

#site 34 – Licensing chat

2017-05-15

00:00:16: <Cimmerian> "doing a run"?

00:00:47: <ProcyonLotor> oh wait that was for my pathfinder shit

00:00:54: <ProcyonLotor> was wondering where that message disappeared to

00:04:26: <Roget> heh

00:09:54: <Cimmerian> Roget and Decibelle: Is it possible to remind the Russian Wiki of the ever decreasing amount of time they have left to make the changes we've requested? I want them to have every opportunity to be warned of the impending thing.

00:10:13: <Decibelle> i can send a pm to the admins

00:10:18: <Decibelle> how much time do they have left?

00:10:23: <Cimmerian> end of this month so...

00:10:27: <Cimmerian> couple weeks

00:10:36: <Roget> slightly over two weeks

00:10:41: <Decibelle> so i should say "the end of the 31st"?

00:10:50: <Roget> They did say they acknowledged everything we'd said so they should know but it can't hurt to say again

00:10:56: <Roget> Decibelle: sounds gud

00:11:13: <Decibelle> who are all of the admins?

00:11:19: <Cimmerian> yeah, exact date should be June 1st

00:11:22: <Roget> Osobist, Gene R and Resure

00:11:45: <Roget> <http://scpfoundation.ru/system:members>

00:11:46: <Cimmerian> and let them know again we will be retracting official recognition and very shortly thereafter they will be subject to the normal licensing enforcement process

00:12:08: <Cimmerian> up to you if you wanna say that includes a takedown order, but it will

00:12:19: <Roget> I think we will also be making moves to ask the translation partners to delist them if it seems that no resolution is imminent

00:23:04: <Decibelle> Hello. This is a PM on behalf of Licensing (from a member of Internet Oureach) to remind the Russian Wiki admins that we are still waiting on a reply about making the licensing changes we've requested. The deadline is June 1st. Failure to do so means that we'll be retracting official recognition of the site, as well as inform all of the other translation sites to delist you and cease recognizing

00:23:04: <Decibelle> you as well. If changes aren't made very shortly after that, we'll have no option but to subject the site to normal licesning enforcement (up to and including a takedown order). Please respond as soon as possible. Thank you.

00:24:06: <Cimmerian> technically the did reply already

00:24:08: <Cimmerian> *they

00:24:24: <Cimmerian> it was just "we're going to take some time before we even think about doing what you're asking us to do"

00:24:39: <Decibelle> im open to rewording changes

00:24:42: <Cimmerian> "waiting on action"

00:24:43: <Cimmerian> perhaps

00:24:54: <Cimmerian> waiting on actions with regards to the...

00:24:57: <Cimmerian> *action

00:25:28: <Decibelle> "waiting on actions as well as another reply with regards to the..."

00:25:28: <Decibelle> ?

00:25:41: <Cimmerian> sure, singular action though

00:26:05: <Cimmerian> they really only have to do the one thing and it'll take them like, a minute to do it ;)

00:26:14: <Decibelle> is everything else fine

00:26:28: <Cimmerian> I believe so.

00:26:48: <Cimmerian> well

00:26:49: <Cimmerian> *informing

00:27:06: <Cimmerian> and "your site" rather than "the site"

00:27:21: <Decibelle> whats the difference between inform and informing

00:27:50: <Roget> They've already got the information so we're re-informing them I suppose

00:28:02: <Decibelle> Roget: in context thius is about the other sites

00:28:04: <Decibelle> not the russian site

00:28:11: <Roget> ahh

00:29:17: <Cimmerian> inform is a present tense version, you you informing when you're talking about future or past tense

00:29:19: <Cimmerian> as in

00:29:34: <Cimmerian> I inform you. I was informing you. I will be informing you.

00:29:36: <Decibelle> alright

00:29:41: <Decibelle> anything else need to change

00:29:53: <Cimmerian> Roget?

00:29:58: <Cimmerian> I think it looks good.

00:30:20: <Decibelle> now i need a subject for the pm

00:30:22: <Decibelle> im bad at that

00:30:32: <Cimmerian> "Licensing Issue"
00:30:38: <ProcyonLotor> looks good to me
00:30:40: <Cimmerian> or something starkly descriptive
00:30:48: <ProcyonLotor> "With Regards to Licensing"
00:30:57: <Cimmerian> yesh
00:31:00: <Cimmerian> this works
00:31:09: <Roget> Sounds like a plan to me
00:31:20: <Decibelle> sent it all off
00:31:37: <Cimmerian> if we remember, and they still don't get back to us...
probably remind them again on the 30th
00:32:37: <Cimmerian> ugh
00:32:46: <Cimmerian> just noticed the Outreach was misspelled
00:33:04: <Decibelle> i fixed it
00:33:05: <ProcyonLotor> well, they probably won't notice
00:33:10: <Cimmerian> oh good
00:33:10: <Decibelle> i also fixed the licensing typo too
00:33:13: <Decibelle> that no one else pointed out
00:33:18: <Cimmerian> I am not good at finding typos. ;)
00:33:18: <ProcyonLotor> not being rude but like, I certainly couldn't point
out their russian typos
00:33:31: <Decibelle> i mean
00:33:37: <Decibelle> they speak, read, and write russian
00:33:40: <Decibelle> er
00:33:41: <Decibelle> english
00:33:44: <Decibelle> none of us do that for russian
00:33:49: <Decibelle> unless you all have abilities i dont know about
00:35:22: Cimmerian takes off his poncho revealing that underneath he is a
vladimir putin looklike
00:35:27: <Cimmerian> *lookalike
00:36:43: Cimmerian takes off Putin costume to reveal he is actually Boris
Yeltsen returned from the dead pretending to be Mikhail Gorbachev
00:38:10: <theinteresteddeer> :0
02:13:16: <Cimmerian> We're not dealing with logic here, so I'm not even
sure you need to respond. Say that we'll be enacting measures on June 1st
regardless, and that's that.
02:13:42: <ProcyonLotor> If they do not comply
02:14:01: <ProcyonLotor> Don't gotta be mean, but we're also well past
"nice"
02:14:24: <Decibelle> i just need to know how to reply
02:14:26: <Roget> what's up did a new development occur
02:14:30: <Decibelle> Roget:

02:14:32: <Decibelle> Gene R
02:14:32: <Decibelle> To: Decibelles
02:14:32: <Decibelle> Re: With Regards to Licensing
02:14:32: <Decibelle> 14 May 2017, 19:43
02:14:32: <Decibelle> Hello.
02:14:32: <Decibelle> We are aware of that license and are currently seeking legal advice. We will adjust our licensing based on legal requirements (or won't, if there are no requirements for us to do so). I hope you (as the wiki administration) do consider the full consequences of your actions before you act.
02:15:44: <Roget> I think we don't need to respond, I think that if we do it ought to emphasize how much we're not relishing having to do this
02:17:24: <Cimmerian> Decibelle: Just reiterate the point, and say that time's up. We can't wait forever on them getting legal advice.
02:27:07: <Deci|Dinner> ProcyonLotor: i also need you to help chime in on what message i should write back with
02:27:11: <Deci|Dinner> because im gonna eat and come back
02:27:13: <Deci|Dinner> and also since im uh
02:27:15: <Deci|Dinner> getting conflicting advice
02:36:43: <TheDuckMan> According to our legal counsel, you are under requirement to do so.
02:43:34: <ProcyonLotor> Deci|Dinner: my message was intended to support Cimmerian's proposal
02:48:36: <Lazar> What's the question?
02:49:10: <Lazar> Oh, is this about the ACP takedown?
02:49:20: <Roget> negative, scp-ru
02:50:04: <ProcyonLotor> Not a secret, but also an internal matter
02:51:35: <Lazar> Ah.
02:51:45: <Lazar> I was wondering why there were no O5 responses.
02:59:51: <Cimmerian> I just can't get over "We won't change our license until we see a legal requirement to do so" "Here's the legal requirement" "Yeah like I said, we won't be changing it until we see a legal requirement"
03:01:13: <Cimmerian> it's probably a combination of a language barrier + genuine obstinance but still it's frustrating that we're having to take this so far.
03:01:43: <Cimmerian> I want to ask them how they intend to enforce on anyone internationally if they refuse to accept the concept of international copyright agreements.
03:01:51: <Lazar> If there's a language barrier, I have a Russian-speaking friend that may be able to help us out.
03:02:05: <Lazar> Summertime, so she shouldn't have too much going on.

03:02:58: <Cimmerian> Is the idea that Russian law trumps *all other national laws* on matters of copyright?

03:03:40: <Cimmerian> it's completely illogical

03:04:45: <Cimmerian> You know I wonder if that argument's been made.

03:05:07: <ProcyonLotor> we're well past the point of figuring out what they want or think they have

03:05:51: <Cimmerian> "If federal laws trump international copyright agreements, then you are arguing that your site's license is only enforceable on people subject to russian law. By your own logic anyone outside of Russia can use your works in a commercial capacity?"

03:07:07: <Cimmerian> I still have an urge to treat them as though they're reasonable logical people even though every thing they've said indicates otherwise.

03:07:31: <Roget> we should we want to be able to continue having a relationship with them in the future

03:08:06: <ProcyonLotor> We treat them, at least from Licensing perspective, as we treat any other violator. We are willing to clarify but not negotiate.

03:08:18: <ProcyonLotor> Purpose or intetion does not matter

03:09:27: Cimmerian nods

03:09:38: <Cimmerian> We're almost there, once the 1st goes by there's not much we can do next.

03:11:05: <Cimmerian> The concept that somehow the Russian wiki gets to dictate if and when I can enforce the site's license is preposterous.

03:11:58: <Cimmerian> "Oh it's non-commercial now cause we translated that into russian and russian law trumps all other laws"

03:12:04: <Cimmerian> like wtf

03:15:52: <ProcyonLotor> We disassociate and if we get evidence of them attempting to enforce NC from there, we move from that point.

03:16:13: <ProcyonLotor> But considering the range of solutions that remain available to us there, we should save that discussion for the point it becomes necessary, god forbid

03:16:17: Roget saddened by this russia thing

03:16:18: <Cimmerian> I'd argue we should start the takedown process shortly thereafter.

03:16:30: <Lazar> Do they have licensing people that regularly enforce their license?

03:16:37: <Cimmerian> They asked *us to do it*

03:16:50: Cimmerian grumps

03:17:27: <Lazar> How terrible of an idea would it be to undercut them?

03:17:39: <Roget> ??

03:17:40: <Jarvis> roget: There are no memos matching your criteria.
03:17:51: <Cimmerian> Could just be me being a little tiffed all of a sudden but I feel like if I'm gonna be sending takedowns to steam or etsy or redbubble then why would we leave out a huge offended like the russian wiki?
03:18:10: <Lazar> They're going to have difficulty enforcing a highly questionable license, yes?
03:18:13: <Roget> I'd give them another month to come around
03:18:15: <Cimmerian> oh
03:18:17: <Cimmerian> you mean
03:18:19: <Roget> at least
03:18:32: <Cimmerian> keep an eye on their enforcement and then contact who they contact and say "nah you're good"?
03:18:37: <Cimmerian> that's... not ideal
03:18:52: <Roget> This is our oldest translator community others are watching how we deal with them in our wider community
03:18:58: <ProcyonLotor> Cimmerian: that's a conversation we can have with the admins //if// it becomes necessary.
03:19:01: <Lazar> It's not ideal, but it's a solution to the symptom, right?
03:19:14: <Lazar> I'm just pitching ideas at this point.
03:19:19: <Cimmerian> ProcyonLotor: What's the if in that?
03:19:22: <ProcyonLotor> Should they force our hand, I will support it, but considering the gravity, we should at least give them until the deadline we gave them.
03:19:28: <Cimmerian> they've been enforcing behind the scenes
03:19:28: <ProcyonLotor> The fact that it is still May 14.
03:19:32: <Cimmerian> according to GeneR
03:19:34: <Cimmerian> sure
03:19:39: <Cimmerian> right
03:19:41: <Roget> If we use anything but our lightest hand we could damage relationships we have with other sites for ever after this
03:19:59: <Cimmerian> ProcyonLotor: Neither I nor anyone else is suggesting we move earlier than the deadline, of course.
03:20:15: <Cimmerian> but given the reply we just got, we ought to have an idea of what's next
03:20:26: <Cimmerian> eh
03:20:30: <Cimmerian> we can talk in june I suppose
03:20:54: <ProcyonLotor> Roget: Cimmerian is right in that we're reaching the point where our lightest and heaviest hands become the same
03:20:55: <Roget> I don't want us to drag our feet but it's in our interest to give them every chance to come around
03:21:02: <ProcyonLotor> But I would prefer the conversation wait until June

04:52:13: <DORA> meow
04:52:16: <DORA> anyone online atm
04:52:20: <DORA> .seen ProcyonLotor
04:52:21: <Jarvis> dora: I last saw procyonlotor 2 hours ago saying: But I would prefer the conversation wait until June
04:52:22: <DORA> .seen Cimmerian
04:52:22: <ProcyonLotor> o/
04:52:23: <Jarvis> dora: I last saw cimmerian 2 hours ago saying: we can talk in june I suppose
04:59:34: <DORA> meow
04:59:39: <ProcyonLotor> \o
04:59:42: <DORA> ProcyonLotor sorry, gotta duck afk for a sec there
04:59:47: <DORA> so basically, a couple of things
05:00:09: <DORA> one is that I got a message from Varaxous in my inbox, asking
05:00:21: <DORA> "Hello there! I just have a quick question about picture licensing: if I were to take picture of Kellogg's Corn Pops myself at my house, and then do various photoshop things to it, would I still be able to use it in my article? Thanks!"
05:01:05: <ProcyonLotor> got same message, answered already
05:01:06: <DORA> I'm ~generally~ sure we'd be ok to use such image, but not sure about the details of how the Licensing will work in this case
05:01:11: <DORA> oh ok
05:01:12: <DORA> gotcha
05:01:16: <ProcyonLotor> but the answer is yes, it's all good
05:01:59: <DORA> would it be under Fair Use or under CC?
05:02:39: <ProcyonLotor> The use of Corn Pops would be fair use, the picture itself would be CC
05:02:50: <DORA> ok
05:03:08: <DORA> the other thing is Scantron's inquiry from a couple of days ago re: that one SCP with the giant spider robot
05:03:44: <DORA> scp-278
05:03:50: <Jarvis> dora: SCP-278: A Large Mechanical Spider (written 8 years ago by FritzWillie; rating: +39) - <http://www.scp-wiki.net/scp-278>
05:04:27: <ProcyonLotor> bring me up to speed
05:04:40: <DORA> <https://paste.ee/p/IE193>
05:05:18: <DORA> so the very bottom image does have a (c) bruce adams watermark
05:05:22: <ProcyonLotor> forward that to vince please
05:05:53: <Roget> oh jeez I just got a WIKIDOT IS DOWN screen and it scared the shit out of me

