

Michael E Plasmeier

From: Andrew Crocker <acrocker@jd13.law.harvard.edu>
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2013 10:16 AM
To: Stephen Suen; Michael E Plasmeier
Cc: 6.805-staff
Subject: 6.805 - Feedback on your final paper

Follow Up Flag: FollowUp
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Michael and Stephen,

We hope you had a nice holiday break, and we apologize for the delay in getting in touch about your paper. We wanted to provide integrated feedback from all the instructors.

In any event, thanks for taking on such a tough problem with an ambitious agenda -- a framework for evaluating anti-infringement proposals. Your paper has some good ideas and shows signs in places of making real contributions to the debate, but it also clearly needed further work to hone all the material you present into a more coherent set of arguments and recommendations.

We graded this paper a **B**. You present quite a bit of material, the substance of your arguments is generally accurate and thoughtful, and the topic was clearly well-researched. But the material is often presented in a disjointed way and without connection to your broader themes, and your fundamental goal -- an evaluative framework -- needs better justification and more careful explanation.

Strengths:

- Well-researched. Your bibliography and footnotes are excellent.
- You present a tremendous amount of materials; this is a dense 50 page effort.
- You have seeds of greatness in your framework. While I was originally a bit skeptical of what could be achieved, I think you identify some useful tools for evaluating copyright proposals. And you show how useful it *could* be in attempting to apply the framework to existing proposals.
- You are generally strong and accurate on your technical arguments and research.

Areas for improvement:

- The entire paper would have benefited greatly from a careful edit with a very sharp pen. It reads disjointedly. Interesting material is presented without context or clear connection to your broader points. You would have probably been better off cutting a fair amount.
- As just one of many examples, consider the "Privacy" section on page 19. A one sentence intro that privacy is important? A detailed discussion of DPI and Phorm - but why? What about other privacy issues? There is little context, an incomplete discussion, and more on DPI than you need.
- Your core evaluative framework proposal is not carefully derived or presented. You offer a set of metrics, but don't really explain how you came up with them. The metrics themselves are not carefully described, and in many cases it's not clear how you would apply the metric. How

would we know if a proposal is “economical”, or technically sound, or minimally necessary? You are close... but you needed a little more rigor to produce a framework that could be objectively applied.

- Navigation in the paper is very difficult; your formatting and transitional writing is lacking.

The staff was aware that you had some organizational challenges as a team. We do appreciate the work that was put in, and your attempt to tackle a big problem.

It was a real pleasure having you both in class. Have a great break!

- Alan and the 6.805 team