

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT 16

PRIV

From: Diego San Martin <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Sent: Friday, August 7, 2020 8:59 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>;
[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>;
[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] (CI)
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

+ @ [REDACTED]

Hi All,

PRIV

PRIV

PRIV

Thank you,
Diego



Diego San Martin

Safety Project Manager | Community Operations

1 Hacker Way, Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 1:17 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Diego San Martin <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Antigone Davis

<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (CI) <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Diego San Martin
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

Hi All,

+ @ [REDACTED], @ [REDACTED],

PRIV

PRIV

Have a great weekend everyone!

Thank you,
Diego

[REDACTED]

Diego San Martin

Safety Project Manager | Community Operations

1 Hacker Way, Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:34 AM

To: Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Diego San Martin <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (CI) <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

Can we get a small XFN on this to talk through how we can address this? Great to understand whether a policy change is required at CS level or this is something we can do at an internal level? As Antigone mentions this is hard to defend externally and would love if we can come up with criteria/ thresholds to solve for this.

Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

I think we need an updated policy w/r/t recipients of CEI. I agree there will be some operational challenges and we will want to think through some complexities (e.g., group threads, public figures,...) and we might be aiming toward post remote work implementation BUT the current policy does is blunt and hard to defend.

Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

+ @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (CI), @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Added some CEI POCs to help chime in with regards to our enforcement of recipients of CEI.

In our CEI message review we currently do not action individuals that receive CEI, unless they are soliciting CEI. Additionally, this is something our teams has discussed with regards to group threads in the past, but currently in a group thread we only action the user that shared the CEI. There was a proposal a year ago to label group threads as egregious, sexualizing, borderline/benign and have all users in egregious threads disabled, but that was never approved and is something we would have to pick back up again.

From my perspective, I agree that someone who has been a part of many NCMEC reports could be a good signal for us to review more thoroughly in a non-COVID constrained world. One issue we would need to

resolve is the fact that users can have messages in their message request inbox from non-friends where some of these NCMEC reports may be from. I am sure this is a problem that is exacerbated for public figures like celebrities and politicians, who may have message request inboxes with thousands of messages and potentially hundreds of NCMEC reports, that they are unaware of.

Best,
Diego

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 7:06 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Diego San Martin <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

+ Diego and [REDACTED] to confirm our enforcement on this, and [REDACTED] for line of sight

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 at 12:44 PM
To: Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

SMEs + [REDACTED]

Thank you, Antigone and [REDACTED]. Understand your concern regarding the safety risk in lack of enforcement on recipients of CEI. Other SMEs and [REDACTED] might have more knowledge/thoughts on this. As Antigone pointed, we could be signals to indicate deliberate targets v. receiving willingly.

From: Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 4:20 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

Agree. We need to solve for this. We cannot let an outlier potential for abuse lead us to an indefensible approach. Perhaps there are signals that would indicate someone is being targeted v receiving willingly. Next steps?

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2020 at 7:29 AM
To: Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

So response back on the task to my question: @Antigone Davis this seems problematic, and I'm not sure if it's a policy issue or operations but if you've received CEI on 100 plus occasions imo you should be disabled--would love some guidance here? @[REDACTED] any idea if this is a policy or operational guideline? Understand the exploitation issue but shouldn't we veer more heavily on safety risk.

"Hi, you can be listed on many NCMEC reports if you are a recipient of CEI for example if you are listed on 100+ NCMEC reports it would mean you have received CEI on 100+ occasions. This typically happens when a user is a member of group chats sharing CEI. Currently we do not enforce on CEI recipients at scale as it would be a gap that

could be exploited (for example, targeting someone by sending them CEI to get their accounts disabled) but I believe there are discussions about it."

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Monday, 13 July 2020 at 12:40
To: Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

Thanks [REDACTED] - wasn't clear about how admin has over 100 NCMEC reports and wasn't disabled previously - left a comment in the task so hopefully we can get more clarity on that. Thanks again for your quick actions [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On 13-Jul-2020, at 12:19 PM, Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com> wrote:

Thank you!!!!

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2020 3:16:34 AM
To: Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

Hi Antigone, sharing an update on this. Safety has done a full review of the group and took the following actions:

1. Deleted the group and the users who shared the CEI in the group
2. Based on the membership of this group and the name, we also deleted 20+ additional groups.
3. The admin already had over 100 NCMEC reports and has been disabled

CO-Safety also noted that they are looking into automated enforcement on such groups and will involve the XFN. Please let me know if you need anything.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

From: Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 12, 2020 6:12 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

Hi, I definitely think we should sort a way to disable this group. The combo of the CRI removals and the name of the group are a big red flag.

