc: "Micah Schaffer" <micah@youtube.com>, "Dunton Maryrose" <maryrose@youtube.com>, "Hurley Chad" <chad@youtube.com>  
Bcc:  
Received Date: 2006-01-31 11:02:10 CST  
Subject: Re: takedown script

---

Ah ha. I see what you're saying.

Maryrose, can we get someone to implement a thing to send out a standard copyrights infringement thing to the users when their video is rejected for copyright reasons? I think we should also rope in the folks at Wilson Sonsini for clearance on the notice we send to these users?

-s

On Jan 30, 2006, at 3:01 PM, heather gillette wrote:

> Yeah this system is better, but we are not messaging at all to the  
> users  
> what they are doing wrong. I've found that the responses I get to the  
> takedown email when I send it are that of clueless-ness and when I  
> don't  
> send it, I get many emails to support where they just don't  
> understand why  
> their videos was rejected. Isn't it better to keep the user and  
> have them  
> become a good user, than to delete and remove a user the  
> unknowingly was  
> doing something wrong?  
>  
> Also, this takedown notice is what we are supposed to do under the  
> DMCA, in  
> addition to it being a valuable message that deters future uploads.  
>  
> Heather  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Steve Chen [mailto:steve@youtube.com]  
> Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 2:55 PM  
> To: heather gillette  
> Cc: 'Micah Schaffer'  
> Subject: Re: takedown script  
>  
> Yup, let's set this meeting up. To the latter point, aren't we  
> forcing people to confirm email addresses and we can use the 3-  
> strikes system to prevent them from using the system again?  
>  
> -s  
>  
> On Jan 30, 2006, at 2:41 PM, heather gillette wrote:  
>  
>> Steve,  
>>  
>> Attached is the email I send to the users whose WWE or ROH videos

>> have been  
>> deleted so you can see.  
>>  
>> I think your point about 'Matt Dancing' brings up another point  
>> that video  
>> rejections should be reversible or at least there should be some  
>> control or  
>> intelligence built in so that if a really popular video is about  
>> to be  
>> rejected there is a popup that says, 'this video has been viewed  
>> 20,000  
>> times, are you sure you want to reject?' this way we have some  
>> safeguards in  
>> place and we can feel free to build other tools to help ease the  
>> manual  
>> process that we have now in rejecting videos for copyright.  
>>  
>> Bottom line, the system that we have now is painful and we are not  
>> preventing users from uploading more copyrighted videos because we  
>> are not  
>> messaging what they have done wrong, or if we are, I am manually  
>> sending the  
>> warning emails explaining what they have done wrong. Could we get  
>> together  
>> and brainstorm what everyone's needs and fears are? This way we  
>> can all  
>> come to a final compromise and hopefully get some improved tools/  
>> automation  
>> in the pipeline?  
>>  
>> I think the following people need to meet to discuss this:  
>>  
>> Maryrose  
>> Micah  
>> Heather  
>> Brent  
>> Steve  
>>  
>> Thanks!  
>>  
>> Heather  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Steve Chen [mailto:steve@youtube.com]  
>> Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2006 4:40 PM  
>> To: heather gillette  
>> Cc: 'Micah Schaffer'  
>> Subject: Re: takedown script  
>>  
>> Is it a generic Cease & Desist letter that we sent to all infringing  
>> parties? Or is it tailored to the specific case/companies in  
>> question?  
>>  
>> We can build this, it's not very difficult to do.  
>>  
>> After finding out one of our most popular videos (matt dancing) was  
>> accidentally removed from the system, I'm getting increasingly more  
>> worried about limiting access for people to reject videos. With the

>> interns coming in, we're essentially granting these interns on their  
>> first days a way to remove every video on the system. Furthermore,  
>> we have no system of record that tracks who did what in the system.  
>> Lastly, we have no way of correcting this problem.  
>>  
>> That's why I'm very reluctant to make rejecting videos 1) easier or  
>> 2) more automated for mass rejections.  
>>  
>> I don't know what the final solution will look like but whatever it  
>> is, I know it must include a more robust "checks & balances" system  
>> implemented as some kind of tiered approval process where to mass  
>> reject videos, it's not as easy as any one of the 15 folks with admin  
>> access to go in and type a search word and hitting a button.  
>>  
>> -s  
>>  
>> On Jan 27, 2006, at 11:42 AM, heather gillette wrote:  
>>  
>>> Just to clarify, 'Cease and Desist' is what the WWE and ROH refers  
>>> to when  
>>> they talk about the warning email we send. I am used to referring  
>>> to it as  
>>> such because this is the terminology they use.  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>> From: heather gillette [mailto:heather@youtube.com]  
>>> Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 11:39 AM  
>>> To: 'Micah Schaffer'; 'Steve Chen'  
>>> Subject: RE: takedown script  
>>>  
>>> To further reiterate what Micah says below, the companies that are  
>>> requesting that we remove these copyrighted videos are also  
>>> requesting that  
>>> we send Cease and Desist letter to the users who have uploaded  
>>> these videos.  
>>> Because we do not give the companies the user info they are unable  
>>> to send  
>>> these Cease and Desist notifications to the infringer themselves.  
>>> That  
>>> being said, it is a manual process sending this notification to  
>>> each of the  
>>> infringers and it would be much more efficient if this notification  
>>> was  
>>> built into the admin tool and the email notification, via a  
>>> differentiation  
>>> that the video was removed for copyright infringement rather than  
>>> porn.  
>>>  
>>> Heather  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>> From: Micah Schaffer [mailto:micah@youtube.com]  
>>> Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 11:27 AM  
>>> To: Steve Chen  
>>> Cc: heather gillette  
>>> Subject: Re: takedown script  
>>>  
>>> When we're flagging 100+ DMCA'd URLs, it's difficult to flag them

>>> all in  
>>> the admin interface when they are mixed in with user-flagged-porn  
>>> that  
>>> needs to be reviewed (the problem is compounded by having multiple  
>>> people using the admin tool). But most importantly, we need to be  
>>> able  
>>> to send a different automated warning email to copyright violators  
>>> than  
>>> everyone else.. they need information on what they are doing wrong  
>>> and  
>>> they need to be told about the counter notice process.  
>>>  
>>> Micah  
>>>  
>>> Steve Chen wrote:  
>>>> Micah --  
>>>>  
>>>> I'm not sure why this is necessary? Let me know if I'm  
>>>> misunderstanding  
>>>> the situation, but it seems to me, the reasons in the drop-down  
>>>> that  
>>>> show up on the flag video page serves only as customer-facing eye  
>>>> candy. When we see it from our admin portal, the result is that  
>>>> it'll  
>>>> be approved or rejected (variations thereof). Furthermore, if I  
>>>> see  
>>>> it's flagged from an admin user, I will pay attention to it even  
>>>> more...  
>>>>  
>>>> -s  
>>>>  
>>>> On Jan 23, 2006, at 12:42 PM, Micah Schaffer wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> While we're at it, we should consider adding a value for  
>>>>> 'copyright'  
>>>>> to the 'reason' variable in flag\_video. Not to be accessible to  
>>>>> users,  
>>>>> just admins.  
>>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>> <takedown.txt>  
>  
>  
>

From jawed@youtube.com Tue Jan 31 10:14:53 2006

---