

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT 4

Message

From: [REDACTED]@meta.com]
Sent: 3/18/2024 7:22:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]@meta.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":100023664310268,"threadFbId":null}]

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 09:49:21 PDT):
>hey thanks a lot for getting stuck into the NCMEC stuff - gonna really need you to lean into this over the next couple days
>
><https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rdYjIqTu1wFy3Htj3tiTec7qEicOP60aVS1LTduXarI/edit>

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 09:50:11 PDT):
>think we also need to get a clearer tentative execution plan together so we can review it. the notes doc is too hard for me to follow

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:11:50 PDT):
>hey good call-out

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:12:35 PDT):
>Is this annual reporting sth new? Or did we use to do it in the prev years?

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:12:52 PDT):
>I'll have a look at th doc. Who are you send it to?

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:21:04 PDT):
>it's a yearly ting

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:21:11 PDT):
>but this is going to be very high priority this wek

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:22:05 PDT):
>leads including WALT get very uncomfortable when there are any issues in the relationship with NCMEC - is there anything you will need to de-prio this week in order to prio work on this? I understand you're going to be the main eng POC right?

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:22:10 PDT):
>so will need lots of TL-ing from you!

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:40:42 PDT):
>Got it

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:41:08 PDT):
>Did WALT already express discontentment yet or are we trying to prevent that?

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:41:25 PDT):
>Sure, I'll be the eng POC

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:41:47 PDT):
>oh everyone's always worried when NCMEC isn't happy

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:42:07 PDT):
>I'll have to de-prio the bank precision work I was planning to do this week

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:42:07 PDT):
>Not a big deal though

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:42:31 PDT):
>so it's one that gains a lot of visibility very quickly, and so just one we need to make sure we're super proactively tackling you know?

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:43:25 PDT):
>I don't doubt it, just trying to fully get the context of what's going on

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:43:26 PDT):
>[REDACTED] is like er this sounds kinda fine, although why on earth is franking taking so long... So they were mostly focused on that, than on mitigating the specific NCMEC thing, because they trust that we will do everything we can do repair that relationship. We need to make sure we live up to their trust!

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:43:44 PDT):
>100%

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:44:15 PDT):

>read this to get up to speed most quickly

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nXV16KLJ8FDLzRyxCZXF2WXRA6nc28YxiQRGLvynPM/edit>

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:44:18 PDT):

>Ah got you

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:44:35 PDT):

>i need to re-frame it because it's too focused on franking as the solution to the NCMEC problem, when that's only just one facet of it

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:44:37 PDT):

>Yeah that makes sense to me

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:45:05 PDT):

>but this is timely because there's always this annual public moment when NCMEC and we publish our figures - so the comms worry is that they will say something to undermine our figure (which frankly would be understandable if you're in their shoes at this point)

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:45:51 PDT):

>I also want to make sure that we don't have eng in front of Jason Barry - I think he needs to be worked with through Ops/Comms, and not directly with eng. It doesn't work out too well then because he doesn't quite have enough context on how eng works

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:46:41 PDT):

>eg, I think Cheesun probably said casually at some point oh yeah franking will land in 18m from now. and that was two years ago... but Jason is likely to take that at face value (which he did), and relay it (which I think he might have), vs getting the comms-ified version of what's ok to go out to NCMEC or not

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:47:02 PDT):

>thanks, that's clear. You know what would be great leading by example - if you made a post in Core to say that you're de-rpio-ing that, to work on short term fixes to repair the NCMEC relationship, and you anticipate pausing on it for eg this week

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:48:15 PDT):

>I see, yes they've got some legit motive

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:49:40 PDT):

>whoa, so that's a major process problem

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:54:22 PDT):

>I mean, we should be in this loop, not an eng, but someone in Safety to ensure we are only disclosing information that should

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 10:56:13 PDT):

>sounds like a good idea, thanks a ton for the suggestion

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 12:07:18 PDT):

>#silent qq, I remember Lisa was about to catch up with Jason in order to capture the real pain points from NCMEC, and the outcome of that is not clear to me yet from the posts and docs I saw. Did you get it or sync with her on that before she went on PTO?

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 12:19:01 PDT):

>Yeah it's not super clear but she did send me a digest

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 12:19:34 PDT):

>Sorry for weird late night message but ran out of time y'day

>

>Making post on NCMEC in Core WP Group, but do not want to add this context quite so plainly. It should be spoken over verbally to team, though I can do when I'm back.

>

>1. NCMEC are generally unhappy with the quality of CTs they receive from Meta

> a) The headline discussions when leadership (Antigone Davis) last met them was on Meta's compromised accounts related reports & better identification of severe memes (i.e. not WhatsApp - we're a constantly backburning issue)

> b) There are approx. 60 USA agencies who receive CTs from NCMEC, approx. [REDACTED]

> c) However [REDACTED]

>2. As Meta moves to encryption, the perception from NCMEC is that they're moving to WA's poorer state.

> a) Meta having 30 messages in user reports vs. WA's 5 is also contentious.

> b) On spoofing, franking was promised as a solution 'in 2 years' more than 2 years ago, and is still 2 years away. There is a general distrust of timelines or features coming from WA until they've been completed and confirmed repeatedly, as LEO repeatedly experience these delays or reprioritizations.

>

>@silent

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 12:20:11 PDT):

>to be honest, it wasn't very revealing for me this info - like I didn't find that actionable. So Raki (comms) and I are going to meet him this week

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 12:22:32 PDT):

>what I would say, though is that at a high level we need to work out how to make the reports higher quality - and define what that means. Broadly I think it means "what is actionable for LE". The questions I'd be asking in your shoes are:

>

>what would higher quality look like for WA if we did all the things that Meta has invested in? Is that different for 1:1 vs group messages? Where are most of our reports coming out of - 1:1 or groups?

>what would higher quality look like if we could do anything possible?

[REDACTED]...- be careful with this one though, as we don't always want to write things down if we know that eg privacy would prevent us from ever doing it)

>

>I think probably

[REDACTED] (3/18/2024 12:22:42 PDT):

>(ignore the last bit!)