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 12, 2020 5:04 AM
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Cc: GPMT
Subject: On-Call Baton Pass - 12 July, 2020

ON-CALL BATON PASS

DATE: July 12, 2020
TIME: 2:30 pm IST
FROM: [REDACTED]
TO: [REDACTED]

#Borderline FB group with CEI violations

SUMMARY: A Facebook group called 'Cute and Beautiful Kids' was flagged by a trusted partner, the HONR Network. We have removed 4 posts by members of the group for CEI violations (not posted by the admins). A previous admin was also disabled for CEI, but the group does not meet the threshold for disable. The ask is for an SOP call to disable the group.

CALL MADE: I requested for the Safety team to conduct an investigation of the admin of the group. If we have sufficient indicators from the safety review, we can disable the admin and thereby the group (which will meet the strikes threshold). If the Safety investigation does not find the evidence, asked R&R to circle back to OCP to consider an SOP to disable the group.

TASK: Leon 5046573

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: n/a

OTHER POCs: n/a

ACTION ITEMS: Please monitor the task for CO-Safety assessment. Sync with Safety Policy if we need to make the SOP call to disable the group.

SMEs INVOLVED: n/a

TASK # FROM EXCEPTION CONTACT FORM: n/a

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? (if so, list out): N/A

From previous shifts [NO UPDATES]

George Floyd Toys

SUMMARY: The IG account @georgefloydtoys (IGU 37701852303) was reported via an Oops Task for selling products that mock the murder of George Floyd. The account sells anti-stress pillows and toys of George Floyd that encourage users to 'squeeze' the face and body of George Floyd. The account claims that part of the proceeds of the sales will go to charities involved in the Black Lives Movement and offers to provide evidence to support this. Escalations determined there are no LOP violations but asked for a SOP to remove account under Cruel and Insensitive - Mocking or further degrading the premature death of a person.

CALL MADE: Cognizant of the ongoing sensitivities regarding the death of George Floyd and ongoing protests, OCP is calibrating on the request for an SOP. Consideration is being given to both Cruel and Insensitive (Mocking/Demeaning) and Bullying and Harassment policies. We are also looking into the authenticity of the account.

[FYI: REDACTING some of the action items to streamline the baton pass - - please be sure to refer to previous baton passes for assessments from earlier shift].

[REDACTED] Based on Community Standards Feedback Group post, it looks like a new, identical account has been created under a slightly different handle, @georgeflyodtoy (no "s").

Additionally, in the CSF posts indicates that the dolls are being strangled and choked by people (re-enacting his death), and being given to pets. Even if the dolls themselves are not deemed to be violating, posts making fun of his death using the doll in this way should be reviewed. I reopened the task and asked Esc to evaluate the new account. SMEs should continue to monitor this as well.

[REDACTED] July 4]: CO found four more IG accounts with similar names. Two accounts were found to be engaging in the same spam behaviour (IS 19.1b) and one of the two accounts is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] to the previously disabled IG account. I approved disabling these two accounts for spam and recidivism violations. The other two accounts had no strikes or DMs with spam violations. I assessed them as non-violating for now but asked CO to monitor for spam violations and investigate whether they were connected to the violating accounts in any way.

[REDACTED] I asked a clarifying question to R&R re: whether there are links to violating accounts to close the loop on the remaining two accounts that have been thus far assessed as non-violating. If R&R confirms there are no links, we can drop from BP.

[REDACTED] Assigned to current R&R on-call for speedier resolution, as we're only waiting on a minor clarification before closing this out.

[REDACTED] No update during my shift.

[REDACTED] shift]: FBer flagged additional accounts, and I asked for Esc to identify the recidivists signals to help OCP make a determination.

[REDACTED] 7 July]: No update. New accounts are popping up and account reviews are likely going to get unwieldy. Asked R&R oncall to create a spread sheet as suggested by [REDACTED] for ease of review. Assigned the ask to current R&R on-call. Monitor task

[REDACTED] July 7]: I have assessed the spreadsheet created by R&R. I have made a call to remove all pending item for violating our B&H policy (9.4.h mocking the death of a private individual) or for having recidivists signals.