05:06:03: <Roget> for just a second
05:06:46: <ProcyonLotor> WIKIDOT IS DELETED
05:07:10: <DORA> meow
05:09:03: <DORA> .tell Vince we've got some inquiries about the images on !SCP-278, and in a quick look it does seem the majority of images there are taken from news photographers who apparently have not released their photos on CC <https://paste.ee/p/IE193>
05:09:03: <Jarvis> dora: I will do it.
05:09:04: <Jarvis> dora: SCP-278: A Large Mechanical Spider (written 8 years ago by FritzWillie; rating: +39) - <http://www.scp-wiki.net/scp-278>
10:57:41: <Cimmerian> .tell Vince ACP site has been taken down, you can edit the thread title to [CLOSED] now.
10:57:42: <Jarvis> cimmerian: Just because I have to do this, doesn't mean I enjoy it.
10:58:01: <Roget> you made quick work of it
19:23:38: <ProcyonLotor> It's a correct understanding
19:24:04: <ProcyonLotor> I received the same message and have already answered it
20:44:39: <Gaffsey> .showtells
21:00:52: <Roget> .tell cimmerian I very much appreciate the work you did taking down that site ripping off my article
21:00:53: <Jarvis> roget: I'm on it, boss.
21:04:29: <ProcyonLotor> Also props to wix for their turnaround
21:16:59: <Roget> excellent

2017-05-23

00:39:38: <Cimmerian> yay recruiting
01:21:57: <Gaffk> .showtells
01:22:14: <Gaffsey> .showtells
01:34:55: <Gaffsey> Hey, here is a really, imo, obvious question, but just for the sake of due diligence I will ask
01:35:22: <Gaffsey> if you write something that is CC-BY-SA-NC, someone cannot adapt it to a work that is CC-BY-SA, correct?
03:12:11: <Gaffsey> .showtells
03:12:13: <Gaffsey> er
03:12:15: <Gaffsey> .showtells
03:12:35: <Gaffsey> <Gaffsey> Hey, here is a really, imo, obvious question, but just for the sake of due diligence I will ask
03:12:39: <Gaffsey> <Gaffsey> if you write something that is CC-BY-SA-NC, someone cannot adapt it to a work that is CC-BY-SA, correct?

03:12:43: <Cimmerian> [19:48] Cimmerian No.
03:12:45: <Cimmerian> [19:49] Cimmerian they can't
03:13:19: <Gaffsey> Ah
03:15:15: <Gaffsey> yeah, so the WL thing about "omg you can totes post NC stuff" should be ammended
03:15:18: <Gaffsey> so that's fun
03:54:56: <Deci|Dinner> hey so CimmeriaFK, ProcyonLotor, just so you know, i forgot to PM Gene R back
03:55:02: <Deci|Dinner> but i also didnt know if it was strictly needed so
03:55:05: <Deci|Dinner> i am just deciding not to
04:04:58: <ProcyonLotor> wasn't necessary

2017-05-24

20:07:35: <Vince> TL;DR, decibelle is asking for a list of probable major articles that we might be removing stuff from. I've identified about a dozen probables, between the heritage list, the top rated list, and the 001s
20:07:39: <Vince> oh hey, perfect.
20:07:44: <Vince> also, roget, are you there?
20:08:12: <Roget> I sure am
20:08:19: <Roget> ???
20:08:20: <Jarvis> roget: There are no memos matching your criteria.
20:08:25: <Roget> are we getting fishmongered
20:09:33: <Vince> Cimmerian: that reminds me, have the russians gotten their shit together yet? do you know?
20:09:40: <Decibelle> Roget: image removals
20:10:38: <CimmeriaFK> Vince: still listed as non-commercial.
20:11:10: <Vince> ughhh
20:11:30: <CimmeriaFK> Wait. We wont' know which articles need taken down until we're already to the point where we actually are about to take them down.
20:11:34: <Roget> Oh that reminds me I think we should give an early notice to the translation sites about the -RU removal
20:11:39: <CimmeriaFK> once the research is done, that's the 2nd to last step
20:11:57: <Decibelle> Cimmerian: i asked vince to give me articles where images will be removed before we do so
20:11:57: <Vince> Roget: Yeah, that's going to be in a week, so it might be a good idea now.

20:12:00: <Roget> Decibelle: I am reminded because you're here, I wanted to know if you wished to send out the notice. I can write it for you but if you still wanna be taking point on the INT sites I support you

20:12:01: <Decibelle> so i can organize a contest immediately

20:12:06: <Decibelle> instead of waiting until images are already down

20:12:09: <CimmeriaFK> OH

20:12:17: <Decibelle> Roget: i already sent one pm to the admins

20:12:18: <Decibelle> now its your turn

20:12:19: <Vince> Decibelle: I think I may have misunderstood you then.

20:12:20: <CimmeriaFK> you mean for like the dozen or so major articles?

20:12:36: <CimmeriaFK> rather than the hundreds we'll have to take down altogether

20:12:40: <Decibelle> the major ones, yes

20:12:45: <Decibelle> aka the ones people care about

20:12:49: CimmeriaFK nods

20:12:53: <Roget> Decibelle: when did ya send it?

20:12:56: <Vince> yeah, I have a bit of a list there.

20:13:08: <Roget> Can I also get the contents so that I know what was said to them already/who it was sent to

20:13:11: <Vince> Roget: so you're on board with removing them if they don't comply by the first, right?

20:13:30: <Decibelle> roget, i sent it ten days ago

20:13:33: <Vince> I haven't been around as much as I need to to see all these conversations taken place

20:13:36: <Roget> Vince: I put it on the table for you guys to use I'm not snatching it away at the last moment

20:13:37: <Decibelle> to every admin on the russian site

20:13:39: <Decibelle> this is what i sent:

20:13:45: <Roget> Decibelle: oh no I meant the other admins

20:13:51: <Roget> For the other sites

20:13:59: <Decibelle> i didnt send them anything

20:14:03: <Roget> since they link to SCP-RU as well and we probably want to give them our side of the story

20:14:05: <Decibelle> im saying if we need to contact the russian site again

20:14:06: <Roget> You want to, or ought I?

20:14:09: <Decibelle> i want YOU to send them a PM

20:14:13: <Decibelle> i can send a pm to the other admins

20:14:25: <Roget> cool beans

20:14:25: <LilyAFK> Decibelle: what /did/ you send to the russians?

20:14:31: <Decibelle> Hello. This is a PM on behalf of Licensing (from a member of Internet Outreach) to remind the Russian Wiki admins that we are

still waiting on action as well as another reply with regards to the licensing changes we've requested. The deadline is June 1st. Failure to do so means that we'll be retracting official recognition of your site, as well as informing all of the other translation sites

20:14:31: <Decibelle> to delist you and cease recognizing you as well. If changes aren't made very shortly after that, we'll have no option but to subject the site to normal licensing enforcement (up to and including a takedown order). Please respond as soon as possible. Thank you.

20:14:57: <Vince> Basically, our intention is to use INT removal and disavowal as the final warning shot. Then, if they don't comply within one or two weeks, we issue the takedown order

20:14:57: <Decibelle> this is what gene r sent back

20:15:01: <Decibelle> Hello.

20:15:01: <Decibelle> We are aware of that license and are currently seeking legal advice. We will adjust our licensing based on legal requirements (or won't, if there are no requirements for us to do so). I hope you (as the wiki administration) do consider the full consequences of your actions before you act.

20:15:12: <Decibelle> so if another pm needs to be sent to the russian admins

20:15:13: <Decibelle> roget can do it

20:15:18: <Decibelle> and if they dont comply by the first

20:15:20: <Vince> are they threatening us

20:15:25: <Decibelle> ill just send out a mass PM to all the other admins

20:15:43: <Vince> THat's almost cute

20:17:22: <CimmeriaFK> Roget should probably send our last ditch reminder.

20:17:41: <CimmeriaFK> whilst decibelle get the other branches prepared for the possible fallout

20:17:44: <CimmeriaFK> *gets

20:17:53: <Vince> I feel like they're just stalling and hoping we'll give up

20:17:57: <CimmeriaFK> they are

20:18:13: <Vince> and trying to scare us with the threat of legal action is almost laughable

20:19:53: <Roget> Decibelle: also a side note, since we're both co-captains on the ambassador team, do you want to be sole captain and move me to the vacant contact admin slot?

20:20:14: <Decibelle> yes

20:20:46: <Roget> cool I'll do so now

20:21:13: <Lily> and so begins the fall of roget

20:21:39: <Roget> I am willingly divesting myself of direct power

20:21:53: <Roget> I want to reduce my footprint before I go up to Flagler so if I get busy we don't die or anything
20:22:06: <Lily> Who will write all the scips
20:22:37: <Roget> I'll probably still write scips
20:22:43: <Roget> I might do more collabs actually I enjoy them
20:22:58: <Roget> and it's fun giving someone the opportunity to post who's excited to do it rather than me who posts and goes to sleep
20:24:16: <Lily> 2594 was fun to do
20:24:59: <Roget> Decibelle: updated
20:25:17: <Roget> Lily: if you wanna collab again hmu I've got an idea and my current collab effort is nearly complete
20:25:53: <Lily> What's the idea?
20:26:08: <Vince> I'm just hoping we don't get doxxed or some shit over this
20:26:10: <Lily> I'm doing a collab w/ min rn but it'd be fun doing another later
20:29:38: <Roget> Lily: canned smoke which causes humanoids to come out of the smoke and commit crimes, but everything they take burns
20:31:02: <Lily> Huh
20:31:20: <Vince> or am I worrying too much for nothing
20:31:46: <Lily> Vince: I don't think that would happen
20:31:54: <Lily> If it did they'd be in serious trouble
20:32:10: <Decibelle> we wont get doxxed for it
20:32:16: <Decibelle> worst that could happen
20:32:20: <Decibelle> is that they try to takedown us
20:32:23: <Decibelle> or file a lawsuit against us
20:32:25: <Decibelle> but not doxx us
20:34:56: <Lily> What'd be the response if they do either of those things?
20:35:19: <Decibelle> if they try and take us down we laugh at them
20:35:24: <Decibelle> if they try to file a lawsuit against us, idk
20:36:25: <Vince> Did we ever get a straight answer of why they are adamantly against changing the thing?
20:36:42: <Decibelle> they believe we're wrong
20:36:45: <Decibelle> is the tl;dr
20:38:11: <Vince> this is stupid
20:43:00: <Lily> It is

2017-05-27

00:20:39: <Roget> ProcyonLotor: you here
00:22:53: <ProcyonLotor> I am
00:22:58: <Roget> Gene posted on 05
00:23:22: <Roget> Decibelle: you here

00:23:30: <Decibelle> yes
00:23:56: <Roget> <http://05command.wikidot.com/forum/t-2296645/ads>
00:23:56: <Decibelle> "This is a great opportunity for you to demonstrate your adherence to the licensing principles. Please work with us to resolve this issue in a peaceful and amicable way." oof
00:24:01: <Decibelle> that passive-aggressiveness tho
00:24:05: <Roget> Seriously
00:24:33: <Roget> That's echoing language I used in my message to them about the upcoming deadline
00:35:33: <Roget> ProcyonLotor: I'm pretty sure the responses to the second point would be that our license is specifically allowing for commercial use, the fact that the license they are using is non-commercial being one of the linchpins of our whole issue with them?
00:36:12: <Roget> For the first it does seem to be a legitimate point that the ad windows use our name and logo without CC attribution but we could probably ask WikiDot about that or somefin
00:38:06: <ProcyonLotor> Can someone get me a screen of these ad windows
00:39:31: <Decibelle> i think they dont appear if youre logged in
00:40:46: <Roget> stand by
00:42:54: <Roget> ProcyonLotor: <http://i.imgur.com/4oXyJR2.png>
00:47:35: <ProcyonLotor> Alright, those are de minimis
00:48:12: <ProcyonLotor> Especially considering that all practical access to such a window will be through a properly licensed page
00:49:34: <ProcyonLotor> Someone please get me the original Izumi Kato message
00:50:33: <Roget> <http://05command.wikidot.com/forum/t-1016698>
00:52:02: <ProcyonLotor> Alright, give me some time to formulate a response
00:52:41: <Roget> kk
03:34:16: <ProcyonLotor> they were apparently aping roget's PMs to them
03:34:52: <Roget> affirmative
03:35:14: <CimmeriaFK> oh cool they're being assholes
03:35:43: <Roget> I have a message drafted up that I can send to Cadeucus so the wikidot community people have a heads up
03:35:53: <CimmeriaFK> actually only evidence of one person being an asshole actually, but still
03:43:45: <Cimmerian> also, procy: We're probably eventually going to need to remove NC images anyway.
03:43:52: <Cimmerian> outside of all the points you made

03:44:08: <Cimmerian> NC is incompatible and we're not allowing them in new articles for that reason.
03:45:03: <ProcyonLotor> we can have that nightmare discussion when we have less on our plate
03:45:30: <Cimmerian> sure, but what I mean is: They're bringing up a thing we're already aware of and working on.
03:46:32: <ProcyonLotor> I, for one, do not want to broadcast that to the entire world at this present moment
03:46:43: <Cimmerian> fairish
04:18:40: <TheDuckMan> have we heard back from russia about the ultimatum?
04:21:07: <Cimmerian> They semi-threatened us last time we talked to them.
04:21:41: <TheDuckMan> How long did we give them? I remember there was an ultimatum, but not how long it was...
04:22:33: <Cimmerian> end of this month
04:22:57: <TheDuckMan> KK.
04:23:29: <TheDuckMan> Sorry russians, not blinking.

2017-05-29

00:07:17: <Roget> :< I was hopeful but I think I was wrong they gave attribution for the theme on their license page but not the site as a whole
20:06:25: <Gaffsey> .showtells
20:21:14: <Vince> .showtells
20:23:06: <Vince> .seen ProcyonLotor
20:23:09: <Jarvis> vince: I last saw procyonlotor 2 days ago saying: I, for one, do not want to broadcast that to the entire world at this present moment
20:23:44: <ProcyonLotor> o/
20:23:55: <Vince> ProcyonLotor: so the russians have updated their licensing work?
20:24:02: <Vince> er, attribution?
20:24:50: <ProcyonLotor> Not afaik. It looked like they had but then they hadn't.
20:25:29: <Vince> I think it's hilarious that they attributed Ael's theme appropriately
20:25:31: <Vince> Alright.
20:25:45: <Vince> So. are you available to talk at the moment?
20:30:13: <LilyAFK> I loved Gene's passive-agressive ads post
20:32:30: <Vince> That's what I wanted to talk about. I'm disappointed in the anger displayed there by our team. If they /do/ comply with us we still need to

be able to work with them after, without causing significant bad blood. Yeah, This was a passive-aggressive deflection, but we can't react with anger.

