

AMENDED Exhibit 767

PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Case No.: 4:22-md-03047-YGR

MDL No. 3047

In Re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation

Thoughts^{W1} on YouTube Discovery

YouTube TV, Sunday Ticket, Prime Time Channels

Don't Be Behind: A proposal to launch a ChatBot interface on YouTube ASAP

No History Home

Principles for the YouTube Data API, including use by Researchers

How to CoreX

Exploration and Harm

PRIVILEGED: How much should we empower users?

On Premature Unification

Thoughts about Music on YouTube, from Olivia Rodrigo's Driver's License

PRIVILEGED: Qualities $\Rightarrow$ Quality

PRIVILEGED: Quality on YouTube

Thoughts on The Filter Bubble by Eli Pariser

"The Algorithm" doesn't like conspiracies

Where to put the Stories shelf on Home at launch?

Where YouTube can't ever compete with Facebook and Instagram

What about Instagram?

On classifier quality

Questions about Responsibility

If only we had focused on growth . . .

The Weaponization of Information

The YouTube Ecosystem

How YouTube grows

Clickbait on Facebook vs. Trashy on YouTube

Brand Safety Crisis on YouTube: What now?

Viral videos: Why have them?

Our responsibility

Social recommendations are poor

Winning the lottery

YouTube Research Summit

YouTube Notifications

What I learned in Brazil

What about Facebook?

Let the viewers decide, always

Acquiring content to broaden our audience

Product Excellence

Interlude: Larry was right, I was wrong.

I don't care how you use YouTube.

Netflix built our homepage vision

Have we moved the needle?

How shall channels that sponsor live events build up credibility?

In addition to giving viewers a good experience before a live event begins, sponsors want to build-up as much internet credibility as possible in advance of the event. In particular, they will want to get anchors pointing to their event, perhaps from blogs that say "On Friday nights, I like to watch live UFC fights on YouTube" where "live UFC fights on YouTube" is a link to the place on YouTube that broadcasts the fights when they are live, but is also a good destination between fights. Sponsors will want these anchors to accrue and build-up on a single destination, so that search engines know this destination is great for the queries [fights], [live fights], [ufc fights], etc.

Search engines will want to know where to send queries like [fights], [live fights], [ufc fights]. An important mechanism for doing that, broadly known as Navboost, tracks the CTR, Long CTR, and downstream watch time of previous visitors who clicked on these results. That is, if last week lots of people who queried [ufc fight] clicked on a result document that played last week's fight, then the Navboost system will use that as evidence that last week's fight document is a good result for people who query [ufc fight] this week. Whatever the good result document was for [ufc fight] last week, we'll want it to include information about this week's fight in order for it to be useful this week.

In short, series of live events will want to accrue credibility, popularity, anchors, navboost to a single destination (or url or result or document).

Now, we might say that these issues - wanting a welcome video on the channel page; providing a consistently branded experience before, during, and after a live event; creating a single destination for a series of live events - are all just things we can address with channel context on watch pages, redirects to watch pages from channels, smearing anchors and navboost, etc. But I think these point towards a broader conclusion about the association between viewers and channels: **youtube, channel owners, and viewers will be better off by forming a strong association between viewers and channels.**

How will a viewer form a strong association with a channel if she cannot watch a video on that channel? In the no-watch-on-channel approach, I think we could imagine getting viewers to form strong associations with the videos from a channel, but not with the channel itself. This is because the no-watch-on-channel approach implies channel-as-browse-only, in which the channel is an interstitial page on which the viewer spends little time. More on this later.^[C61]

September 9, 2011

Watch time, and only watch time

From an email I sent to [REDACTED] John Harding, and [REDACTED] on September 9, 2011:

Page 48 Comments

N60 I'm sorry, but I completely disagree here. I think it's a giant leap to say that a user won't associate with a brand because they don't have a video player on that brand's page. Look at Twitter. Look at Facebook. Brands and channel owners get to bring their message to me right alongside messages from my friends and family. That's what's most valuable. If a user starts treating a brand/channel in the same way they start treating their favorite content then that's when we win for brands/channels. There's also something to having a shared experience that I can link around to my friends. A watch page is something that's very shareable. A channel page that can be altered, has several different states and so on is just not a very atomic shareable thing. For me it all comes down to the message we want to send our publishers. If you put a player on the channel and show the publisher that every click from the channel will keep the user in their channel then you are sending them a clear message that their goal is to get their users to come to their channel and stay there. This also encourages channel owners to try and create one beefy channel where all of their content, regardless of subject matter, exists so that the user is likely to find everything. That makes a subscription system very difficult to work because you want to give the user a discrete enough decision to get pushed the content they want. I don't want content from all of ABC, I just want Modern Family and so on. On the previous note about sending publishers the message that they should get everyone to come to their channel, that is just not how the web works today. How many channels is a user likely to visit directly on a given day? in a given week? Not many. All of these smart publishers know that the right way to get to a user is to come to where they already spend their time. The Office doesn't try to get their viewers to come to The Office site on NBC.com, they invest most of their marketing dollars on Facebook and Twitter. YouTube is a similar platform.

11/14/2011 03:41 AM

C61 [REDACTED] you were right, and I was wrong.

Cristos Goodrow, 4/7/2020 11:45 PM

I think we need a discussion about watch time, and whether it is our primary goal to increase this measure. Folks across the organization hold a wide variety of positions on this, and I think it will become increasingly difficult to work together without some kind of consensus.

Proposal: All other things being equal, our goal is to increase (video) watch time.

This is based on the observation that "Time is a scarce resource", and the conclusion that "If users spend more of their scarce time watching YouTube videos, they are happier with those YouTube videos".

Corollary: no binary measure of viewer satisfaction with a video (eg. `set_awesome`) is effective.

Example: All other things being equal, if you will watch seven minutes of a 10:00 video on how to tie a bowtie, or all of a 1:00 video:

1. you as a user are happier watching 7:00/10:00 than 1:00/1:00
2. we prefer you watch 7:00/10:00 rather than 1:00/1:00
4. (1) and (2) are true even if you can tie a bowtie after watching 1:00/1:00
3. (1) and (2) are true even if you cannot tie a bowtie after watching 7:00/10:00

Another example:

You are happier (and so are we) if you watch 1:30/10:00 than if you watch 1:00/1:00.

Why does this matter? Many experiments are running (Cosmic Panda, removing video length on thumbnails) and will start running (Hitchhiker). If we don't agree on success, I think we'll be arguing about it with each experiment. Further, if watch time is important, then it can't be broken in RASTA or LE anymore.

Cristos.

I should add that learning to tie a bowtie quickly is a legitimate use of YouTube. My proposal is essentially to ignore this use and to focus instead on entertainment and engagement.

Why focus? Simplicity. For example, if we wanted to help people learn things quickly, we would run Time To Task rated experiments (as they do for web search). I propose not doing these kinds of rated experiments, and further, essentially ignoring the initial intention the user had when coming to YouTube if it helps to increase entertainment (measured via watch time).

July 28, 2011

No Onetree until 2012

██████ has written a document with pros and cons of moving YouTube search to Onetree. The challenge in making this decision is that it is impossible to measure the speed of execution in Onetree and the value of broader ranking improvements to YouTube, or to weigh those against the progress that can be made by focusing on YouTube-specific concerns.

Overall, I believe that more progress will be made quickly by focusing on YouTube-specific issues that may not be relevant to Google, rather than by migrating YouTube search to