[REDACTED] Bringing this one back up because ER-Esc found some more recidivist accounts. Some clearly had a similar names (e.g., GeorgeFloydToysOfficial7) to accounts we already disabled and were device linked so I gave the go-ahead to disable those accounts (shout out to

[REDACTED] 11 July]: [REDACTED] sent the email to [REDACTED] Keep adding on-calls till [REDACTED] replies and then close the loop

[REDACTED] No Leadership response yet. Once we have it, please respond on the case. R&R is tracking this and has reached out for a status update.

[REDACTED] 12 July]: Ulrick bumped the email to [REDACTED] Continue to monitor and update R&R accordingly

SMEs INVOLVED: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

DID YOU FILL OUT THE EXCEPTION TRACKER – INCLUDE TASK?: N/A

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? N/A

[X-check] Trump meme with SSI violation

SUMMARY: Conservative page 'Hard Truth' posted a graphic digital meme depicting President Trump shooting himself in the head with blood gushing out from his temples. The meme was accompanied with a the caption that read - "Facebook don't penalize me! Don't restrict me! [REDACTED] I am not promoting violence! I am actually promoting that these images should be banned. I am just showing my followers what garbage that liberals are allowed to post. At the same time while FB is factchecking and restricting non-liberal speech because of partially false memes fact-checked by Nopes, PolitiHack and CNN! Seriously would FB allow a picture like this with Obama? Pelosi??".

CALL MADE: This post violates our Suicide and Self Injury policy (IS 6.1.b) as it depicts graphic self injury imagery in a suicide or self-injury admission context. However, the caption contains political speech accusing Facebook of a liberal bias in being selective about removing content about politicians. Esc assessed that removing the post may lead to a PR fire as this page has 30,000+ followers and may further the perception about Facebook's alleged bias. I have requested for inputs from Safety Policy and US Comms/PP input on whether we should grant a narrow exception to keep this post up OR remove this post without a strike.

[REDACTED] shift]: Safety Policy ([REDACTED] and [REDACTED] have weighed in and err on the side of removing the content . We are still awaiting US PP/Comms input.

[REDACTED] SHIFT]: PP has started weighing in. From a conversation offline with [REDACTED] (safety policy), she is still awaiting some input from folks that she has looped in (pp/policy comms). Please stay close to this one. OCP awaiting their input.

[REDACTED] Shift]: The XFN has aligned on removing the content but without issuing a strike given the image is shared in a condemning context. We have asked ER Esc to confirm the messaging that would be sent to the page admins if removed in the x-check queue.

[REDACTED] 11 July]: Safety, P&G are aligned on removing the post. [REDACTED] from Comms agreed with removal but [REDACTED] [REDACTED] raised risks and recommended MAD. The call is still to go ahead with

removal without strike. Waiting for ER to confirm violation notification messaging before enforcing.

TASK: T69796653

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: N/A

OTHER POCs: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

ACTION ITEMS: Follow up with Safety Policy and US PP/Comms for inputs. Provide final OCP guidance to keep up or remove the post after evaluating their inputs.

[REDACTED] 11 July]: No updates. Monitor task.

[REDACTED] 11 July]: bumped ER-Esc for response

SMEs INVOLVED: N/A

DID YOU FILL OUT THE EXCEPTION TRACKER – INCLUDE TASK?: N/A

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? N/A

Request to disable Groups posting sexually explicit material

SUMMARY: Escalations reached out to request an exception to de-dupe strikes against several Groups flagged by a Danish journalist. In short, Escalations found a significant amount of admin-approved content in each Group that violates our policies on nudity and/or adult sexual activity, but due to [REDACTED]

CALL MADE: I asked whether the Groups had any previous strikes and whether they had received any messaging or been informed about the fact that they are posting content that violates our Community Standards. If not, I'm not sure we have sufficient reason to override our enforcement principle that users should generally have a chance to self-remediate after being educated about our policies before being subjected to severe actions like unpublishing Groups. If PP/Comms or other stakeholders feel there are circumstances or context to warrant exceptional treatment in this case, I asked Escalations to please circle back. I asked for confirmation that all of the violations in the Groups were all related to *adult* nudity and sexual activity (if there is any CEI, that would obviously change the assessment) and flagged to our Actor and Behavioral Policy sub-team in case they have anything else to add or would recommend a different course of action.

TASK: T67463843

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: N/A

OTHER POCs: N/A

ACTION ITEMS: None for now—feel free to drop from the baton pass if no AIs in the next few shifts.

[REDACTED] 11 July]: Same as above

[REDACTED] 11 July]: Assigned task to Amy for response.

