Questions for Riché McKnight
General Counsel, UFC &
SVP, Deputy General Counsel, Co-Head of Litigation, Endeavor

---

1. **Can you describe for us the partnerships you have with various social media companies and online platforms to combat illegal streaming? Are those partnerships effective? In other words, in order to combat illegal streaming should Congress rely on private, voluntary partnerships alone?**

   We have takedown tool arrangements with a number of social media companies, but despite these arrangements, online platforms have neglected our requests to engage—as partners ordinarily would engage—for the purpose of more effectively combating illegal streaming. We believe communication, coordination, and cooperation could be greatly improved. Our general experience is that those subject to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) use it as a floor and do the minimum required to be in compliance. I will note that Facebook has improved its communication with us and has slightly improved their take down response.

   In addition to our in-house team, we have contracted with "Stream Enforcement," a company that specializes in anti-piracy and in protecting content.

   Private, voluntary partnerships are not sufficient to combat online piracy. Addressing this problem requires a new approach that includes a strong legal framework, a combination of private and public enforcement, and enhanced cooperation with our international partners. That said, it is important for the United States to lead in this regard, which is why we believe elevating the commercial piracy of live sporting events to a felony is so important.

2. **In addition to possibly harmonizing the criminal penalties between illegal downloading and streaming, are there other substantive changes to copyright law that Congress should consider that would help combat copyright theft and piracy? For example, should we be looking at any changes Section 512 of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act?**

   UFC supports the Committee's efforts to examine whether the Digital Millennium Copyright Act's (DMCA) existing legal framework should be updated. When Section 512 of the DMCA was enacted, the primary focus of policymakers was ensuring that copyright law applied to the Internet. But the internet of the 1990s - where stored content was the focus - is far different than the internet of today.

   Since the late 1990s, technology has made streaming content readily available and streaming has replaced the downloading of stored content as the primary commercial

content distribution methodology for legitimate and illegitimate businesses. However, the legal framework providing protections to online content providers has not kept pace.

Congress should examine how best to properly incentivize platform providers to protect copyrighted online streaming content. It is our experience that the DMCA has become a floor, not a ceiling, and that most subject to it do the minimum needed to be in compliance. Transitioning from a reactive "take down" regime to a proactive "prevention" regime would better protect and enhance a vibrant online ecosystem. For example, few platforms have a policy to bar repeat infringers. This seems like an easy way address those pirating and profiting from stolen content.

Congress recently directed the Copyright Office to examine the problem of online streaming and evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the safe harbor provisions contained in section 512 of title 17, United States Code. The Copyright Office is expected to issue its report later this year. Hopefully, the Copyright Office will provide a roadmap for Congress to address this issue in a comprehensive fashion.

While this process might take some time to complete, the UFC looks forward to working with the Committee to better protect online streaming content. In the near term, we believe a positive first step should be harmonizing the law for illegal commercial streaming.