

Characteristics of Video Sharing Sites Supported by TubeMogul: 11-16-07

We've learned a great deal listening to our users, so we recently took a poll to hear in your words what differentiates the video sharing sites we serve. We compiled your comments in a "Zagat's" like format and added what you told us about different monetization opportunities.

Since this is based on your feedback, this is a living document that we will update based on your comments. Please share your thoughts, and check back for updates!

Site	ESSENCE - from User Quotes	Monetization Options
YouTube	"America's Funniest Home Videos of the internet," YouTube is the "granddaddy of online video" with "communities that thrive along side videos."	YouTube contacts select creators to partner for their rev share program, though contacting YouTube and asking into the program is possible. The process is opaque, requires NDA, and there is no reporting on what views are monetized. Approximately \$14 in video CPM, \$2-\$3 banner CPM.
Yahoo	"Great people," "great content," but "all over the place" with their content and "really miss the boat with the social aspect to their service."	No opportunities for independent producers
Dailymotion	The "YouTube of Europe," many here are "just starting to get to know the site," and "hoping good things from them," but "don't see any real community hook yet." "Overly conservative with metadata" - several users complained of getting "blocked for no reason."	They seem to be considering revenue sharing options
Myspace	"Arguably the best social network," but "have a lot of work to do to integrate the social community with the videos." While you get "TONS of traffic if you get featured," the "community is nasty – I don't need the abuse."	Very select circumstances are negotiated separately, nothing standard
Metacafe	"Unique in that the featured videos are put there by the user community," so "if you have a good community, you can get your videos on the front page." But "the content is only as good as the collective conscious of the users, which is a double edged sword." Overall, "the setup of their editorial process" makes it "the least game-able site."	Sign up for Producer Rewards, though sometimes they will even contact you. \$5 CPM after 20,000 views on a video that has an average rating of 3.0 or higher.
Google	"Why would you go to Google when there is YouTube?" Many don't get it, while a few note that it's a "good place if you have huge files, but if you do, this may be the only place for you," and "A brand for video search, not for video discovery."	Not available
Revver	"They are revenue share pioneers and back end providers" with "cool geeky tools" and "perhaps best" for "rev share and building your own site."	50/50 on sponsorships and in-play advertisements, though some creators have pushed for a better share. Select creators have CPC rate (pre-roll) only fixed to flash versions.
Blip.tv	Users call them "innovative" with an "outstanding player" and "smart about the creators they pay attention to." They "have a network-feel more than a video-site-feel" and are praised as "broadcast TV for the internet." On monetization, some question, "whether they will live up to the hype."	50/50 on sponsorship and in-play advertisements. Blip sells the advertising, and they also match creators to sponsorship opportunities, which they are staffed to sell.
Veoh	"Great technology and great player" "allows you to build your own channel," but "the site is missing on the social aspect" and "customer support is lacking." Some feel like "they're trying to sell you something," "but it's unclear what they're selling."	They have a monetization mechanism, but revenue share not clear. Not selling specific sponsorship as far as we can tell, though they offer producers the opportunity to produce content for brands. Doesn't seem to be a standard practice yet.
Stupidvideo	Content is "heavy on comedy" and "the bizarre." "Their name makes me not want to post my content," but many receive "good traffic" from the site.	Note that they sell in stream ads, uncertain whether they will offer revenue stream.
Crackle	Positioned as a talent acquisition mechanism for Sony. "Great site, but the backend technology needs improvement" and "video discovery could be easier." Crackle is "known for high quality premium content," and "feels more like television online." A few users were unaware that they were accepting UGC; "I thought they had stopped."	No revenue share apparent, but big on contests and opportunities to pitch shows to Sony.