20:32:41: <Vince> like

20:32:58: <Vince> if/when they do comply, they need to be actually happy about working with us again in the future

20:33:10: <Vince> being all stick and no carrot is not helping with that

20:33:54: <Vince> Rules-lawyering is frustrating as fuck, and this situation is beyond my normal comprehension of the CC-by-SA-3.0 license

20:34:03: <Vince> but we have to keep a level head about us.

20:34:08: <LilyAFK> Aye

20:35:46: <ProcyonLotor> I didn't react with anger. I gave them a one sentence reminder that we're not the ones they needed to be worrying about

20:36:28: <ProcyonLotor> Which was in line with, and no more or less curt, than previous statements of such

20:36:35: <Vince> fair enough. Tone is often difficult for me to understand in text.

20:36:54: <LilyAFK> Where was this?

20:37:00: <Vince> in the ads thread

20:37:24: <ProcyonLotor> <http://05command.wikidot.com/forum/t-2296645/ads#post-2833815>

20:37:57: <ProcyonLotor> Indeed, I went to great pains to make the explanation both thorough while still being as (relatively) accessible to the casual reader as possible

20:40:30: <Roget> I think we struck a more stern tone but not an angry one

20:40:45: <Vince> I appreciate that. Has there been any more communication since then? I seem to remember you, roget, or decibelle mentioning pm's being sent?

20:40:57: <Vince> or recieved?

20:41:07: <Roget> I sent a PM the ads post sarcastically quoted/echoed me at the end

20:41:12: <ProcyonLotor> Not since this post, at least to my awareness

20:41:37: <Vince> alright.

20:41:39: <Roget> The " Please work with us to resolve this issue in a peaceful and amicable way." was from me and I think the rest of that line was echoing me

20:42:08: <Vince> Yeah, I noticed that

20:42:22: <Vince> pissed me off a bit

20:43:05: <ProcyonLotor> I'm willing to write that off as an ELL guy aping phrasing. I do it with Spanish all the time. Admittedly in less formal situations, but...

20:43:09: <ProcyonLotor> vOv

20:44:04: <Vince> yeah, I wouldn't be surprised if there's been a bit of a language barrier and that that may have caused some misunderstanding

20:44:55: <ProcyonLotor> My posts, especially, and I don't believe there is any way to address that due to the nature of the questions, probably in particular

20:47:00: <Vince> yeah, a lot of technical language gets lost in translation

20:47:55: <ProcyonLotor> Yep. Unfortunately, this are the kinds of questions you can answer simply OR correctly.

20:51:13: <ProcyonLotor> Dude did raise some interesting points. In any other situation they would have been fun to look into.

20:54:13: <Vince> Absolutely. I have no problem helping them with these sorts of things and answering licensing questions, at all. I just wish they would ask ones pertinent to their situation

20:55:26: <ProcyonLotor> Might have been part of the perception problem- I was completely earnest in saying "interesting fields of copyright theory" but I see how that could look dismissive

20:55:51: <Roget> This is part of why it would be nice if they were more communicative

20:56:04: <Vince> have any of them been in here since the whole thing started?

20:56:16: <Vince> or the main staffchat?

20:56:23: <Vince> I know at least Gene has access to that one

20:56:32: <ProcyonLotor> No. At least on the public end none of them have touched it except GeneR

20:56:43: <ProcyonLotor> He might just be pointman though

20:58:38: <ProcyonLotor> I'm assuming again that language barrier might be part of the problem- due to our grasps of English, we are able to craft responses much more nimbly. Of course, that would only explain part of it

20:59:24: <Vince> CC-BY-NC = NYET. CC-BY-SA-3.0=DA

20:59:47: <Vince> idk

20:59:52: <Vince> I'm just stressing a bit over this

21:00:13: <ProcyonLotor> Out of our hands at this point, if it's any small comfort.

21:00:28: <Vince> ?

21:01:04: <ProcyonLotor> Ie we've taken all the action we can to demonstrate why what we are demanding is right and necessary, and at this point it is on them

21:02:07: <Vince> Ah

21:02:09: <Vince> Yeah.

21:02:23: <Vince> If they were willing to ask more questions and get some back-and-forth going that would be amazing

21:02:27: <Vince> like. Relevant questions
21:02:33: <Vince> but it's getting to be a tad late for that
21:03:06: <ProcyonLotor> Hell, if they were willing to give us even a discussion I'd be willing to push the date back until said discussion is resolved
21:03:28: <ProcyonLotor> (Assuming it was carried out in a timely manner)
21:04:54: <Vince> So our current timetable is if they haven't complied by Thursday, we remove them from INT and the official translation list, and send the final warning that they needed to get their shit in order.
21:05:05: <Vince> with a reasonable period of time to do so, yes?
21:06:59: <ProcyonLotor> Yeah. As far as I'm aware, on Thursday our duties begin and end at checking for compliance and giving a yay or nay to the admins
22:36:19: <CimmeriaFK> you know
22:36:51: <Lily> ?
22:36:57: <ProcyonLotor> do I
22:37:06: <CimmeriaFK> ProcyonLotor: I had a thought yesterday. Let's pretend that for a moment the russians are somehow right. What about all the russian authors they're ripping off from the main wiki by altering their license to add NC?
22:37:59: <CimmeriaFK> I mean it's just another example of the incredibly poor logic by which they're operating but still. A funny thought.
22:38:03: <ProcyonLotor> stare not into the abyss, my friend

2017-05-31

16:58:27: <anqxyr> so I wanted to peek at the Russian's side of the discussion, and I've been poking around their branch for 5 minutes now, and not only is their version of 05 either private or non-existent, but I can't even find the list of their site staff
16:58:43: <Lily> It's a private site
16:58:46: <Lily> Annoyingly enough
16:59:28: <Roget> Yeah it's private
16:59:36: <Roget> You can see their admins and mods on the system:members page
16:59:47: <Roget> I think they've always had few staff members
18:53:12: <Vince> .showtells
19:39:58: <anqxyr> .im stats 002-099
19:39:58: <Jarvis> anqxyr: 75 indexed images in this category (_____
0,2 AWAITING REPLY _____ 1, _____ 0,2
BY-NC-SA CC _____ 3, _____ 0,3 BY-SA

CC _____ 3, _____ 0,4 PERMANENTLY
REMOVED _____ 1, _____ 0,2
PERMISSION GRANTED _____
5, _____ 0,4 SOURCE UNKNOWN _____
10, _____ 0,4 UNABLE TO CONTACT _____

- 2). Not reviewed - 50.

19:40:20: <anqxyr> .im --usage

19:40:21: <Jarvis> anqxyr: usage: !images

{scan,update,list,notes,purge,search,stats,sync,add,remove,attribute,claim,tag
cc}

19:40:36: <anqxyr> .im

19:40:37: <Jarvis> anqxyr: usage: !images

{scan,update,list,notes,purge,search,stats,sync,add,remove,attribute,claim,tag
cc}

19:40:40: <anqxyr> .im list

19:40:40: <Jarvis> anqxyr: usage: !images list target [index] [--terse]

19:40:57: <LilyAFK> oh jeez that's complex

19:41:35: <anqxyr> there's a guide on it in the room topic

19:42:27: <LilyAFK> Ah cool

19:42:30: <LilyAFK> Will look soon

19:42:51: <anqxyr> .im claim --usage

19:42:51: <Jarvis> anqxyr: usage: !images claim category [--purge]

19:43:06: <anqxyr> .im claim 2200-2299 --purge

19:43:22: <anqxyr> hm?

19:43:46: <LilyAFK> At the guide

19:44:04: <anqxyr> nah, I'm hm at jarv

19:44:17: <anqxyr> he did the thing, but haven't replied about it

19:44:30: <anqxyr> *I'm hming

19:45:02: <anqxyr> .im claim 400-499 --purge

20:14:25: <Gaffsey> .showtells

20:31:56: <Cimmerian> hokay

20:34:47: <Gaffsey> hokay?

20:35:04: <Cimmerian> progress it looks

20:35:15: <Roget> o/

20:35:47: <Cimmerian> ProcyonLotor:

<http://05command.wikidot.com/forum/t-2171743/russian-youtube-audio-versions#post-2838040>

20:36:50: <Cimmerian> you know it's funny to me that the "Foundation" doesn't actually appear in 173

20:37:27: <Roget> We didn't even call ourselves the SCP Foundation until after we'd moved to wikidot

20:37:37: <Gaffsey> I was gonna say
20:37:55: <Gaffsey> the other ones were... the organization, and like, something weird like "the bastion," iirc
20:37:56: <Cimmerian> yup
20:38:06: <Cimmerian> which makes our case on this super easy to make
20:38:25: <Vince> I'm just really upset that Gene seems to think our work/station is illegitimate
20:39:00: <Cimmerian> if we want to press them further, let's wait until they actually change the site license
20:39:37: <LilyAFK> Hell, it was originally the "SCP Organisation" on wikidot
20:39:45: <LilyAFK> If you go back to the earliest pages
20:40:51: <Roget> I think I linked to the exact thread where we decided to go with Foundation in this discussion thread
20:41:01: Cimmerian nods
20:41:08: <Roget> <http://www.scp-wiki.net/forum/t-76752/foundation-or-organisation>
20:41:12: <Cimmerian> I wanted to communicate that as concisely as possible
20:41:13: <Roget> I did
20:41:28: <Roget> Do you want me to re-link that thread for emphasis or maybe add it to yer post?
20:41:33: <Roget> *in the thread
20:41:52: <Cimmerian> I'll add it to the post.
20:42:06: <Roget> kk
20:42:27: <LilyAFK> Originally, I used "organisation" instead of "organization" because it sounded atypical but not improper. The more I look at the question, the more I'm beginning to like the sound of Foundation. Is there an alternative spelling we can use to make it sound old-world or ancient. And not something gay, like "shop" to "shoppe"
20:42:32: <LilyAFK> Imao @ the admin
20:42:56: <Vince> lol it was a different time
20:43:13: <LilyAFK> Personally I'd like the Foundation to be called something gay
20:43:25: <Gaffsey> the "scp something gay?"
20:43:26: <LilyAFK> we should do a pride themed contest or event or something imo
20:43:31: <Cimmerian> 2008 was a crazy time.
20:43:34: <LilyAFK> change the theme to a rainbow version for a day
20:43:39: <Roget> I'd be down
20:43:44: <Gaffsey> foun gaytion

20:44:02: <Cimmerian> either way, I'd say we've made some real progress on this issue

20:44:03: <Cimmerian> which is good

20:44:20: <LilyAFK> Roget: this could be a good thing for IO/CO

20:44:30: <LilyAFK> Cimmerian: thanks moose

20:44:42: <Cimmerian> hmm?

20:44:59: <Roget> I think we've got contests booked for this year but we've got a lot of room for doing future contests

20:45:09: <LilyAFK> afaik moose was good in originally moving the site in a better direction

20:45:17: <Cimmerian> oh

20:45:21: <LilyAFK> Roget: even as not a contest but just a day/week event thing

20:45:34: <Cimmerian> while I am glad we are making progress on that front, I meant the russian issue

20:45:47: <LilyAFK> Cimmerian: oops lol

20:45:50: <Cimmerian> their saying they'll change the site license is a huge step forward

20:46:06: <Gaffsey> "I just want to read about spooky stuff, not read some sjw shit"

20:46:08: <Gaffsey> there, now that's out of the way and no one will every say that again

20:46:09: <Roget> Definitely. Do we want to give them more time now or keep with our deadline?

20:46:32: <Vince> I like that they're willing to compromise that far, and to set it up for all future works

20:46:47: <Roget> Well it's not really a compromise if it's what we need them to do

20:46:53: <Roget> More acceding to our request/demand

20:46:57: <Gaffsey> on the one hand, it's a show of good faith as they understand it; otoh, they didn't actually comply with our demands

20:47:13: <Cimmerian> Roget: My call would be to give 'em a few more days to get it together. Once they do, if they start releasing works that feature foundation stuff with an NC element attached we can revisit.

20:47:35: <Roget> Maybe note that in the post so they don't think we were bluffing if the deadline comes and goes?

20:47:51: <Cimmerian> I'ma leave that one to you.

20:48:49: <Cimmerian> make sure to post something referencing our posts to drive home that point as well

20:49:07: <Cimmerian> give them another date, as well

20:49:11: <Cimmerian> not just "a few more days"

20:49:14: <Vince> I'm unsure of how to handle it. On the one hand, they did have a show of good faith. On the other, we can't allow this to drag on for much longer because it's getting in the way of other pressing matters like image compliance

20:49:29: <Roget> I'm thinking 3-7 days

20:49:33: <Cimmerian> 3

20:49:34: <Cimmerian> not 7

20:49:36: <Roget> k

20:49:47: <Vince> my original plan was to drop the ultimatum then give them like a week to understand the gravity of the situation

20:50:06: <Vince> I just. Fear them overreacting and trying to burn the licensing team and site down with them

20:50:18: <Cimmerian> meh

20:50:34: <Cimmerian> Don't worry too much. We gotta do what we gotta do.

20:50:36: <Roget> So a post giving them till the end of this week to update their site before we begin any kind of take-down measures, referencing the other posts to let them know what we need them to do?

20:51:43: <Cimmerian> Yesh. Something as simple as "I agree with Procy and Cimm's post as well, but since it may take you a couple of days to put that announcement together, we'll extend our deadline to the 2nd."

20:51:49: <Cimmerian> I'd do this myself but it needs to come from an admin.

20:52:14: <Vince> I'd give them til sunday, personally. but yeah.

20:52:30: <Vince> something roughly like that

20:52:35: <Roget> I'm gonna give em til Sunday

20:52:41: <Cimmerian> fair enough

20:53:06: <Vince> are we still doing the formal disassociation for failing to meet the original deadline, or is that stepping on their necks too hard?

20:53:17: Vince has no idea how to properly be a hardass

20:53:18: <Cimmerian> nah that's what's being extended

20:53:50: <Vince> Right, okay

20:53:55: <Cimmerian> this needs to be the *final* extension as well. They're saying they're moving towards doing the thing. There isn't anywhere else to go.