SMEs INVOLVED: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

DID YOU FILL OUT THE EXCEPTION TRACKER – INCLUDE TASK?: N/A

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? N/A

[X-check] PSR of designated terrorist by Pakistani politician

SUMMARY: Haji Muhammad Akram Ansari is a Pakistani politician from a prominent political party (PML-N) and till recently was Minister of State for Commerce and Textile. The post published by his page contains political speech about the Kashmir dispute. The caption of his post also paraphrases Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan's statement on Burhan Wani terming him a martyr which constitutes as praise for a designated terrorist figure.

CALL MADE: Since the poster does not condemn Burhan Wani or discuss him in any of the contexts allowed under policy, the post would be a violation of our Dangerous Individuals and Organisations policy (IS 2.3) and if we enforce as per policy this post would be removed. However, keeping in mind the popular usage of the word 'martyr' in the region and the poster's background, I have requested for input from Pakistan Public Policy.

TASK: T69286441

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: N/A

OTHER POCs: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Pakistan PP)

ACTION ITEMS: Follow up with PP for input. Provide OCP guidance to keep up or remove the post after evaluating PP input.

[REDACTED] 11 July]: No updates. Monitor task.

[REDACTED] Bumped the task for [REDACTED] (PP) for input. Please have an eye on it should he respond.

SMEs INVOLVED: N/A

DID YOU FILL OUT THE EXCEPTION TRACKER – INCLUDE TASK?: N/A

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? N/A

#MeToo and PII in Egypt

SUMMARY: Markets flagged a trend where women in Egypt are sharing private numbers and names of individuals that have allegedly assaulted them in Whatsapp groups. They have raised that these screenshots could find their way onto the IG/FB platforms. They proactively wanted guidance and were concerned deleting the content would mean valuable evidence may be removed.

CALL MADE: I have asked for live content but flagged concern over making any exceptions under PII given the harm with such content and possible vigilantism, esp in the current climate. I

PRIV	Legal,	PRIV
PRIV		

[REDACTED] No updates, currently with [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] shift]: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	PRIV
PRIV	
PRIV	

TASK: T69598921

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: n/a

OTHER POCs: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

ACTION ITEMS: Follow up on task to get an answer from the XFN [REDACTED] PRIV

PRIV

[REDACTED] 11 July]: No updates

[REDACTED] 11 July]: Assigned task to [REDACTED] for response.

SMEs INVOLVED: n/a

TASK # FROM EXCEPTION CONTACT FORM: n/a

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? (if so, list out): n/a

UK BBC Comms inquiry on “pedophile hunter” FB groups (originally from 9 June)

SUMMARY: A freelance journalist for the BBC enquired about so-called “paedophile hunter” FB pages. The journalist provided examples of four such pages and claimed that these pages were targeting people with disabilities. The journalist also claimed to be investigating a potential

spike in suicides amongst those exposed by these pages. R&R investigated the four pages and found that all meet the unpublish threshold for a mix of violations for admin authenticity and IS 1.10 – “Threats against potential predators in Sting Operation situation.” IS 1.10 is an escalations-only policy that allows us to “Remove content that puts individuals at risk by revealing their identity and the status as a target of a sting operation as a sexual predator” if there is XFN alignment.

[Update] On July 3, BBC came back with 26 more groups they found, and wanted to know if they would be removed from our platform after review. Some of these are sting pages, but others seem more dedicated to just outing sex offenders. In some cases they say they were convicted, in others just arrested.

CALL MADE: I recommended that the four pages be unpublished for letter of the policy violations. R&R is seeking PP, Comms, LE and Safety Policy input before we action.

[Update] Additional contents awaiting review came in towards the end of my shift, so I didn’t have time to review 9 pieces of content Esc put together in the Assets tab in C#23157. Please review and comment on assets and discussion tabs.

[REDACTED] I didn’t have time to review the content due to the focus on the conversion therapy escalation. Please keep this in the baton pass, and I’ll try to get an update on this before the end of the next shift.

[REDACTED] and I tag-teamed to review all of the pieces of content flagged here. We need further details about the conviction status of the individuals being called out here for 7 of the pieces flagged as they mention that the individuals were arrested and we require confirmation, 1 was considered as non-violating as there is no sexual predator claim and the last piece was considered as violating and we recommended removal after receiving sign off for that from PP and Comms from the UK.

[REDACTED] I answered a few questions and followed. I pushed back on making exceptions for purposes of taking down groups without review. I am cognisant that there are limited resources, so I asked for more data to support calls to lower the threshold for removing pages and groups and also asked they keep ABP in the loop.

