

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT 17

Message

From: [REDACTED] [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[REDACTED]]

Sent: 5/7/2021 7:06:10 PM

[illegible]

Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbld":null,"threadFbld":3148465225217229}]

Attachments: 181227452 568660987432653 9095539719365618892 n.jpg

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 05:38:33 PDT):
>CO friends, I think historically we didnt' always restore FP from misbanked clusters. Is my recollection true?

(5/07/2021 05:39:07 PDT):
>Second question: for CEI disables in UFAC, there is no worked appeals right now, yes?

(5/07/2021 05:41:10 PDT):
>I'm trying to be really cautious on the accounts we want to disable for historic CEI, and I saw at least one xchecked account where the three CEI appear to have been matches to clusters that are no longer banked in our CEI delete banks. This is ... concerning.

Diego San Martin (5/07/2021 08:58:22 PDT):
>No appeals at the moment.

Diego San Martin (5/07/2021 08:59:00 PDT):
>We try to restore FP's from misbanked clusters but its a very manual process and I am sure we miss some unfortunately.

(5/07/2021 08:59:50 PDT):
 > if its an indefensible disabled, like black borders taking down someone's math homework, we always
 restore when made aware to it. If someone did post a child safety violation, but the incorrect action was
 applied, it often comes down to assessing the content and # of accounts impacted

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 09:23:07 PDT):
>For how far back is this?

(5/07/2021 09:23:27 PDT):
>Like yes in the last couple of years, but we have CEI deletes for like 10 haha.

(5/07/2021 09:24:57 PDT):
do you a few specific examples? happy to dig in a bit more to see what may have happened to cause these accounts to remain active even after hitting a bank

(5/07/2021 09:24:59 PDT):

>I'm trying to get a feel for risk that very old (and I guess new, too) NCMEC reports are FP

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 09:25:30 PDT):

>(so that we can confidently disable a population of people with 3+ CEI, given there are no appeals right now)

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 09:26:03 PDT):

>yea its a bit hard to estimate how many NCMEC reports are FP, we really only get a sense through our false positive measurement queue + feedback from NCMEC (which is very time delayed)

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 09:27:21 PDT):

>Ok, Well ... then I think:

>* exclude any content with any restore decision we have on file (including IG cascade restores)

>* thoroughly double-check tier 1 xcheck users for FPs

>* everything else, hope for the best and that we get it right

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:31:10 PDT):

>Unrelated question: Does "meeting for sex" include if the adult proposes meeting for sex and minor says no?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:31:16 PDT):

>is that tier 1?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:34:54 PDT):

>no it doesn't, there should be evidence that either they met or they are planning to.

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:40:49 PDT):

>Interesting!

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:41:32 PDT):

>What about just possible access?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:41:45 PDT):

>physical access

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:43:16 PDT):

>In what sense? Access to children as in the uncle or family friend of a minor? or location (I.e. both live in Connecticut so they're in relatively close physical proximity to each other)?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:45:34 PDT):

>Like is the stepparent of a friend or something. But haven't actually met for sex, maybe the adult is pressuring the minor, and the conversation is sexual.

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:45:37 PDT):

>For access to children but no contact offense (ie no confirmed or imminent plans to meet for sex), we typically send those to COINV to investigate further. But we're planning to start sending Standard Reports for those in H2 in place of COINV. If this doesn't clearly constitute T1 IIC already, I believe we should revise our definition to make it so. Sefa, thoughts?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:46:19 PDT):

>So it "might" be T1 if an investigator finds concerning situations to report.

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:46:28 PDT):

>Yup

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:46:40 PDT):

>I believe trusted access to child + sexual convo constitutes t1?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:47:02 PDT):

>at least I've always treated it that way

Mrs. [REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:48:51 PDT):

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:48:54 PDT):

>my definition of t1 is potential for "real-world harm" vs "online harm" t2

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:49:21 PDT):

>Can we please write down our definitions of T1 and T2 IIC somewhere? Happy to do it, there's no doc I can point to and say "this is T1 IIC". The spirit of T1 IIC is real-world harm, & there is strong potential for real-world harm w/ access to child even if no contact offense

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:49:38 PDT):

>this is in my H2 suggestion of revising DMAT definition per convos with Malia

>

>T1 = meeting for sex or sextortion

>

>Reportable to NCMEC = the above sex talk + agh factor such as access to child, position of trust, incest etc

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:50:22 PDT):

>T1 is meeting for sex or sextortion

>

>T2 is sex talk

>

>Reportable to NCMEC is a different thing, it's Tier 1 or Tier 2 + aggravating factors as mentioned above.

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:50:45 PDT):

>We likely should add to T1 "enticement of images"

Mrs. [REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:50:45 PDT):

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:51:10 PDT):

>(based on what @ [REDACTED] and @ [REDACTED] have told me is typically prosecutable in various countries)

Mrs. [REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:51:17 PDT):

PRIV

Mrs. [REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:52:02 PDT):

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:52:06 PDT):

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:52:13 PDT):

>That's CEIS so would be reportable but not Tier 1 IIC

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:52:19 PDT):

shared: 181227452_568660987432653_9095539719365618892_n.jpg

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:53:10 PDT):

>I wonder though. This isn't just CEIS like in trade. From what @ [REDACTED] and Ravi have said, enticing directly from the minor is higher harm.

Mrs. [REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:53:30 PDT):

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:54:01 PDT):

>I think this is real world harm to a minor who could have their photos recirculated in perpetuity, no?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:54:37 PDT):

>Yep neither is position of trust or military etc, you have to have the sex talk.

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:54:39 PDT):

>Right, I mean access to child + sex talk, sorry. That's reportable to NCMEC is my understanding - but would that be reasonable cause to categorize as T1 IIC (real-world harm)?

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:55:13 PDT):

>

Mrs. [REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:57:03 PDT):

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:57:06 PDT):

>Or else, we can go with [REDACTED] definitions here - but it might be confusing to have this category of child safety harms that's not T1 IIC & not a CEI violation but is still reportable to NCMEC.

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:57:16 PDT):

>Our policies and DMaT don't explicitly cover the inbetweeny reportable to NCMEC part here I think is the problem from discussing with Malia before. I stuck this in my H2 things to sort out.

>

>If we are reporting to NCMEC for sex talk and access to child I would consider that more than Tier 2 but possibly not as high as Tier 1 met for sex.

>

>I think [REDACTED] said

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:58:01 PDT):

>Haha, ok this tells me we need some in depth conversations in Q3 on retiering "extreme harms to children".

Mrs. [REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:58:19 PDT):

PRIV

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 11:59:16 PDT):

>Yes. And I think some have fallen under the assumption that what "we" think is Tier 1 is the only thing getting prosecuted off of information from us.

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 12:02:39 PDT):

>No, a lotttt of "t2" gets prosecuted. It's still illegal. The difference is because there is an aggravating factor/risk of physical interaction with a victim they just get flagged to NCMEC with higher priority

[REDACTED] (5/07/2021 12:06:10 PDT):

>A lot of us didn't see the retiering document last year so there's a whole bunch of comments in it now related to this.

>

>For "what is T1 and T2", T1 is the "arranging real world encounters" line and the whole "sextortion" section. Every other policy line is T2.

>No policy line is for the fuzzy "T1b" part described above.

>

>For DMaT, we have onboarded "IIC T1" but in reality we have more or less onboarded "everything reported to NCMEC" which is more than T1.