20:54:50: <Vince> defs.

20:55:26: <Cimmerian> they blinked first, I'm alright with giving them a little ground to regain their dignity

20:55:32: <Cimmerian> but only a little

20:56:49: <Roget> <http://05command.wikidot.com/forum/t-2171743/russian-youtube-audio-versions#post-2838050>

20:57:23: <Cimmerian> cool

20:57:40: <Roget> o7
20:57:45: <Cimmerian> ok that was the only reason I got on here
20:57:51: <Cimmerian> y'all need anything else?
20:58:14: <Roget> I've started a channel for policy workshopping if you're interested in being a part of that
20:58:33: <Cimmerian> what's the channel?
21:02:06: <Roget> #TheBullMoose
21:03:43: <LilyAFK> ?
21:04:13: <Roget> Policy workshopping channel I made for staff and influential users to talk shop on site policy
21:06:54: <LilyAFK> Ah cool
21:07:04: <LilyAFK> Also I think soul is working on the guide update jsyk
21:07:08: <LilyAFK> Or planning to
21:07:13: <LilyAFK> Worth talking to him about anyway
21:08:15: <Vince> I need to finish talking and hashing out the licensing team guide (duties, etc) with the raccoon when he's around lol

2017-06-01

22:47:20: <Vince> at this point I have exactly one question, unless their song changes drastically between now and sunday: How long are we giving them after the disassociation before we drop the hammer?
22:47:52: <Roget> I think after we get all our compliant partners to take them down
22:47:56: <Roget> so none of them are exposed
22:48:05: <Roget> by linking to scp-ru
22:48:19: <Vince> have you poked around the other wikis to explain the situation yet, Roget?
22:48:31: <Roget> We've sent them a message within the past week
22:48:33: <Vince> I don't know if Tom and etc are aware
22:48:36: <Vince> okay
22:48:38: <Roget> They are
22:48:46: <Roget> Information has been distributed
22:48:55: <Vince> okay
22:48:56: <Roget> Sunny is aware if Tom isn't at the very least
22:49:01: <Roget> for SCP-CN
22:49:16: <ProcyonLotor> That's a nasty matter I've been avoiding, but... well, I want to wait until we gave evidence of them attempting to enforce NC afterwards, but I don't think that's practically tenable
22:49:45: <ProcyonLotor> *have, not gave
22:50:09: <Roget> we have an SCP-RU admin in 19

22:50:10: <Roget> Resure
22:50:15: <Roget> do you want to invite them in here
22:50:40: <ProcyonLotor> I'm not sure whether GeneR is just the pointsman or if he's specifically the one handling it

2017-06-02

00:01:26: <Gaffsey> .showtells
00:39:14: <Cimmerian> Russian site's updated.
00:39:21: <rogay> Woo!
00:39:42: <rogay> I still see NC on their site ;~;
00:40:36: <Cimmerian> I'm looking at the page right now
00:40:42: <Cimmerian> which page are you looking at?
00:40:56: <rogay> their main page at the bottom
00:41:09: <rogay> at the bottom it says Unless otherwise stated, content on this page is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License
00:41:18: <Cimmerian> "Пока не указано иное, содержимое этой страницы распространяется по лицензии Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 License"
00:41:41: <Cimmerian> are you looking at a version through google translate or something?
00:41:57: <rogay> Negative
00:42:13: <rogay> I just refreshed and I see it looks right now
00:42:19: <rogay> might've had an old version cached
00:42:26: Cimmerian nods
00:42:39: <Cimmerian> hokay, so *that's* a huge leap forward
00:44:36: <Cimmerian> now. How do we make sure they don't let future pieces get released under a NC version. ;)
00:45:35: <rogay> I'm sure if they've changed we'll be hearing from them before Sunday
00:45:52: <rogay> For now though I think we can exit crisis mode
00:46:12: <rogay> Good work everyone we've achieved a major foreign policy goal on the site for the past couple of years
00:46:38: Gaffsey throws confetti
00:49:41: <ProcyonLotor> did you see the 05 post, however, cimmerian?
00:51:04: <Cimmerian> Procy: Which one?
00:52:39: <ProcyonLotor> his most recent in the thread
00:52:47: <Cimmerian> Yes. I replied even.
00:52:49: <ProcyonLotor> he said he'd change the license but he made some unacceptable exceptions

00:53:20: <ProcyonLotor> as far as I'm aware that has not changed
00:54:01: <Cimmerian> yeah that's why I'm asking "How do we make sure future pieces don't end up released under NC"
00:54:07: <Cimmerian> because that's a real possibility
00:55:25: <Cimmerian> basically, they've *said* it
00:55:33: <Cimmerian> we've replied
00:55:51: <Cimmerian> but we actually need to see them do the thing before we make a stink about it
00:55:59: <rogay> It's less of a crisis now that their wiki is compliant in any case
00:57:17: <ProcyonLotor> Did you, uh, all miss "Original works will remain non-commercial (refer to the second question for explanation)."
00:57:49: <Cimmerian> procy: Have you read our replies to the thread yet?
00:58:23: <ProcyonLotor> Yes. And they've given no indication of changing their minds about that yet, and until such a time as they do I am assuming they have not.
00:58:46: <rogay> ;~;
00:58:55: <Cimmerian> That's fine. As soon as there is evidence of that being *applied* in say a discussion thread on a piece, then we can move on it.
00:59:18: <ProcyonLotor> There's already evidence, in that he designated a specific category of pre-existing work noncommercial!
00:59:22: <Cimmerian> but that guy saying it in a thread on our O5 forums isn't the same thing as it being a problem. Yet.
00:59:59: <rogay> I think it's still a problem in that we still need to make sure our license is enforced
01:00:02: <ProcyonLotor> He's the master admin and the one who has been our point of contact this entire time, it is absolutely the same as it being a problem.
01:00:36: <Cimmerian> Then we poke 'em for a response to our responses.
01:00:50: <Cimmerian> Roget, you still got a direct line to 'em?
01:00:57: <Cimmerian> or indirect, as it were
01:00:59: <ProcyonLotor> Decibelle spoke with them earlier.
01:01:08: <ProcyonLotor> They were... not particularly amenable.
01:01:13: <Cimmerian> Ahh. Context. Wh... yeah.
01:01:51: <rogay> Resure was in 19 earlier
01:02:05: <Cimmerian> what exactly did they say? Anyone got logs?
01:02:13: <ProcyonLotor> I'm getting them.
01:02:17: <Cimmerian> cool
01:02:57: <ProcyonLotor> <https://paste.ee/p/MO3Cv>
01:03:12: <ProcyonLotor> Note: "3:39:03 PM We're currently processing a list of Russian-authored articles to revert to their original licenses"

01:03:33: <rogay> I think our ultimatum still applies here, in my post I said the SCP Foundation and all derivative content needs to be cc-by-sa
01:03:33: <ProcyonLotor> This came in well after our responses to his 05 post, and is direct evidence of them not complying.
01:03:39: <Lily> ProcyonLotor: I've decided I will no longer talk to other staff unless it's through Kain Pathos Crow
01:03:46: <ProcyonLotor> Our ultimatum still applies.
01:04:05: <Lily> But seriously they are being so petty and it is infuriating
01:04:19: <ProcyonLotor> Frankly I was unhappy at the extension- we have never been anything less than clear about what they needed to do- but I'm entirely too fed up to force the point
01:05:20: <Cimmerian> Well that's pretty clear I think. We need to start gathering actual instances of improper licensing for the eventual takedown.
01:05:33: <rogay> :<
01:05:33: <Decitrans> also as a note
01:05:48: <ProcyonLotor> We can do that if (when) the first hammer falls.
01:05:55: <Decitrans> gene hasnt said anything since "Back to the topic - this was only a matter of our (mine and Osobist's) preference. We can't force anyone to do anything.
01:05:55: <Decitrans> Moose just seems the most reasonable, that's all."
01:06:09: <Decitrans> which was two hours and 45 min ago
01:06:18: <Decitrans> but hes showing as away on discord
01:06:50: <Cimmerian> ProcyonLotor: Sure, but that's just a thing we need to think about how to do.
01:06:51: <ProcyonLotor> I'm at the point where it's do or die with them, really. I don't care what they think, and I'm certainly not interested in any discussion beyond "okay we did it".

2017-06-04

21:08:18: <Vince> Was curious if we had any movement on the Russian situation since the last time we talked
21:11:38: <Decibelle> not that im aware, no
21:11:46: <Decibelle> we're giving them until june 4th ends in american time
21:15:14: <Vince> kk
21:20:40: <Lazar> And if they don't move?
21:21:04: <Vince> SCP-2980
21:21:07: <Jarvis> vince: SCP-2980: Devil's Nightlight (written 3 years ago by djkaktus; rating: 200) - <http://www.scp-wiki.net/scp-2980>
21:22:28: <Lazar> But is that positive 200 or -200?

21:23:10: <Vince> sorry, I got a question on one of the tumblrs about that one and I've never read it before

21:23:37: <Vince> positive 201 now.

21:23:39: <Vince> lol

21:24:53: <Vince> But yeah. If they fail to do what they need to then we're going to have to disassociate with them to protect our license. We have too many film, game, and television companies breathing down our necks the last few years to allow foundation work to slip into an unlicensed state.

21:25:30: <Vince> I imagine if they're not happy about someone making \$20-100 or so off their shit they'd definitely be pissed if Universal or someone started raking in millions off it

21:25:30: <Lazar> What's their anticipated response to that?

21:26:08: <Vince> That's a very good question, that I do not have an answer to. I can't imagine they'll be happy

21:28:52: <Roget> We're willing to re-associate with them if they cease their plans for making a section of their site the NC license, I think right now everything is actually compliant

21:29:03: <Decibelle> i think ProcyonLotor and Cimmerian need to like

21:29:03: <Roget> ?

21:29:06: <Decibelle> look that over and judge it

21:29:12: <Decibelle> they edited their site license but

21:29:14: <Decibelle> something else was wrong with it

21:29:19: <Decibelle> that it wasnt kosher with licensing team

21:29:33: <Roget> I think it was their post they said when they planned to make a list of things they would classify as NC

21:30:12: <Vince> Last I heard they were only planning on licensing translations of our works under the correct license and were intending to keep the NC license applied to their "original" works

21:30:40: <Vince> by original I mean russian-language-first SCPs and tales, not generic fiction/creepypastas

21:30:42: <Cimmerian> technically everything is compliant, as far as I can see. The fact that they plan to create a list of original works and contact the authors to get them to claim them as NC is no bueno.

21:31:10: <Roget> Do we need to take them down if that's not actually up yet? I feel like since they're working with us now we should use the lightest hand possible

21:31:20: <Cimmerian> We should, yes.

21:31:24: <Decibelle> ProcyonLotor?

21:31:28: <Decibelle> i want his word on all of this

21:31:30: <Cimmerian> It's a reversible step, after all.

21:31:38: <Vince> I'm uncertain if coming down hard on them is going to help at this point

21:31:53: <Vince> especially if they've made motions to make most things compliant.

21:31:56: <Cimmerian> it won't *hurt* either. We were pretty clear in our posts as to what was and wasn't acceptable.

21:32:23: <Cimmerian> and they came back by telling us that they don't think the SCP Foundation itself is under our site's license, only the specific works.

21:32:35: <Vince> If, as with the Wanderer's Library, they have original fiction that has no ties to the actual SCP universe, I was under the impression that they can license that separately

21:32:50: <Cimmerian> They can. That is not what they're doing here though.

21:32:53: <Roget> ^

21:33:12: <Cimmerian> they met us halfway on an issue that require total compliance.

21:33:16: <Cimmerian> *requires

21:33:49: <Cimmerian> and again insisted openly that we can't enforce on them because the SCP Foundation isn't itself under the site license.

21:34:15: <Vince> can you rephrase that, I'm not sure I understand

21:34:38: <Cimmerian> They agree that specific works, like say SCP-2913 is under an enforceable license.

21:35:01: <Cimmerian> However if they write a tale featuring the Foundation explicitly, they believe they can tack on an NC clause to the work.

21:35:06: <Cimmerian> *an original tale

21:35:21: <Vince> That's simply wrong

21:35:31: <Cimmerian> I'm aware. This is the problem.

21:35:33: <Roget> Hence the issue remains unresolved

21:35:37: <Vince> did they explain their reasoning behind that belief?

21:35:48: <Vince> because I don't remember that in either thread on O5

21:36:12: <Cimmerian> they consider the SCP Foundation as a "concept" rather than an expressly written thing.

21:37:20: <Cimmerian> "Authors will be notified that they can choose any license they want for their future works, be it CC BY-NC-SA 3.0, CC BY-SA 3.0 or any other."

21:37:36: <Cimmerian> from gene's post

21:38:36: <Vince> http://new2.fjcdn.com/pictures/Multitude_a8b2f6_664667.jpg

21:39:45: <Cimmerian> as long as that is their plan everything else is moot

21:40:50: <Roget> I think our best way to move forward is to let them stay as long as they're compliant, as they are now, but say that if they make this idea formal policy we would revoke recognition without a waiting period

21:41:06: <Cimmerian> if they reply that that will not be the case and that they'll be enforcing the license properly on their own site, we're fine. Otherwise we disassociate at the end of the day/tomorrow and as soon as someone actually does that thing and it is reported to us we have to deal with it like a standard licensing issue.

21:41:43: <Cimmerian> Roget: You're taking a step back there. As soon as that happens we're already going to have to enforce it like a standard licensing problem.

21:41:51: <Cimmerian> Contact the author, then start working on a takedown.

21:42:28: <Roget> I think that dropping them is going to be walking away from the table, if we can let them stay on we're in a better position to communicate to them that we're not going to accept that

21:42:44: <Roget> Then if they post it we can drop them and immediately treat it like a problem without doing this do-se-do

21:42:49: <Cimmerian> They are already there.

21:42:56: Cimmerian looks up this pasebin

21:43:20: <Cimmerian> <https://paste.ee/p/MO3Cv>

21:44:36: <Roget> 3:39:03 PM We're currently processing a list of Russian-authored articles to revert to their original licenses >> If this list materializes, then we should move forward, but until then they're properly licensed as far as we can see at the present moment

21:45:56: <Cimmerian> Are they?