CASE/TASK: C#23157, C#31739, C#20944

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: N/A

OTHER POCs: N/A

ACTION ITEMS: I have asked they revert to the on-call with further questions. Remove from BP if no follow-up.

[REDACTED] 11 July]: No updates. Still waiting on answers for questions posed by [REDACTED] Continue monitoring the task

[REDACTED] 11 July]: Assigned task to Esc oncall for response.

SMEs INVOLVED: N/A

DID YOU FILL OUT THE EXCEPTION TRACKER – INCLUDE TASK: N/A

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? (if so, list out): N/A

Luchcha Veer page being reported for inappropriate content

SUMMARY: The partnership team escalated via Early Response a page that belongs to an Indian comedian and it has 400k followers. According to the Partnership team, the page contains many videos of women shown being harassed without consent and talked about in a degrading

way. The GO market team reviewed the page and found it to be non-violating. Early Response asked OCP for input on the matter.

CALL MADE: I have asked Early Response to clarify their ask for OCP (do we want this page removed or not) and to give us examples of concerning content that does not violate our LoP. I looped in [REDACTED] as well for regional expertise, who took a quick look at some of the videos and tend to agree with the first assessment of the GO Market team that these video likely do not violate our IS. She agreed as well that we will need more context on the request here as well as an idea of what content is being considered as inappropriate.

[REDACTED] India Media Partnerships provided examples of content that based on their POV are vulgar and degraded and should therefore not be on the platform. I explained that to determine whether the content violates our Community Standards, e.g. our policy on Adult Sexual Solicitation and Sexually Explicit Language, we would require translation of the content and market input. An initial market assessment of the Page concluded that the Page is not violating. I assigned to the Early Response oncall coming online the earliest on Monday (no current ER oncall) to loop in the market team. Please monitor the task for policy questions. For the translation we may need to wait for Monday. OCP oncall can then follow up.

TASK: T69735081

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: N/A

OTHER POCs: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

ACTION ITEMS: Monitor for OCP AIs

SMEs INVOLVED: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

DID YOU FILL OUT THE EXCEPTION TRACKER – INCLUDE TASK?: N/A

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? N/A

BBC enquiry about Core Issues Trust

SUMMARY: Comms has received a query about an Instagram account representing Core Issues Trust. It is an organisation based in the UK that describes itself as an organisation that “focuses on issues of homosexuality, challenging gender confusion and upholding science and conscience”. The organisation offers “change identity therapy” and goes further to state that they “the right of individuals to seek professional assistance in attempting to reduce or eliminate unwanted sexual feelings and patterning”. The organisation provides different therapies but does not provide detail on what these therapies include. Further, they consider their practices to problematise sexuality and are not “conversion therapy”. The ask was whether the account was violating. **CALL MADE:** There are no strikes on the account. Majority of the videos attack homosexuality, calling it a “developmental issue”, “a sin” and something that people who seek help can cleanse themselves of. These do not violate as they are attacks on concepts. Included in the account are testimonials of individuals that went through the therapy and consider themselves to be “ex-LGBT supporter”, “ex-Lesbian” or “ex-Trans”. The account actively uses the hashtags

"#gay", "#pride" and "#LGBT" to encourage interaction. There are no letter of the policy violations within the account. Given the upcoming debate in UK parliament, ongoing attention on Twitter regarding the account and concerns around a press cycle, IG Comms is syncing with UK PP to determine next steps. SRP and OCP will be working on an escalation email as appropriate to determine if there is room for an SOP if appropriate. There is a long deadline given BBC have flagged this will only be worked on next week.[Fadzai] A leadership email is being drafted and finalised for further input and decision. We have looped in multiple XFN viewpoints given impact. Huge shout-out to [REDACTED] for working on this.

[REDACTED]-Y [REDACTED] Leadership guidance is to apply Ads policy and make an SOP call on organic content. Leadership guidance is to apply "Content that promotes conversion therapy. An example of violating content would be the promotion of a book, product, service etc, etc. that explicitly promote conversion therapy. However, we would ignore content with implicit promotions of conversion therapy (e.g. testimonials, etc.)." on the organic content found in the IG account @coreissuestrusttv. Spent time locating leadership email and guidance - @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] can you look at the examples [REDACTED] [REDACTED] put together in the "discussions" tab (from C#31160) and provide guidance?

