Stuart's Moderation Rubric

When you are a moderator on a YouTube channel, you go to the Community menu item in the left hand sidebar and that gives you a screen with 3 tabs. The tab you are on when you get there is the Published Comments. Then there is a Held for Review tab and the Likely Spam comments. How YouTube sorts is a mystery and is often not correct in my terms.

So let me try to explain how I want the comments moderated since the tone and tenor or the comments is part of the impact that the channel will have.

- On the left of each comment will be a check box if you want to apply one of the choices below to a batch of comments at once.

- On the right there are 3 choices, and one of the three has a pop down menu with 2 choices so in total there are 4 choices. Let me list them.
    - There's a check mark to instantly approve the comment
    - There's a trash can to instantly remove it
    - There's a flag symbol which pops down a list of...
        - Report Spam or Abuse
        - Hide this User's Comments on this Channel

So, this is the rough rubric I use for making my decisions:

- Any comment from an obvious 'troll' will get the 'Hide...' choice. I don't want to have to deal with this person over and over.

- Any comment from someone who is clearly and obviously supporting us and encouraging us, I approve automatically... BUT... if there is a Read More tab, I will check that first because my rubric pays attention to the whole comment, and especially to links in the comment. So anything like a short 'Keep up the good work' gets instant approval.
    I don't do that merely so people will think we are hot sh!t, but because every time you approve a comment, the person who made the comment gets a notification. So if their approval is published, it is like a 'thank you' and encourages them to interact more.

- I've had trolls comment "How come there's no one calling this a hoax in the comments?" and I delete that comment of course. They can go pee in someone else's pool, or create their own pool that they all can pee in to their heart's content.

- Check the entirety of comments (including the Read More parts) for links. I am generally against publishing comments with links in them because they pull the attention away from us to some other channel or website. If the comment indicates to me that the particular link may be a good one, I will look and see. If I think this will advance what we are doing, I will sometimes approve the comment. If it is just someone trying to draw attention to their own monetized website or channel, I trash the comment. If few of the comments we approve have

external links, then we will tend not to lose the focus of those who are watching and they may go on to watch another and perhaps share.

- If the comment contains vulgarity, I generally trash it. Occasionally I will approve it if the rest of the comment warrants. A good enough thought punctuated by 'fuck' is ok once in a while.

- People who post things that amount to 'conspiracy theories' I trash. Like there's a comment at the top now asking why no one has the integrity to admit that the condensation trails are in fact SRM (solar radiation management) that's been going on for a long time. If I had the time I would approve and then IMMEDIATELY go and do a reply under the approved comment (this requires some work to find the comment once it's approved) asking if he is an atmospheric scientist, or just conjecturing based upon other YouTubes out there. I consider such comments to be distractions, unless there is a reason for me to approve and then comment to 'flatten' the issue.

- Then there are the grandstanders. Patrick McNulty will post on every single one of our YouTubes that Ocean Thermal Tunnels are the solution. I've approved once or twice, but generally just trash the comments as an 'odd ball'.

- Here's a comment up there now...
  "'..people in Bangledesh? Let's talk about NORMAL people.' WTF???"
  That I would trash. Don't know what he means, he is illiterate and sounds a bit racist. I'd have to go listen to the video in question (Quit the Loose Talk) to see what he's talking about. Trash it.

- People who say "Guy McPherson was right, we'll all be dead soon" or variants of that I trash.

- People who quote Paul Beckwith I will generally approve unless they have links to his videos. He has is own audience, much larger than ours. No need to send our viewers to his channel.

- Someone comments...
  "You have to make your videos in Chinese. The Chinese made no commitment to lower Co2 . They committed to think about it after 2030. China emits double the Co2 of the USA so ...."
  This is unhelpful and untrue for the most part. The Chinese are arguably doing way more than we are. And their emissions are from manufacturing crap for us. Not a system's thinker. I don't want to further defective thinking and the standard objections of the "How about China" kind. I would trash the comment. The only way I would approve it is if I were willing to go and do a reply. But it's not worth it if we think we will change that person. It's only worth it if we are trying to undermine the biased argument.

- That same guy went on to comment on a different Wadhams video...
  "It can't be that bad.. at my house the high temp today was 30 degrees Fahrenheit below average. Very cold and winter is weeks away. Maybe a new ice age will start and Co2 will not matter."
  I would Hide his comments on the channel. Why waste time fielding them in the future.

- If someone is abusive in a comment, I report them for Spam or Abuse. I do more of the abuse choice than the spam choice, but if they are trying to send the reader to their monetized website or channel, I will report them as spam. If they are sending someone to a bona fide great website (say, Citizen's Climate Lobby) I will approve.

- Also, super long comments (my 10 ways to fix the problem... running on to pages in length) I will usually trash it. More grandstanding and armchair quarterbacking.

- What about Nuclear Energy Advocates?

You can see why this takes time. Even if people would help me by just getting rid of the real trash and approving the easy ones, I could handle the tough calls. But with 150 up there waiting for attention, it's daunting.

Remember, the writer of the comment gets notified when you approve or when you reply, but not when you trash or report them. So it's also a way to communicate with the reader, and the only way I have discovered.

I'm told a really good comment can be pinned to the top, though I have not done that yet.

Q: It can also mean reporting certain users? I suppose one might decide to do this if they habitually insert trashy comments or maybe one is enough.

> A: Right. Sometimes I will give people a second chance; sometimes once is enough. Generally someone will comment on a few of the videos in one go so you can tell if they are serial crap, or grandstanders.