21:46:20: Cimmerian goes to look

21:46:21: <Roget> I think we should make a stance at the end of the deadline if they don't respond saying "Since your site is presently licensed correctly, we are leaving the connection intact. Should the list of articles you want to attribute as Non-Commercial materialize, we would consider that a license violation, remove you from our official listing and immediately pursue

21:46:36: <Roget> further measures up to and including requesting a takedown of your WikiDot site

21:48:04: <Roget> Yeah it looks like Resure actually purged all the refernces to NC they had on their site

21:48:15: <Roget> (Resure is one of their admins)

21:48:32: <Roget> <http://scpfoundation.ru/system:recent-changes>

21:48:34: <Vince> I think as a show of good faith, if they don't post that list up of articles who are reverted to their original license, we should properly address the two questions they had for us

21:48:42: <Vince> like.

21:48:45: <Roget> all the changes she made appear to be removing notes indicating a NC license

21:48:52: <Vince> if they keep everything the correct license at this moment

21:49:06: <Roget> Vince: yeah that's what I'm saying, if they're working with us we should keep them at the table

21:50:07: <Cimmerian> they need to post as such in the thread. Right now anyone else we're enforcing on can point to that unresolved point as an example of us not enforcing properly.

21:50:21: <Cimmerian> if they hadn't *openly stated defiance of our license* that'd be one thing

21:50:24: <Cimmerian> but they did

21:50:36: <Cimmerian> now they have to take it back or we're gonna have problems

21:50:40: <Roget> I think we can post in the thread noting that we've seen them change it since it seems like they might have circumstances limiting their posting, it'd serve the same purpose

21:50:56: <Roget> I don't think a takedown is at all necessary at this stage, they look to be full-throatedly workign with us in actions if not in words

21:52:42: <Cimmerian> Can I ask that before making a final decision on that, you get ProcyonLotor's opinion?

21:52:53: <Cimmerian> you've still got the rest of the day, after all

21:53:02: <Roget> They've fixed their site license and purged all references to NC so I think we can assume they mean well at this point

21:53:14: <Vince> Yeah, I'd like his thoughts on this as well, though I am in agreement with roget

21:53:19: <Roget> I'm heading off to a social gathering in something like five minutes

21:53:23: <Vince> alright.

21:54:08: <Roget> But I am strongly and urgently saying that we can leave them in place for the moment and all evidence suggests they've taken the effort to meet our requests, their site license is correct and they've removed references to stories and SCP-XXX-RU articles being licensed seperately under NC

21:54:12: <Cimmerian> I feel like this is a fairly serious mistake, personally. But I'll abide by what you settle on.

21:54:44: <Cimmerian> we need them to state their intentions, if they are not going to infringe

21:54:52: <Cimmerian> otherwise we have to assume the worst, not the best

21:55:10: <Roget> I think we can state as such and allow them to confirm it, I think we should assume the best of them when we can see physical evidence of them complying with our requests

21:55:33: <Roget> They've been slow to post this whole time and I think from their perspective they might think this is all solved and not realize we want some kind of final confirmation

21:55:48: <Cimmerian> and ultimately, the thing we're gonna do is reversible. I don't see why it's being treated as the end of all things.

21:55:54: <Roget> So if we provide that opportunity with a final post as I specified above, saying "we're cool for now but if you do x then it's super not cool"

21:56:16: <Roget> Because it's a big deal to take down our oldest and longest translation partner under any circumstances for any amount of time, that will send shock waves through our whole network

21:56:29: <Vince> Cimmerian: our decision to not take them down is reversible. If they dig in their heels and we demand a takedown, that is not reversible

21:56:31: <Roget> Especially since we're planning on following up with take down requests on the other branches

21:56:36: <Vince> it would destroy an entire branch of the wiki

21:56:44: <Vince> and cause great stress with the others

21:57:08: <Cimmerian> And if we don't, after being brought to the precipice like this, we're going to face bigger problems down the road.

21:57:47: <Cimmerian> Vince: Yes. But you'll never get back what you've lost once you let a deadline go and don't do the thing you said you'd do.

21:58:21: <Cimmerian> I mean.

21:58:28: <Cimmerian> Shit read the end of Moose's post alone.

21:58:43: <Roget> They've done what we need them to do for now, we can see with our eyes that they've removed all references to NC

21:59:15: <Roget> that to me indicates they're with us and we should not bring down the hammer on that cooperation

22:00:46: <Roget> gtg, please please please do not remove them today we need to be using a light hand with our international network which we have taken such care to build up

22:00:48: <Roget> later folks

22:00:58: <Roget> Light hand is best hand now

22:01:04: Cimmerian shakes his head

22:01:22: <Cimmerian> This is a bad move. But it's ours, I suppose.

2017-06-07

00:07:12: <Roget> Anyone in here know the info for the official email we use for the community survey and such

00:17:56: <Cimmerian> it's a roget!

00:17:57: <Cimmerian> also no

00:18:39: <Roget> it is a me! sorry for disappearing on ya for a couple days I had to focus on some school stuff

00:19:59: <Cimmerian> it's cool

00:20:11: <Cimmerian> I think I needed to talk to you about a thing but now I can't remember what

00:20:35: <Athenodora> removing links to the Russian sites on International?

00:20:42: <Roget> You'd sent me a .tell about taking -RU down from a few places, I removed them where I could and also edited the Ambassador hub on 05

00:21:43: <Roget> I was going to ask if it would be better for a member of licensing to make a post laying out what SCP-RU needs to change, I don't think they have any material violating the license on their site right now but they have stated intent to do so in the FAQ, which is the bit I have quoted in the thread

00:23:53: <Cimmerian> oh

00:23:55: <Cimmerian> no

00:24:01: <Cimmerian> you've misread there stuff

00:24:16: <Cimmerian> it's "opt in" to remove NC elements

00:24:50: <Cimmerian> they are claiming all their original works, unless the author specifically asks to remove the NC element, automatically have it

00:24:56: <Roget> ahh

00:25:06: <Cimmerian> if posted before the date they changed the site-wide license

00:25:36: <Cimmerian> basically they've got *tons* of material that's violating

00:26:15: <Cimmerian> though they're actually putting their own userbase at risk there, with the shit they're pulling. When we go after them, I'd prefer to hit them on any Admin written stuff.

00:26:26: <Cimmerian> rather than users who have no idea what's going on

00:29:15: <Roget> We'd just be asking WikiDot to take their site down, no?

00:30:09: <CimmeriaFK> ish, we still have to point out specific instances of infringement

00:31:08: <Roget> That's all of their original works, right?

00:32:11: <CimmeriaFK> not all, no

00:32:20: <CimmeriaFK> they already have people asking to remove the NC element

00:33:30: <Roget> Would we be asking WikiDot to take down specific pages rather than their entire Wiki?

00:34:21: <CimmeriaFK> No. But this does make the whole thing a bit less palatable. We need to figure out if there's a way to save the works of people

who aren't infringing while at the same time enforcing the thing. It's probably gonna have to be a full wipe, but shit that's gonna suck.

00:35:59: <Roget> Argh I feel bad deleting the works of people who don't know better and have been told by their site leaders that they're fine in what they're doing

00:36:09: <CimmeriaFK> or worse

00:36:22: <CimmeriaFK> the people who do know better and have specifically requested that their works be brought in line with our demands

00:38:14: <Roget> It's good that there are people on their end who are trying to do the right thing. Should I use this info to make a post in the thread, or would it be better for a licensing person to do it?

00:38:33: <CimmeriaFK> ongoing they don't seem to be listening to us anymore

00:38:37: <CimmeriaFK> probably you

00:38:58: <Roget> okee

00:44:00: <Roget> CimmeriaFK: <https://pastebin.com/VyX7w99H>

00:44:35: <CimmeriaFK> sounds about right

00:44:53: <CimmeriaFK> probably double check with at least 2 other admins before posting something that strongly worded, but you've got my nod at least

00:45:10: <CimmeriaFK> ProcyonSick would likely agree. Get their take as well.

00:47:41: <ProcyonSick> Go for it.

00:47:58: <Roget> Okee

00:49:51: <Roget> ProcyonSick: that's a go for posting? I added a sentence to the top saying again that they're officially disavowed and such

00:50:41: <ProcyonSick> Yeah. Gets my stamp.

00:51:59: <Roget> posted

00:55:13: <CimmeriaFK> by the by

00:55:19: <CimmeriaFK> the korean wiki already removed russian links

00:55:29: <CimmeriaFK> so far they're the only ones to do so but just an fyi

00:55:46: <CimmeriaFK> a wild decibelle appears

00:55:59: <CimmeriaFK> did you get those logs from the russians on the discord thing?

00:56:29: <Roget> CimmeriaFK: there's a discussion on the INT wiki about removing it so I'm going to make a post there to get them to do it

00:57:19: <Decibelle> oh no, i didnt

00:57:33: <Decibelle> i will after i

00:57:37: <Decibelle> finish my part of the survey thing

00:57:54: <CimmeriaFK> roget: On the forums over there?

00:59:19: <Roget> yee

00:59:42: <Roget> Actually it looks like this discussion is restricted to only the primary contacts so I think Decibelle would be the one to post

00:59:52: <Roget> <http://o5command-int.wikidot.com/forum/t-2309480/removal-of-the-russian-branch-from-the-official-branches> this thread specifically

01:01:20: <Decibelle> yeah ive been considering it

01:02:25: <Roget> I had written up a post before I saw it was limited to primary contacts

01:02:39: <Roget> **1. We move RU from the official branches lists on the main page and link pages to unofficial branches, remove their hub and move their content to the Others Hub.** It's important that we all move quickly and in unison to remove SCP-RU's links from our sites. As long as we officially link to a site not using our license we're exposing ourselves to legal repercussions and bad times for our community. If we're not all standing behind the same shield, we can't protect each other.

01:37:53: <CimmeriaFK> could be useful if they see a new face saying so, as well

20:31:22: <ProcyonLotor> .tell Vince I wouldn't bother. They simply won't be swayed. No point throwing good effort after bad.

20:31:22: <Jarvis> procyonlotor: Sent.

20:32:02: <LilyAFK> ProcyonLotor: they seem to be planning to hire another lawyer which

20:32:03: <LilyAFK> ???

20:32:04: <Jarvis> lilyafk: Memo not found.

20:32:20: <ProcyonLotor> ?

20:33:48: <LilyAFK> The russians, in the link deci posted

20:33:59: <ProcyonLotor> Ah. Doesn't matter. It's all on them. I'll check before we bring the axe down but I am done with holding their hands.

20:33:59: <LilyAFK> One of them is contacting some other lawyer .-

20:34:40: <ProcyonLotor> They can knock themselves out.

20:35:02: <LilyAFK> wouldn't that be nice

20:36:00: <ProcyonLotor> Like my standing position at this point is: unless it is what we are demanding, I don't give a single flying fuck what they do

20:43:49: <Cimmerian> Trixie: Has anyone gotten with you for the answer you asked for this morning?

21:16:20: <Roget> ProcyonLotor: Cimmerian I've got Gene R in the scp international staff discord set up for the scp-int site and they're asking about the license issue

21:16:37: <ProcyonLotor> Tell them our terms have not changed.

21:16:55: <ProcyonLotor> And I'm frankly not interested in speaking to them beyond a "yes, we will do it".

21:17:45: <ProcyonLotor> I did not sign on to throw my life away on the infinitely small chance that //this// time out of god knows how many might be the time they listen

21:18:07: <Roget> resure is asking about like, logging ip for an anonymous board

21:18:34: <ProcyonLotor> I've argued, demonstrated, and explained until I was blue in the face, for nothing

21:18:38: <Roget> "As programmer I really wonder how you manage to identify user session on anonymous board and verify it's connection to some exact posts"

21:18:55: <ProcyonLotor> And that's related to us how?

21:19:42: <Roget> asking about scp-173 authorship to try to change the cc licensing

21:19:45: <Roget> I think?

21:19:53: <ProcyonLotor> Moto42? I take Mann at his word. If they don't, that's their problem.

21:20:47: <ProcyonLotor> I'll repeat- I'm done trying to explain things or cooperate, and the fact that they're only interested now that the cavalry's here is very demonstrative of the kind of people we are dealing with

21:21:40: <ProcyonLotor> We did all we could to prevent it reaching this point, and now we're out of time, out of methods, and, speaking solely for myself, out of damns to give about what happens to them now

21:23:07: <ProcyonLotor> If they want to cooperate- and that means full, unqualified cooperation, I'll work with them. Gladly. Anything less than that is wasted breath.

21:23:28: <Roget> what's the Mann proof again

21:23:31: <Roget> so to speak

21:24:37: <ProcyonLotor> Something to do with an SA account. It had convinced Mann and the rest of the administration, and as such I took them at their word. There was apparently identifiable, real life personal details involved so I did not receive it myself

21:28:20: <Roget> the admin of scp-ru is calling us copyright trolls :\

21:31:24: <Lily> :|

21:34:01: <ProcyonLotor> He can call us what he pleases

21:34:06: <ProcyonLotor> Die's cast now

21:35:03: <Roget> she

21:35:05: <Roget> Resure

21:35:24: <Roget> she seems really angry and bitter about this :<

21:35:53: <Lily> entirely preventable

21:35:55: <Lily> by them

21:36:04: <Lily> This was never a hard task

21:36:13: <ProcyonLotor> I'm really torn up they're angry that we're not letting them essentially steal our shit anymore

21:39:27: <ProcyonLotor> We have tried over literal years to engage with them in good faith on this matter, and they have met us with nothing but passive-aggression, condescension, and, perhaps thematically appropriately, cries of "but you are lynching negroes!". The people I feel sorry for are the Russian authors who are going to have to suffer due to their staff's pigheadedness, the administration can take a flying leap as far as I am concerned.

21:40:02: <ProcyonLotor> Eventually comes the time when one must pay the Piper.

21:40:55: <anqxyr> funny story, there's a thread on the russian wiki's forums from ~2 years ago, I think, where the author asks how he can re-license his article under CC-BY-SA 4.0

21:41:14: <anqxyr> and presumably he did, I haven't checked the actual article

21:41:22: <anqxyr> *presumably

21:41:39: <anqxyr> so there's one lone article on the russian wiki that complies with the license

21:42:12: <ProcyonLotor> there are several under gener's half-cocked little scheme

21:42:21: <ProcyonLotor> what will become of those is something that needs to be discussed

21:43:15: <Lily> anqxyr: do you speak russian?

21:43:20: <anqxyr> yup

21:43:56: <Lily> huh, cool

21:43:58: <Trixie> im more angry at grom

21:44:07: <Lily> why grom?