(note: Many thanks to @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and @ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for helping me locate the case and leadership email)

[REDACTED] I had to immerse myself in an awful lot of conversion therapy content, but eventually documented a detailed analysis of content flagged by R&R right here. Though much of the content is problematic and deeply offensive, the majority do not violate the definition of "promotion" under the Ads Policy that prohibits the promotion of conversion therapy. @ [REDACTED] also ran an assessment on flagged content from the Core Issues FB Page (**big thank you [REDACTED] for helping before your shift even started!!!**). We are running this by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to gauge consensus, after which we will circle back with a final recommendation regarding the Core Issues IG/FB accounts.

[REDACTED] OCP completed a further review of the IG account and Facebook Page of the 'Core Issues Trust' for content which explicitly promotes conversion therapy service. We will remove 5 pieces of content from the IG account (taking the total to 6) and 15 pieces of content from the FB Page under the spirit of our hate speech policy. We will bulk action this content and, per usual practice, attribute one strike to both, sending our usual messaging for hate speech. SRP are currently finalising the leadership response and will reply at which point the content can be removed. Please find the policy analysis for both the IG and FB page here.

[REDACTED] Violating Content has been removed. Discussions remain ongoing about the specifics of the exception. Please keep this in the baton pass until this is completed and the exception is filed.

[REDACTED 7/10]: As far as I can tell, the exception has not yet been formally documented. I did not have complete visibility into how the decision was made and why, so I bumped the OCP/SR-P thread for this escalation to try get clarity on the rationale.

TASK: C#31161

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: n/a

COMMS POC: [REDACTED] Sophie Vogel

OTHER POCs: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

ACTION ITEMS: Continue to monitor until the exception task is filed. Once it is, one of the POCs below will notify the current on call to update and close out this baton pass item.

[REDACTED 11 July]: SMEs listed below to file the exception task and close out

SMEs INVOLVED: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

DID YOU FILL OUT THE EXCEPTION TRACKER – INCLUDE TASK: PENDING

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? (if so, list out): N/A

Removing B/H proactively against Ana Gabecheva

SUMMARY: Markets flagged a young woman who became well-known when a death occurred in her home. OCP recently designated as an involuntary public figure and the market team has reverted asking to remove the limitation of face/name match to remove further attacks going viral against the young woman.

CALL MADE: I completely understood the concerns raised however the nature of the face/name match policy was to ensure we are removing broad attacks because the individuals has objected. Even further, making this exception and going proactive without clarity on harm seemed like crossing a line. I asked for further examples of the content we were worried about and clarification of harm.

[REDACTED] We received further information from Markets on the harm risks and are calibrating with SMEs.

[REDACTED] Continued calibration with SMEs

[REDACTED] SME's aligned on granting approval for the sweep if Markets can confirm that the target had reported content that was targeting her with cursing, expressions of contempt and disgust or similar violations. I asked Markets to confirm this. Once we have the confirmation, OCP should grant approval to sweep for content targeting her with cursing, expressions of contempt and disgust without requiring a Name/Face match on grounds that the person has spoken publicly about harassment on the platform and has reported similar content on our platform.

[L] [REDACTED] Market reached out to Legal

PRIV

PRIV

[Rou] [REDACTED]

PRIV

PRIV

Legal h

PRIV

Please

keep this task in sight.

[REDACTED] Shift]: We are currently assessing a proposed exception by the market team to action B&H content without a name or face match. The next oncall and SMEs will follow up on this request.

[REDACTED] 7/10]: From the chat on this, it seems that OCP members who have been tracking this escalation are aligned on making the exception. I gave signoff on the task for Markets to begin enforcing on content per the exception since I (as an SME) had no objections to the exception in principle so long as we are satisfied that the content that we will be removing is maliciously targeting the individual, but I asked for help on fleshing out the rationale from folks more familiar with the details of the case before documenting it.

TASK: T69609250

CO-ESCALATIONS POC: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

COMMS POC: N/A

OTHER POCs: N/A

ACTION ITEMS: Adam and/or one of the others listed below will follow up with the exception task. Once it has been filed, list the exception task below and remove this item from the baton pass.

[REDACTED] 11 July]: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to follow up with an exception task. Do not drop from BP till this is done

SMEs INVOLVED: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

TASK # FROM EXCEPTION CONTACT FORM: Pending

DID YOU UPDATE WATCHMEN TRIBES & CO GROUPS WITH ESCALATIONS GUIDANCE OR UPDATES? (if so, list out): n/a