

AMENDED Exhibit 376

PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Case No.: 4:22-md-03047-YGR

MDL No. 3047

In Re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation

Message

From: Guy Rosen [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXTERNAL (FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=92BCA91BE2DF4977A7D82AFF68A516A5]
Sent: 8/30/2018 4:36:06 PM
To: Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]
CC: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Message scanning

Enabling us to proactively scan that segment of conversations.
 People don't tend to report these things, so we need protections.

On Aug 30, 2018, at 9:34 AM, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] > wrote:

What does success look like for addressing the stranger case? Giving someone recourse if they get reached out to (blocking?) or making sure they don't get the initial message in the first place?

From: Guy Rosen [REDACTED]
Date: Thursday, August 30, 2018 at 9:30 AM
To: Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] >
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Message scanning

More the case of someone looks me up on Instagram/Facebook because I'm a cute girl, sends me a message (or even a friend request) and we start messaging. That is where all the bad stuff happens. (From the "less bad" tier 2 sexual harassment like dudes sending dick pics to everyone; to the tier 1 cases where they end up doing horrible damage.)

I do think the safety cases are much more important on FB+IG than on WA because FB+IG are a directory. So I'm actually okay with being inconsistent because of that, or carving out the "stranger" case.

On Aug 30, 2018, at 9:28 AM, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] > wrote:

The stranger edge case is if someone I don't know gets my number and starts messaging me?

From: Guy Rosen [REDACTED] >
Date: Thursday, August 30, 2018 at 9:23 AM
To: Adam Mosseri <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Message scanning

I'm actually fine encrypting if we solve the "stranger" edge case - i.e. if I am a random person and I approach you, I don't get to enjoy privacy. In our analogies this is not "a private living room conversation" it's someone on the doorstep of my home. I actually think if we figure out a good framework here we could unify it - apply the same on WA, and encrypt all the rest of Messenger regular conversations too.

On Aug 30, 2018, at 9:21 AM, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] >
wrote:

I'm curious for your thoughts on encryption here, specifically how do we rationalize having WA encrypted and Messenger and Direct from a company perspective?

From: [REDACTED] >
Date: Thursday, August 30, 2018 at 9:18 AM
To: Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] >, Guy Rosen
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Message scanning

If we present to [REDACTED], I think we should fully game out both 'private' and 'encrypted' and what that would mean for Instagram.

Guy, this is following your 'give leaders all the options including the extreme ones' strategy.

From: Adam Mosseri
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2018 8:39:56 AM
To: Guy Rosen
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Message scanning

Makes sense. For what it's worth I think it might be a good time to talk through the other option, which would be encryption. The middle ground, unencrypted and not scanned, makes the least sense to me.

Sent from my phone

From: Guy Rosen [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 5:29 PM
To: Adam Mosseri
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Message scanning

I doubt we'll want to make a decision without him given he feels very strongly. But let's iterate together with you / Mikey and see if we can build a convincing argument. Ultimately I think we'll end up talking this through with Cox and Mark too.

On Aug 29, 2018, at 4:24 PM, Adam Mosseri
[REDACTED] wrote:

Honestly I'm not sure. I've been emailing [REDACTED] about big things that have come up over the past few weeks, but haven't heard back from him. At the very least though I'm happy to spend some time with you and/or the team teeing this up. If we want to try and make this decision without him that'll be pretty intense, but I can breach the subject with Mikey when he's back next week.

From: Guy Rosen [REDACTED] >
Date: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 at 10:55 AM
To: Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] >
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Message scanning

We were chatting about this with the IG team yesterday in the context of IIC (Inappropriate Interactions with Children) which is basically blocked on this. It's [REDACTED] #1 priority to make progress here, and I suggested a series of meetings to hash out the details, culminating with you+us+ [REDACTED] and then [REDACTED] after. Do you think we'll be able to get some buy-in from [REDACTED] pre-9/24? That's a long time for them to be blocked.

On Aug 29, 2018, at 10:39 AM, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks, [REDACTED] (IG Policy) mentioned to me that she's been working with CI and Legal to prep some materials for when [REDACTED] is back (9/24) to talk about message scanning. Any other developments since we talked about this last in this space?

From: Guy Rosen [REDACTED] >
Date: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 at 10:34 PM
To: Adam Mosseri

<[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED]
>
Subject: Re: Message scanning

We're working through a detailed list with the policy team. Raw quip is here but it's messy so don't look yet. + [REDACTED] is working with policy team on this.

One thing that I learned in the past two days may accelerate us here - Mark is planning to spend the next few weeks thinking through a number of content moderation related decisions. I'm probably going to add message scanning as one of them as it is part of the same framework of broadly where we are proactive vs. reactive, how much we remove, etc. I'll keep you posted and make sure you are part of the process.

On Aug 15, 2018, at 1:44 PM, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] wrote:

I'm curious about two things around message scanning: (1) which integrity problems we use it for and (2) do we yet have a list of policies for messaging for integrity problems (as we've talked about different policies in messaging versus broadcast sharing in the past) ? Wasn't sure who the best person to ask was so thought I'd start with you.

Adam