21:44:09: <Trixie> who was the one demanding i reply to every point in the russian thread

21:44:13: <Trixie> that i linked to you all

21:44:14: <Lily> ah

21:44:30: <ProcyonLotor> there's a method to my stonewalling madness

21:44:54: <ProcyonLotor> they are, whether intentionally planned or just as a developing unintentional strategy, trying to bog us down in details that do not even need to be discussed

21:45:07: <ProcyonLotor> which is why I've refused to engage them further beyond total cooperation

21:46:19: <Roget> have you reached out to wikidot yet

21:47:16: <ProcyonLotor> not yet. in spite of all my angry rhetoric, I see no reason it needs to be done absolutely ASAP. I'm willing to give them a week

or two to sweat it out, and possibly come around- I think freezing them out might actually work, as opposed to shouting at them.

21:47:23: <ProcyonLotor> However, that is my //personal// opinion

21:47:44: <ProcyonLotor> The team's strategy has not yet been decided, as far as I know, I have been away due to an illness for some time

21:47:50: <Roget> Right now Resure is being pretty belligerent in the Discord chat

21:48:06: <ProcyonLotor> and I'm being pretty belligerent here

21:48:16: <ProcyonLotor> I like to think that at least in terms of action, cooler heads usually prevail

21:49:08: <ProcyonLotor> If push comes to emergency shove, I could have a fully-fledged DMCA filed in fifteen minutes from when I'm given cause to do so

21:54:40: <Roget> gah it feels like I'm talking to a wall

21:55:59: <ProcyonLotor> That's because for all intents and purposes you are

21:57:02: <Cimmerian> hrm I have no idea if that went through

21:57:20: <Trixie> i will pay literal money

21:57:32: <Trixie> for a goddamn actual lawyer to talk under legal consule

21:57:39: <Trixie> to talk to them to get them to shut up

21:58:40: <anqxyr> god, I just got around to reading the russian thread

21:58:41: <Cimmerian> hokay

21:58:44: <anqxyr> > Нет, наши английские коллеги проявили редкостное упорство, граничащее с упрямством, и не оценили сделанное им одолжение.

21:58:50: <Cimmerian> I said a thing and I don't know if it went through

21:58:56: <anqxyr> that's passive aggressive as fuck

21:59:04: <anqxyr> .trans ru-en Нет, наши английские коллеги проявили редкостное упорство, граничащее с упрямством, и не оценили сделанное им одолжение.

21:59:05: <Jarvis> anqxyr: [ru-en] No, our British colleagues have shown a rare persistence bordering on stubbornness, and did not appreciate the favor.

21:59:27: <Lily> Cimmerian: don't think it did

21:59:31: <Cimmerian> engaging with the russians is atthis point likely a bad idea as Procyon has said. But a gently worded letter to the international partners for the int thread would be good.

21:59:38: <anqxyr> huh, it actually translates sentences much better than individual words

22:00:19: <Cimmerian> ProcyonLotor: It would be best if you put together our legal reasoning for the international folks, if you haven't already. If you don't have time, I can try to cobble it together sometime today.

22:01:54: <Cimmerian> it'll be inferior to what you can come up with, I imagine, but something is better than letting those guys dangle too

22:02:04: <ProcyonLotor> I'll do it tomorrow

22:02:10: <ProcyonLotor> it can wait until then

22:02:13: <Cimmerian> fair enough

22:02:42: <Cimmerian> in that case Trixie: You can let them know our licensing team is putting a thing together for 'em.

22:02:57: <Cimmerian> that will be done by EOD tomorrow

22:03:28: <Cimmerian> 'em being the international folk

22:03:34: <Cimmerian> the russians can rot for all I care at this point

22:05:50: <Cimmerian> and/or Roget. I think roget was getting the same questions from the other translation sites?

22:05:56: <Cimmerian> either way

22:06:31: <anqxyr> from the russian thread, "To the West, copyright is a holy cow"

22:06:51: <anqxyr> said people who refuse to change their copyright license

22:07:51: <Cimmerian> heh

22:08:11: <Cimmerian> the base "misunderstanding" is that they seem to think that we're trying to claim ownership over the concept.

22:08:30: <Cimmerian> It's actually really simple. So simple I can't help but think they're willfully misunderstanding us at this point.

22:09:24: <Cimmerian> If I make up a secret government group of superheroes fighting crime and saving the world, I'm on shaky ground... but I'm likely ok. If I call that organization SHIELD, Disney's gonna all up on me.

22:09:33: <Cimmerian> *gonna be

22:09:54: <anqxyr> there's a common term in Russian, which I don't think if it exists in English, maybe I just haven't stumbled on it

22:10:09: <anqxyr> it can be loosely translated as "watchman's syndrome"

22:10:15: <Cimmerian> the idea of secret anomaly stuffs is obviously fine to use elsewhere. You call it the foundation though? Or serpent's hand, or GOC or... it goes on

22:10:22: <Roget> I told them explicitly that we're not claiming ownership of the concept in this discord chat which I have just torn myself from because it felt unproductive

22:10:37: <anqxyr> when you give a person a tiny bit of authority over something

22:10:40: <Trixie> they

22:10:41: <Trixie> sigh

22:10:42: <anqxyr> like "watch this door"

22:10:43: <Trixie> ok so

22:10:54: <Trixie> they're saying if this is so important to us

22:11:02: <Trixie> why dont we talk to Creative Commons themself
22:11:07: <Trixie> and see what they have to say
22:11:12: <Cimmerian> buahahaha
22:11:21: <Cimmerian> oh man they're trolling you now or they're idiots
22:12:02: <Cimmerian> ultimately I'm most curious as to how, given their current interpretation, they think their NC clause actually protects them.
22:12:12: <Cimmerian> What's to stop someone else from claiming the same thing they are?
22:12:25: <anqxyr> and they start to exert over everyone at a tiniest provocation, and will never let go of it under any circumstances
22:12:55: <Cimmerian> anqxyr: That's a thing in english too. More a trope, I don't know if we have a word for it.
22:13:37: <anqxyr> I believe in English it's called "HOA President"
22:24:15: <Roget> Cimmerian: ProcyonLotor I communicated to them Licensings only desire for communication at this point being confirmation of compliance with the cc-by-sa license and that's the last word they
22:24:27: <Roget> we're* have having for the moment
22:24:34: <ProcyonLotor> awesome, thank you
22:27:41: <Trixie> ProcyonLotor: does creative commons superscede the law?
22:28:01: <ProcyonLotor> no, because it is the law. think of a license like a contract.
22:28:25: <ProcyonLotor> when properly put in place it becomes legally binding on the parties
22:31:24: <Trixie> im just gonna say this
22:31:29: <Trixie> oh heya rikjard
22:31:40: <RikjardRegreps> Hellp
22:31:47: <RikjardRegreps> *hello
22:31:48: <Trixie> Roget: when this situation is done, you can be the primary contact
22:32:02: <Trixie> i dont speak good enough english to keep playing messenger girl
22:32:47: <Roget> you want to switch places on the org chart then?
22:32:58: <Trixie> yeah
22:33:34: <Roget> kk
22:33:52: <RikjardRegreps> This is the chat for Licensing, right?
22:34:10: <Trixie> yes
22:34:18: <ProcyonLotor> International, I believe. Neither Roget nor Decibelles are actually Licensing members.
22:35:04: <RikjardRegreps> I'm a member of the german branch and I'm here because of the whole RU-licensing-thing.

22:36:17: <ProcyonLotor> I'll be releasing a statement tomorrow- I would have done so this evening but I just got out of the hospital- but I can answer any questions you may have in the meantime.

22:36:46: <RikjardRegreps> Thing is, right now it seems a bit weird to me that the licensing team seems to have no interest in resolving this situation in any other way than force RU to change their license or take legal action.

22:36:59: <ProcyonLotor> Because that's the only way it can be resolved.

22:37:09: <ProcyonLotor> There isn't, legally, an acceptable compromise.

22:37:20: <RikjardRegreps> Has anyone contacted Creative Commons about this?

22:37:25: <ProcyonLotor> This isn't a matter where negotiation can be done. It's a "yes/no" equation.

22:37:39: <ProcyonLotor> I've cited creative commons documentation at them ad infinitum.

22:37:43: <ProcyonLotor> They simply do not listen.

22:38:12: <RikjardRegreps> I mean, there could hypothetically be a solution, exception or something the guys at creative commons know about.

22:38:21: <ProcyonLotor> There is none, I'm afraid.

22:38:23: <ProcyonLotor> https://raw.githubusercontent.com/creativecommons/faq/master/CC_License_Compatibility_Chart.png

22:38:36: <ProcyonLotor> CC-BY-NC-SA is straightforward incompatible with CC-BY-SA

22:38:47: <RikjardRegreps> Yes, I know.

22:39:07: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: Essentially, if there *was* a way around it then no license would be valid.

22:39:47: <ProcyonLotor> As I was just saying to Decibelle, licenses are like contracts

22:39:54: <ProcyonLotor> If one has a loophole or exceptions, it's a bad one

22:40:14: <Cimmerian> If one could just add any element to the license for any reason, then you can add *any* element.

22:40:28: <RikjardRegreps> If the original license holder agrees to make an exception in a limited number of cases, there might be; if CC allows it.

22:40:31: <Cimmerian> which goes against the share-alike provisions of the license

22:40:49: <RikjardRegreps> At least asking them wouldnt hurt, would it?

22:41:12: <Cimmerian> CC is explicitly non-reversible. It's the SA provisions that force that.

22:41:23: <ProcyonLotor> Unfortunately due to the tangled snakes nature of the works, the "original license holder" for every violation on the Russian wiki are literal scores of people

22:41:23: <RikjardRegreps> Do you have anything to lose by asking, except for maybe a few minutes?

22:41:42: <ProcyonLotor> The fact that we've bent over backwards trying to get them in line, and they've done nothing except insult us?

22:41:53: <ProcyonLotor> It's honestly half a matter of dignity at this point.

22:41:53: <Cimmerian> Actually.

22:42:01: <Cimmerian> Hold on. That's not it at all really.

22:42:15: <Cimmerian> The Russians are the ones in violation of the license.

22:42:30: <Cimmerian> If there's a solution that "the creative commons people" have, the russians should be responsible for getting it.

22:42:56: <Cimmerian> there isn't such a solution, I'm afraid. But if that's a thing they think actually might work, they can give it a shot. In the mean time, we gotta enforce our license.

22:43:40: <RikjardRegreps> Yes. But wouldnt it be better if the message to the CC people was written by RU and EN together, to provide a more balanced viewpoint, which also would make clear that you actually are also interested in finding a solution?

22:44:01: <Cimmerian> the CC people don't really deal with people individually

22:44:09: <Cimmerian> that's not a thing the license exists for

22:44:12: <ProcyonLotor> And we've been clear on what the solution is. Crystal.

22:44:25: <Roget> They're not arbitrators

22:44:29: <Roget> They set terms and we abide by them

22:44:42: <Cimmerian> I should note, the Russians actually forced this issue. We've been talking to them for years on this, trying to convince them, but we had been looking the other way for a bit. Then the Russians publicly asked us to help enforce a license they knew we considered invalid. At that point we either have to enforce properly and publically or lose the right to...

22:44:44: <Cimmerian> enforce on anyone.

22:45:00: <Cimmerian> it's a simple thing that

22:45:10: <RikjardRegreps> They dont deal with individual peepole. The wiki has how many members? Hundreds?

22:45:14: <ProcyonLotor> Yeah, this was not out of the blue.

22:45:22: <RikjardRegreps> At least try it, thats all I'm asking.

22:45:27: <ProcyonLotor> We have tried to get them to cooperate, in a friendly manner, for literal years.

22:45:27: <Roget> The wiki is not Creative Commons

22:45:29: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: I'm not sure what you're asking us to try.

22:45:34: <ProcyonLotor> They have either ignored us or been passive aggressive.

22:45:50: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: You're talking about a thing that isn't even a community. It's a framework.

22:45:55: <Cimmerian> What people are we supposed to talk to?

22:46:09: <ProcyonLotor> And I think I speak for the team when I say their trenchantness, their pigheadedness, is not going to be an albatross around our necks

22:46:17: <RikjardRegreps> Cimmerian: Try to get in contact with wikidot, together with RU, to find a solution.
<https://creativecommons.org/about/contact/>

22:46:25: <ProcyonLotor> But //we know the solution//

22:46:25: <Cimmerian> wait

22:46:28: <ProcyonLotor> The solution is obvious.

22:46:31: <Cimmerian> wikidot or creative commons?

22:46:32: <ProcyonLotor> Explicit.

22:46:35: <ProcyonLotor> It could not be clearer.

22:46:35: <Cimmerian> those are not the same thing

22:47:31: <ProcyonLotor> And frankly, the Russians have stooped to insulting us directly, and I've spent hours and endured god knows how much stress typing up responses they have just ignored.

22:47:33: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegeps: That's a contact form for asking questions. The russians are capable of doing that on their own. It's not a contact form for the people involved in shaping the license.

22:47:33: <RikjardRegreps> I know that wikidot and CC are not the same. But SCP is a community with lots of members, which could hypothetically get CCs attention to deal with this (maybe I'm naive to think that).

22:48:12: <ProcyonLotor> We have extended our hands to them multiple times, offering to explain, to help, so long as they would cooperate. They have slapped it away each time.

22:48:22: <Cimmerian> I get what you're saying. But this isn't an issue that can be solved with CC. The driving force behind the russian objections isn't a dispute over the CC license.

22:48:33: <ProcyonLotor> It gets both tiring and embarrassing.

22:48:56: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: In fact the Russians have accepted that our interpretation of the CC license.

22:49:05: <RikjardRegreps> Also, about the insulting: You set them an ultimatum and are threatening legal action to delete everything they've build up over 6 years. I understand their frustration, even tho I agree that insulting isnt very productive.

22:49:10: <Cimmerian> it's why they changed their license for translated work.

22:49:14: <RikjardRegreps> Ultimatums aren't either.

22:49:26: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: We've actually been on them for about 5 of those 6 years about this.

22:49:31: <Cimmerian> this is not out of the blue

22:49:33: <ProcyonLotor> RikjardRegreps: do you know how many times we tried //before// the ultimatum?

22:49:39: <ProcyonLotor> We've been working for literal actual years.

22:49:44: <ProcyonLotor> They have ignored us. Every. Single. Time.

22:50:04: <ProcyonLotor> We did not do the ultimatum for fun. We did it because we were at the point where we believed it was the only thing that would work.

22:50:06: <Cimmerian> they've delayed and denied us for half a decade. We finally had to put our foot down when they asked us to enforce a license they knew we thought was incorrect.

