

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT 5

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 3/20/2024 3:57:47 PM
To: Lucy Kerr [lucykerr@meta.com]; Sofiane Abbar [sofa@meta.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":100064555546011,"threadFbId":null}]

they - I can see you're not convinced that we have a handle on understanding the problems NCMC has atm with regard to triaging CyberTips etc

>I think we have enough of a baseline understanding to take a few actions - and a large part of repairing the relationship is going to be about showing we are 'willing to do something'. Even if it isn't the thing they want (ie rebuild the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED])

>I wanna hear more from you, what worries you, what you think we are missing and how taking short term action now might not be the right thing

>You're totally right. I feel we're rushing this piece of work without enough evidence it'll have a tangible impact on our relationship with NCMEC/LE. Some of the reasons that make me feel this way are listed below:

>2. We're conflating LE and NCMEC views on our reports which seem to have different reasons to hate them. On one hand, LE doesn't have access to uncertain reports and only sees reports that have user info which all look genuine. They are potentially unhappy [REDACTED] b7E
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I wonder if there's something else they are unhappy about.

[REDACTED]

>4. Batching Viral reports: is presented to us without even giving us a chance to understand how it works and whether it will solve some of the problems that are specific to WA. And yet, I've seen us almost committing to it as in "yes this is a great thing, let us just make sure we have enough resources to implement it."

>> You're totally right. I feel we're rushing this piece of work without enough evidence it'll have a tangible impact on our relationship with NCMEC/LE.

> I'm prioritising showing progress as we work through the potential mitigation steps, especially because lots of people are asking - what we are looking at now is not a commitment to implement (with the exception of the talking points which we will get framed up regardless)

>Let me read the rest of your message now, but hope this reassures you a bit

>Since [REDACTED] is running point on this from the eng side, I think you should also share this directly with him. Suggest to him the kinds of questions one might ask in his position, encourage him to challenge. Then trust the working group to go through the reviews.

>Alternatively, if you feel strongly, then perhaps you should be taking a driving seat alongside me? Do you want to discuss it together so I can address each of these individual points? I will write a little on each if not so you know the page I am on

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 08:51:47 PDT):

>Let's start with 3 & 4 - easy process things

>

>On 3.

>

>Just to level set, there are two meetings. One is the internal (Meta) bi-weekly NCMEC XFN sync. Sinan and I have both been on the invite for a while; I mentioned to him, Abby and co I was going to de-prio it because at last meetings several months ago the discussion centred around FB/IG etc, and wasn't a good use of time. The plan was to be looped in ad hoc when WA was on the table. Either WA never came up, or the looping was missed / forgotten. Definitely a gap and addressing process and this ritual is one of the improvement points in the review doc.

>

>The other meeting is with NCMEC themselves. That is typically handled by Einat / Abby / Jason and others. I will chase down more info but I don't think that tech should be there on the reg; I do think we should be meeting ad hoc with NCMEC. I'll try and fix this as part of the process thing too.

>

>

>On 4.

>

>> And yet, I've seen us almost committing to it as in "yes this is a great thing, let us just make sure we have enough resources to implement it."

>

>Unless there's a commitment happening somewhere else, this is absolutely not committed to.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 08:57:47 PDT):

>Now for more specifics on the challenge at hand:

>

>On 1. I agree, I keep hearing different things from various people, especially stats. Please also point out in the review doc where the facts are incorrect. It's always helpful. Let's make sure we have a crisp write up of exactly the status quo. Is that something you'd like to own?

>

>On 2 - and related to 3 - I hear the frustration. Raki from comms, Laura in Policy and I are validating this but I think on the face of it the problems are fairly simple:

>- NCMEC has a hard time triaging, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] they're understandably frustrated.

[REDACTED] is a powerful datapoint for investigators. I'm working to understand this better, but I don't think we are about to escalate adapting the [REDACTED] That would compromise privacy. Ofc, we will be noting it as an issue.

[REDACTED] has now been on their radar for an extremely long time. They are confused and annoyed that WA is 'taking so long' to fix it. That gives an impression that it's not important to us, and from there a perception forms that none of it is important to us. This is why some of our key talking points will be around all the important investments and progress the team has made.