To: "David G King" <dgking@youtube.com>
From: "Franck Chastagnol" <fchastagnol@youtube.com>
Cc:
Bcc:
Received Date: 2007-06-07 21:23:01 GMT
Subject: Re: Strikes for CYC claims?

Figueira Decl. Tab
197

this is additional work so i need to find out if anyone will be
available for v21.
for now, let's assume this is v22 - ok ?

see questions/comments below

could we start documenting this, either at the end of the v1.0 spec
(as future enhancement) or in a separate v2.0 spec ?

thanks,
franck
On Jun 6, 2007, at 5:36 PM, David G King wrote:

> As you know, CYC is not currently hooked up to our repeat infringer
> policy. I'm coming under some pressure to change that, with the
> BBC in particular getting upset that it is not working that way.
> From my perspective, it does not sound like a ton of work, but I'll
> understand if that guess is far off the mark. We already have
> block claims getting logged in the database, and we already have a
> functional repeat infringer policy, so the work is connecting those
> two services. Do you think it is reasonable to schedule this work
> into v.21?
>
> A few things we should consider in taking on this project:
> - Once blocks in CYC are resulting in account strikes, should we
> apply strikes to all legacy block claims?

i would rather keep it simple an give the strike only for that one
video.

now we also need to think about scenario of a content policy update.
if UMG decides to block all prince video and update the policy for an
ISRC to block, we are going to take down video. should we as well
strike all the users ?

> - Should we allow partners to decide whether they want to actually
> strike the user's account on a case-by-case basis? In many cases
> the CYC partner is not actually upset with the user, but they would
> just prefer that we highlight a different version of the same video.

not sure it is ok to let partner decide to which user give a strike
or not
i would rather make it either a global rule for all partners, or
eventually a rule per partner (their blocked videos end up giving
strike to user)

> - Multiple block claims against a single video should only result
> in one strike.

agreed

> - and I'm sure there are many more considerations....
>
> dk