22:50:47: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: Real quick, let me point out the actual issue here. It's not a CC dispute anymore.

22:51:06: <RikjardRegreps> I don't know how often you tried, but frankly; I don't think it matters. You need to either give them more time or find another solution, or otherwise, the oldest counterpart of the SCP-Foundation is doomed - and on INT, there are already people seeing you (unfairly) as the villains.

22:51:24: <RikjardRegreps> This has to stop.

22:51:39: <ProcyonLotor> And it will stop. They either license properly or they go.

22:51:41: <RikjardRegreps> @Cimmerian: What's it about then, if not CC?

22:51:43: <Roget> They did this to themselves

22:51:49: <ProcyonLotor> It is their fault. Not ours.

22:52:28: <RikjardRegreps> Again, it doesn't matter. But even if they insulted you, even if they refused to find a solution: Give them at least time.

22:52:41: <ProcyonLotor> RikjardRegreps: We have given them five years.

22:52:44: <Cimmerian> See, the Russians believe the SCP Foundation is only a concept. The problem is that we know for a fact that the words SCP Foundation originated on this wiki under our specific license.

22:52:45: <Roget> If people see us as the villain, they're not paying attention. We'll be making a post on the Int site in order to make sure the correct information is out there

22:53:08: <ProcyonLotor> The changes we are asking can be made in less than five minutes.

22:53:16: <ProcyonLotor> They have had nothing but time.

22:53:24: <ProcyonLotor> And then we gave them a month.

22:53:37: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: We are giving them time, actually. Whilst we will eventually be forced to issue takedowns on them for the licensing violation, we are not doing so now.

22:53:37: <ProcyonLotor> They ignored that before forwarding a half-step they were well aware was unacceptable.

22:53:41: <ProcyonLotor> How much time should they get, here?

22:53:43: <ProcyonLotor> Infinite?

22:53:58: <Cimmerian> They have time to correct the problem, still. We're *still* giving them more time.

22:54:03: <Roget> Remember, the entire time we're linking to them we're exposing ourselves to serious negative consequences

22:54:06: <Cimmerian> 5 years and we're still waiting for them to correct the issue.

22:55:12: <Cimmerian> The link removal is merely the best signal we can give that this is not an acceptable path they've chosen. I don't care about their belligerent nature. They can be angry at us. What is important is that we are forced by law to take this stance or lose our right to enforce the license at all.

22:55:15: <RikjardRegreps> ProcyonLotor: Yes, now you've given them an ultimatum. They're forced to act now, but give them more time. Six months or so, so they actually can try and contact the authors that released their own works under the wrong license and ask permission to change the license that article has been released under. Forcing them to change the license without

22:55:34: <ProcyonLotor> RikjardRegreps: six months is an utterly unacceptable timeframe.

22:55:37: <ProcyonLotor> A month was overgenerous.

22:55:39: <RikjardRegreps> permission by each author wont make them more likely to comply, neither would it be right.

22:55:39: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: Their license is invalid. Those works are *not* NC.

22:55:45: <Cimmerian> regardless of the labeling

22:55:47: <Cimmerian> that's the entire problem

22:55:51: <ProcyonLotor> They don't need permission because they're invalidly labelled.

22:56:16: <ProcyonLotor> Just because you put a CC-BY-NC-SA sticker on a CC-BY-SA work, it does not magically become CC-BY-SA

22:56:45: <ProcyonLotor> And they're not interested in solving it- they want it to remain an either/or thing. Read the post- they're not trying to go over to purely CC-BY-SA

22:57:08: <RikjardRegreps> @Cimmerian: I know, but the authors didnt know that. So changing the label of things they wrote without their permission - maybe aggainst their will even - yould lead to more problems.

22:57:24: <ProcyonLotor> They're still making it opt-in even for new works posted.

22:57:40: <ProcyonLotor> That does not inspire confidence they are acting to solve the problem. Because it is consciously allowing it to become worse.

22:57:52: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: It's possible. But even if that was a valid point, which I'd argue with, they're actually classing all future original works as NC as well.

22:58:01: <Cimmerian> which again, is simply incorrect

22:58:31: <ProcyonLotor> And again, if that was a problem they indicated they were interested in addressing, we'd be willing to cooperate

22:58:53: <ProcyonLotor> They have never said "we'll go CC-BY-SA fully, but we're worried about X, Y, and Z"

22:59:04: <Cimmerian> If they did, we could help them with that.

22:59:16: <ProcyonLotor> If they did, I can assure you, we'd bend over backwards to help with X, Y, and Z, and give them all the necessary time to deal with it so long as good faith efforts were being made

22:59:21: <ProcyonLotor> That is not what is happening here.

22:59:21: <Cimmerian> Instead they've said "We are going to use NC on our original works and you guys are dumb for asking us to do otherwise"

23:00:20: <RikjardRegreps> Would you allow me to send parts of this chat to RU?

23:01:07: <Cimmerian> You can if you want, we're not optimistic that'll help but I would love for this to be resolved in a friendly manner.

23:01:14: <ProcyonLotor> They're not going to listen, but as far as I'm concerned, I was speaking on the record. You can do as you will.

23:01:25: <RikjardRegreps> Maybe I can convince *someone* on RU to be a bit more open.

23:01:38: <ProcyonLotor> Well, I certainly won't stop you

23:02:05: <Trixie> feel free

23:02:17: <Trixie> since procyon snd cimmerian were fine with it

23:02:48: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: Let me give you one last thing to explain the ultimate problem here.

23:02:54: <Cimmerian> I've used it as an example for other folk as well.

23:04:08: <Roget> I'm fine with that as well

23:04:13: <Cimmerian> If I write a superhero team that goes around saving people and the world all the time, I'm ok from a licensing standpoint. That's a concept you can't really own. If I call it "The Avengers" that's getting me sued.

Same problem comes up here. You can technically have your anomaly containing clandestine group all you want... but if it's called the Foundation...

23:04:26: <Cimmerian> this is the disconnect

23:04:43: <Cimmerian> the russians seem to be saying we're saying the former isn't ok, when in reality our problem is with the latter

23:04:51: <Trixie> Cimmerian: in addition to that though

23:05:11: <Trixie> theyve been trying to ask for proof moto42 wrote 173 and that we coined the SCP Foundation

23:05:12: <Trixie> this is

23:05:18: <Trixie> what ive been tellin yall

23:05:26: <Cimmerian> The word Foundation doesn't appear in 173

23:05:30: <Cimmerian> that's a non-point

23:05:39: <Cimmerian> why would that matter?

23:06:02: <Cimmerian> the word foundation was not used until the move to wikidot

23:06:13: <Cimmerian> and is under the site's license, period

23:06:21: <Cimmerian> when used in this context

23:06:32: <Cimmerian> it's at the top of every original russian work

23:06:38: <Cimmerian> as part of the site's theme

23:08:15: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: you get all that?

23:08:23: <RikjardRegreps> Yep

23:08:49: <RikjardRegreps> I've already made the same point while talking to RU, but that didnt go anywhere

23:10:02: <Cimmerian> Yeah you're where we were a few weeks back. ;)

23:12:26: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: I really appreciate you coming here to get some clarity by the way, if anyone else has the same sorts of questions, don't be afraid to send 'em my way.

23:12:36: <RikjardRegreps> Will do.

23:12:56: <Cimmerian> if they can't get on chat, I'm "Doctor Cimmerian" on the wiki

23:13:07: <Cimmerian> though this is a complex issue that is best explained in chat

23:13:52: <Cimmerian> in the mean time we are putting together an explanation of the problem and why the situation requires us to act now rather than later that will be ready tomorrow.

23:13:58: <ProcyonLotor> And I will be making a long, in-depth post on SCP international tomorrow

23:14:25: <ProcyonLotor> To both explain our desires and address the community's justified concerns

23:14:32: Cimmerian nods

23:15:23: <ProcyonLotor> I realize the delay's not ideal but I am recovering from some serious health issues and simply do not have the emotional or mental energy at the moment.

23:17:22: <Roget> Alright I hafta go, I will repeat the thanks to RikjardRegreps for coming in here to discuss thigns

23:17:37: <ProcyonLotor> Yes, thank you RikjardRegreps

23:17:45: <ProcyonLotor> If you have any further question, I'm available on chat or on wikidot

23:18:00: <RikjardRegreps> Thanks to you all for your time.

23:18:12: <Cimmerian> No problem!

2017-06-10

00:48:03: <Roget> .seen ProcyonLotor

00:48:07: <Jarvis> roget: procyonlotor was last seen 2 days ago saying:
Athenodora: russian_legal_system.jpg <http://www.canadianbusiness.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/bribery-corruption-payoff-108114114.jpg>

17:13:41: <Vince> Afternoon

17:20:46: <Roget> o/

17:36:24: <Cimmerian> Did we ever get that statement out to the International Partners?

17:37:21: <Roget> negative

17:38:36: <Cimmerian> has the heat died down there a little bit in the last 3 days?

17:39:17: <Roget> I've not seen any discussion I think they're still in wait-and-see

17:40:51: <Roget> I've been trying to reach out to the branches not really on INT to take down RU, Koreans have and I'm currently talking with SCP-CN and SCP-JP to get the russians removed from their front pages

17:41:03: Cimmerian nods

17:41:07: <Cimmerian> How is that going?

17:42:11: <Roget> Sunny has informed her fellow admins of our request and I'm pretty much playing timezone telephone with SCP-JP at this point

17:55:19: <Roget> SCP-CN has delisted

17:55:55: <Roget> SCP-JP has delisted

17:56:52: <Athenodora> oh gods do I need to care about SCP-VN too

17:56:56: <Roget> nope

17:57:12: <Athenodora> I think there's still that wikidot site that's basically not received any attention for the last... 2 years?

17:57:19: <Athenodora> oh good

18:02:05: CimmeriaFK nods

18:02:09: <CimmeriaFK> Good progress.

18:07:24: <Roget> SCP-JP admin on the cc-by-sa license: "I see. we take extra care about that."

18:14:57: <Vince> For the record I'm intending to take a month or so off in order to unfuck my stress levels. These last six have been a kick in the ass mentally and emotionally, and I don't want it to reach a point where I end up just table flipping and storm out or have a complete meltdown of any kind

18:17:11: <Vince> Roget Cimmeriafk Athenodora procyonlotor

18:17:30: <Vince> I hate doing it so soon after Gaffs walked out again, but yeah

18:17:39: <Roget> ok

18:17:41: <CimmeriaFK> eh it'll be fine, I think

18:17:53: <Roget> Who would be interim licensing captain?

18:18:39: <CimmeriaFK> Procy's got seniority. Probably makes the most sense.

18:19:28: <Vince> I would say procyonlotor. He took over last when I had to take a break for school a couple years ago

18:19:44: <Athenodora> it should be ok

18:21:04: <Vince> After the Russian clusterfuck is handled it's just starting up the image enforcement and getting the site in order, as far as I know, that goes beyond the normal web sweepup

18:21:30: <Vince> Which will need a few more hands on deck at least

18:22:04: <CimmeriaFK> we technically haven't completed the merger yet. I mean above just saying "alright you guys handle this now"

18:22:19: <Vince> Well. Yeah

18:23:15: <Vince> But Apop disappeared again, and anq is busy with other shit so it's basically just the licensing team right now

18:23:48: <Vince> Athenodora did you do the thing

18:24:22: <Athenodora> wait what's the thing

18:24:30: <Athenodora> which thing are we talking about

18:24:50: <Vince> The thing you posted you were gonna do on O5.

18:25:10: <Athenodora> oh right, not yet

18:25:24: <Athenodora> will do it tomorrow cos it's a bit late here rn

18:25:33: Athenodora completley forgot that it exists tbh

18:25:41: <Vince> Okay

18:25:57: <Vince> Also yeah it's like 2am there go to bed

18:26:10: <Athenodora> meow

18:26:13: <Athenodora> see ya folks

18:27:38: <RikjardRegreps> Hello, I recently was here to discuss the licensing issues of the RU branch

18:29:10: <CimmeriaFK> Yes. I recall!

18:29:18: <CimmeriaFK> How goes it?

18:29:18: <RikjardRegreps> An admin of RU has asked me to inform you that they have taken a little step in the right direction, until further notice they no longer allow any new article to be published under another license than CC-BY-SA.

18:29:37: <RikjardRegreps> Its not much, but a start, I guess

18:30:03: <CimmeriaFK> that's a start, yeah. At least.

18:31:26: <Roget> If they remove their grandfathered articles they would be compliant again, right? With a disavowal of using CC-by-NC or summat

18:31:46: <RikjardRegreps> They're still unsure if it is legal for them to change the licensing on their older works, though.

18:32:09: <CimmeriaFK> I actually understand their concerns there. Though they're actually in the clear.

18:32:16: <CimmeriaFK> I can get why they'd be worried about it.

18:32:23: <Vince> They had already changed it once, when they changed it from SA to NC

18:32:33: <Vince> But I understand

18:33:01: <CimmeriaFK> If you're acting as a go-between, let 'em know that regardless of the labeling, the works were always non-NC

18:33:16: <CimmeriaFK> the previous license was an error, and can be corrected as such

18:33:49: <RikjardRegreps> I will do. Not sure if they'll believe that, but I'll try

18:33:54: CimmeriaFK nods

18:34:06: <CimmeriaFK> also

18:34:38: <CimmeriaFK> to be clear, since they might still be concerned about this despite what we've said, original non-foundation based works are able to be licensed as they like.

19:05:59: <RikjardRegreps> I informed them, they want to consult a lawyer firrst to check if they a) are allowed to change the license on their old works and b) check if they really have to use CC-BY-SA. Also, the admin I'm in contact with asked me again what kind of proof you have that the person that claimed to have written SCP-173 actually did it.

19:07:44: <RikjardRegreps> Tired old question, I know, but if you could give me quickly a list of the things you got about him (no details, but a list like "we got the name, the IP that was used when 173 was released etc"), so I could maybe try to convince them that yes, it really is proven that that guy did it, I'd appreciate it.

19:18:00: <Vince> Roget do you still have your notes on 173's author?

19:19:14: <Roget> I don't recall having such notes, I know moto42 claimed authorship in 2008 when the wiki was still a little nuffin' and Mann saw

information through somethingAwful that convinced him and we all took him at that.

19:19:58: <Vince> Oh, I thought when you did the site history or whatever

19:20:03: <Vince> Okay

19:21:45: <RikjardRegreps> Oy. That ... will not convince RU. Damn ...anyways, thanks. I'll try to convince them nevertheless.

19:22:48: <Roget> Well we can ask Dr. Mann what the specific evidence is I suppose

19:24:45: <RikjardRegreps> I thought he was no longer active?

19:24:53: <RikjardRegreps> Or am I thinking of someone else?

19:25:26: <Roget> he's low-activity but still around

19:27:32: <RikjardRegreps> I'd really appreciate it if you could ask him

19:59:21: <ProcyonLotor> Okay, I came in at the right time it looks like. As it appears that positive forward momentum is being made, I believe our branch can hold off on further action for the time being.

20:00:07: <ProcyonLotor> specifically @ roget

20:00:19: <ProcyonLotor> I would, however, like verification thereof

20:22:46: <Cimmerian> ProcyonLotor: I looked at their faq

20:22:49: <Cimmerian> they edited it

20:23:02: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: Honestly 173 is sort of a non-issue at this point.

20:23:33: <Cimmerian> RikjardRegreps: This all hinges on the organization "The Foundation" which was first written on our site, not wherever 173 first showed up.

20:23:46: <Cimmerian> 173 doesn't once mention The SCP Foundation

20:23:49: <Cimmerian> that originates on our site

20:24:33: <Cimmerian> Like, we have enough proof for our own mollification on 173, but it doesn't enter into this at all.

20:25:05: <RikjardRegreps> Not sure if that makes it easier or even harder. But I will talk to RU about that.

20:25:47: <Cimmerian> even an article that doesn't include "The Foundation" or any GOIs is still going to have "The SCP Foundation" at the top of every page. That contextualizes the work enough that the issue is moot.

20:26:05: <Cimmerian> since our wikis are all set up "in character" as it were

20:26:20: Cimmerian nods

20:26:22: <Cimmerian> thanks

20:27:37: <Cimmerian> I only bring it up because they need to know *why* if they're getting legal consultation. They have to ask the right question or else they may get the wrong answer.

2017-06-12

02:41:00: <Decibelle> whens the takedown supposed to be given?
02:45:11: <ProcyonLotor> For the Russians? They have, in the past few days, taken positive action- refusing the posting of NC works while they examine their overall status- that, while insufficient for reinstatement, is enough to pend off the DMCA so long as we believe proper discussion is being had.
02:45:37: <ProcyonLotor> Not forever, but for an indefinite albeit brief period.
02:47:48: <Decibelle> sure
02:47:52: <Decibelle> just wanting to know whats up
02:52:06: ProcyonLotor nods
02:57:48: <Roget|Hockey> Oh, update to the other sites taking down SCP-RU, previously SCP-KO, CN and JP had removed the link from their pages. SCP-TH has also removed their link. Now SCP-FR, DE, IT, ES and PL still have a link on their front page
03:03:54: <ProcyonLotor> Awesome. I see no point to further force the issue (beyond what we've done) //for the moment// as a sign of good faith.
03:05:19: <Roget|Hockey> heh, apparently scp-ru delisted the english site from their front page
03:05:47: <ProcyonLotor> hah, I'll give that one to 'em

2017-06-29

01:27:21: <Cimmerian> I know that we're like, not likely too keen on this
01:27:38: <Cimmerian> but we should probably follow up on the russian thing by now and find out where they are
01:28:59: <ProcyonLotor> I was planning on it when I return home
01:29:13: <Cimmerian> oh heh
01:29:16: <Cimmerian> we're on the same page then
01:29:47: <ProcyonLotor> I'm out of state currently and have been for several days
01:30:32: <Cimmerian> fair enough
01:30:47: <Cimmerian> I was just gonna say "Hey, roget, can you gently get a read on the russian situation?"
01:31:00: <ProcyonLotor> that also works!
01:31:04: <Cimmerian> they've made more edits which seem to indicate they're still trying to figure things out
01:31:13: <Cimmerian> "Clarification: The possibility of creating and distributing articles under license CC-BY-NC-SA 3.0 is suspended until a special order is issued."
01:31:35: <Cimmerian> hey roget

01:31:46: <ProcyonLotor> As long as they're discussing it I'm happy to give them indefinite time

01:31:59: <Cimmerian> Can you gently get a read on the russian situation? See where they are in trying to figure out what to do about their older works?

01:33:12: <Roget> Last I saw they had told the other int sites they were still looking into it, and the int sites said they're going to have a vote this weekend and the remaining sites will most likely delist scp-ru if nothing changes before then

01:33:50: <Cimmerian> their only remaining sticking point is "works published before they publically changed the license" which I can sorta get. Essentially if they still think they're right but changed it because of our pressure, they would also think they'd run into legal trouble by just straight up saying the older works are under a new license.

01:34:10: <Cimmerian> even if they're completely wrong, which is the whole problem

01:34:21: <Cimmerian> Roget: Got ya.

01:34:28: <ProcyonLotor> It's progress, if nothing else.

01:34:34: <ProcyonLotor> At this point, I will take progress.

01:34:42: <Cimmerian> it's pretty significant progress really

01:34:44: <Cimmerian> also

01:34:58: <Cimmerian> I'm going to go on the record and say we need to forget about jarvis commands for images and just do things manually.

01:35:10: <Cimmerian> it'll be much simpler and easier to train people on

01:35:19: <ProcyonLotor> We can have that discussion when Vince is around

01:35:23: Cimmerian nods

01:35:24: <Cimmerian> fair

01:35:27: <Cimmerian> like

01:35:31: <Cimmerian> wikiwalk is making huge progress

01:35:32: <Roget> There had previously been a vote where the other INT sites had wanted to wait to see what happens, but I think with it the int opposition we had gotten for acting, from their perspective, quickly will be mitigated because SCP-RU blew off the other sites just the same as they did us

01:35:49: <Cimmerian> and they work on a more manual set up

01:36:00: <Cimmerian> because literally anyone can get into it and know how to do it, in very little time

01:36:11: <ProcyonLotor> My task list for my interim Team Captaincy is 1) Russia and 2) Image Policy Guide

01:36:16: <Cimmerian> fair

01:36:26: <Roget> It's been a process we developed over time to give maximum transparency, if you want to copy our methods go right ahead
01:36:41: <ProcyonLotor> anything else that isn't actively exploding will have to wait until those two things are done
01:36:52: <Cimmerian> Roget: You may forget but I was one of the 2 or 3 architects of wikiwalk's process.
01:37:06: <Cimmerian> it's literally the only thing I did for wikiwalk, but it was significant ;)
01:37:34: <Cimmerian> which is why I'd love to do something similar here
01:38:15: <ProcyonLotor> I'm entirely neutral on the process, myself, and will take whatever gets us to the end in an orderly fashion
01:38:22: <Roget> Cimmerian: ah, I thank you very much for your contribution. It has evolved a bit since then I think so you could probably make something like it over easily
01:38:36: Cimmerian nods
01:38:40: <Roget> well maybe not easily, but without having to work from scratch
01:39:15: <Cimmerian> it has evolved a bit, but it's still mostly the same as when y'all started. I remember when we had that problem with duder crosslinking his own shit and I just as Jr. Staff went "No, we need a rule on that right now and I'm making the call"
01:39:31: <Cimmerian> the good old days
01:40:01: <Cimmerian> anyway, Procyon, I feel ya.
01:42:25: ProcyonLotor nods
01:44:20: <Roget> I can try to help in finding you some manpower should ya need it
01:45:24: <ProcyonLotor> We probably will but we've got a few more steps before that
01:45:34: <Roget> kk
01:45:43: <ProcyonLotor> Unfortunately, we're a small team and we can't handle the Russians and ready ourselves for the recruitment push simultaneously

2017-08-27

20:28:43: <Tuomey> that was not a few days
20:29:02: <ProcyonLotor> I meant before I have anything for you to do
20:29:30: <ProcyonLotor> .tell Cimmerian They demanded our resignations in doing so (hahahaha) but the Russians are handled fully.
20:29:31: <Jarvis> procyonlotor: Sent.
20:29:33: <Tuomey> Cool

20:30:21: <Tuomey> I'm starting work in a week so I'll be awake at regular times more often

20:30:41: <Tuomey> It's a part time job so I'll still be around pretty much just as often

20:30:57: <ProcyonLotor> Awesome

20:31:34: <ProcyonLotor> Will try to get back with an informal duty structure (which you can take at whatever pace you choose) after I talk with Cimm next

20:33:54: <ProcyonLotor> Roget: you're okay with the plan for visual records, correct?

20:34:18: <Roget> What plan is that? I've actually got a guy working on excising all the improperly licensed stuff as we speak

20:34:35: <ProcyonLotor> Oh? The Polish Guy?

20:34:49: <ProcyonLotor> Not sure why guy is capitalized but c'est la vie

20:34:59: <Roget> Blackpeace, yeah

20:36:07: <ProcyonLotor> Well, we're planning on replacing it with something better organized and with hopefully more storage (for the long-term)

20:36:27: <Roget> Oh?

20:36:52: <ProcyonLotor> Although with BlackPeace doing our licensing shit for us it can remain while we figure it out in the meantime

20:37:23: <ProcyonLotor> But, basically, we need a way to make sure this isn't just a temporary fix

20:37:34: <Roget> righto

20:38:01: <Roget> If we do move to another site I'd recommend bringing him along as he's definitely a guy you can get a lot of value out of

20:38:22: <Lily> /s

20:38:22: <Lily> ProcyonLotor: is just one large imgur folder

20:38:36: <ProcyonLotor> Put him in contact with me or Cimm next time you guys talk please, we can absolutely use him

20:38:42: <Lily> but, I'm here to help with VR, whatever we're doing o7

20:39:06: <Roget> dope

20:39:34: <ProcyonLotor> Nothing yet, Cimm, I, staff as a whole, and other licensing team OS will need to discuss

20:40:03: <ProcyonLotor> But with the Russian albatross removed from our necks we can make real forward momentum

20:40:10: <anqxyr> hey, passing through, what's VR?

20:40:17: <ProcyonLotor> Visual Records

20:40:18: <Lily> anqxyr: visual records

20:40:20: <anqxyr> wait, yeah

20:40:25: <ProcyonLotor> Basically SCP Fuel site

20:40:35: <anqxyr> I had a brain fart, realised the answer right after I asked

20:40:56: <ProcyonLotor> Happens to the best of us :P

20:41:40: <ProcyonLotor> Long term does include promoting it on the site far more as a creative resource but we need the license shit on lock before that

20:44:42: <ProcyonLotor> DrMagnus, I or Cimmerian or Vince will speak with you when we have a better idea what we want and need

20:46:45: <Lily> oh hey I never noticed magnus here

20:46:47: <Lily> o/

20:50:08: <Roget> Blackpeace is going through and excising stuff as we speak

20:53:37: <DrMagnus> Understood.

20:53:45: <DrMagnus> Lily: I was invited very recently

20:54:15: <Lily> welcome :3

21:32:53: <Cimmerian> procyonlotor: Have we gotten them back on the pages they need to be on?

21:33:34: <ProcyonLotor> I've been leaving that to IO

21:33:37: <ProcyonLotor> Roget?

21:34:33: <Cimmerian> ProcyonLotor: Is the stuff up anywhere where I can see them demanding our resignations?

21:36:13: <ProcyonLotor> Cimmerian: <http://scpfoundation.ru/forum/t-3475761/po-povodu-izmenenia-licenzii-cast-vtoraa>

21:36:22: <Cimmerian> coolness

21:36:52: <ProcyonLotor> I am starting to write the image policy guides and once those are done we are moving forward with everything, full throttle

21:37:22: <ProcyonLotor> also do you remember vince's facebook name? he needs to be informed and I can't seem to find my communique with him. PM it to me if you do.

21:38:08: <Cimmerian> I don't have a facebook myself, so I don't.

21:38:23: <ProcyonLotor> Okay

21:38:37: <Cimmerian> OH HAH

21:38:55: <Cimmerian> answer to question 6 is what I've been saying for months

21:40:28: <ProcyonLotor> I didn't even bother reading most of it, but we can take a victory lap

21:40:43: <DrMagnus> It's some pretty ridiculous posturing overall.

21:40:46: <ProcyonLotor> But once I'm done these guides, we're burying the needle

21:41:08: <Cimmerian> we never really interacted with 'em before, I don't see why this will cause us too many problems

21:41:08: <ProcyonLotor> Let them take whatever posturing they like, we've been the bigger people all along and I am personally happy to keep it that way

21:41:36: <Cimmerian> we weren't their enemies here, we were helping them properly protect their works

21:41:45: <Cimmerian> if they don't get that, I'm alright with it

21:41:51: <DrMagnus> That was my (completely unsolicited) opinion as well.

21:47:10: <Cimmerian> as for our visual records fix:

21:47:16: <ProcyonLotor> I mean, this is an open forum, DrMagnus

21:47:24: <ProcyonLotor> feel free to say whatever you want

21:47:38: <Cimmerian> I've been pushing to use image blocks with captions. Simple and effective. If you post an image, you must caption it with the source of the image.

21:47:40: <Cimmerian> Easy peasy.

21:48:36: <Cimmerian> if someone adds an image with no source, it gets removed

21:49:10: <Cimmerian> added benefit is that it frees us up from having to police it like super hard, the users will be able to immediately have access to the source information

21:49:42: <Cimmerian> and "don't use images without sources" in big block letters at the top of the page as a warning is all it really needs at that point

21:57:09: <ProcyonLotor> quick and elegant

21:58:16: <Cimmerian> and easy to implement really

21:58:26: <Cimmerian> nothing fancy or new

22:46:27: <ProcyonLotor> Cimmerian: can you write one of the three policy guides? It's like, three paragraphs maybe

22:46:36: <ProcyonLotor> and it's basically your image policy

22:46:43: <Cimmerian> whatcha nee... got ya

22:46:49: <Cimmerian> yeah I can do it

22:47:00: <Cimmerian> end of day tommorrow?

22:47:00: <Cimmerian> end of day tommorrow?

22:47:07: <ProcyonLotor> <http://scpsandbox2.wikidot.com/licensing-staff-guidelines>

22:47:08: <ProcyonLotor> <http://scpsandbox2.wikidot.com/licensing-staff-guidelines>

22:47:11: <ProcyonLotor> "Team Processes"

22:47:11: <ProcyonLotor> "Team Processes"

22:47:18: <ProcyonLotor> Just chop it up to be more image-focused

22:47:18: <ProcyonLotor> Just chop it up to be more image-focused

22:47:19: <ProcyonLotor> Sure

22:47:20: <ProcyonLotor> Sure

22:47:46: <ProcyonLotor> I'm going to put out a casting call for one or two other operational staff to help us, because recruitment is next

