

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT 28

Message

From: [REDACTED]@meta.com]
Sent: 6/14/2023 5:46:27 PM
To: [REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]@meta.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbld":null,"threadFbld":5963211137130545}]
Attachments: 353026895_799041661741337_7059335377477466097_n.png

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 01:42:26 PDT):

>Thanks for the heads up [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 01:45:28 PDT):

>[REDACTED] tagged me into a chat on lowering thresholds for IG disables. [REDACTED] will keep you in the loop once we have some documentation/info on what's changing

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:05:40 PDT):

>One other q Ravi brought up with me - I'm pretty certain I recall one of the MacSa signals being "user has searched for a designated CSAM search term in X timeframe"

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:05:44 PDT):

>Is that right or am I making that up?

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:06:32 PDT):

>If accurate, what/where is the "designated" CSAM terms and can we take a look at that list (+ the process based on which investigators designate CSAM terms) ?

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:08:33 PDT):

>There is a process to ensure these are high precision.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:08:53 PDT):

>They are the same ones we use for the search intercept of "you could be searching for CSAM

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:08:54 PDT):

>"

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:09:09 PDT):

>Could you ping [REDACTED] for the latest list?

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:09:21 PDT):

>I believe part of taskforce is spinning this continuous vetting process again.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:18:46 PDT):

>Yup!

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:18:55 PDT):

>I think Ravi didn't know that this list/process existed

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:19:14 PDT):

>So he mentioned it would be a taskforce goal to create one, but I vaguely remembered this already existed based on MacSa signal knowledge

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:19:25 PDT):

>Good to know I wasn't imagining CSAM search terms

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:47:15 PDT):

>The list predates him. [REDACTED] organised it and for a while we had a queue to add to it.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:47:41 PDT):

>We couldn't maintain funding for this over time and adding to the list didn't make the cut.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:52:40 PDT):

>So there's a legacy list but it hasn't been maintained due to resource constraints?

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:52:44 PDT):

>(every time I say things like this, I feel like some wizened elder ☹)

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:52:45 PDT):

>But we still pull from it for MacSa purposes?

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:53:06 PDT):

>We know that the precision is high but the recall is likely inadequate.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:54:34 PDT):

>Great. So as part of the taskforce, we'll develop a process to grow the list/ increase recall

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:55:20 PDT):

>And my understanding from Ravi is that we may need a process that allows us to ingest keywords from external expert bodies (though I think that's still TBD whether it makes sense/we have resources to vet keywords)

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:56:05 PDT):

>Also I'm straying outside ABP remit a bit with the keyword stuff (to the extent it's unrelated/independent from MacSa work), so apologies for being nosy!

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:56:19 PDT):

>Yep, so I've been low-key thinking about this as an intel process.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 04:56:37 PDT):

>We likely need to engage i3 on this, as they should be the keeper of intelligence ingest.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 05:02:07 PDT):

>I'll ping [REDACTED] on the side to see if we have representation from the intel group there.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 05:06:27 PDT):

>Based on what I heard from Ravi, it's a pretty nascent idea rn

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 05:07:07 PDT):

>But my instinct was the same re: i3/intel running the show on how to ingest keywords proposed by externals (inc. doing some form of impact measurement on precision vs. recall before ingesting them into our systems)

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 05:07:11 PDT):

>So I flagged that to Ravi too

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 05:07:23 PDT):

>But I assume these will be brought up more formally as part of the taskforce

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 05:07:30 PDT):

>Yeah, this is in a larger set of "processes I want to enable to get intelligence into scale quickly"

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 09:45:07 PDT):

>Hey--qq: We have a slide going to Zuck on MacSA.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 09:45:30 PDT):

>Do we say that MacSA "is an actor-behavioural policy"?

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 09:46:19 PDT):

>Like is that a widely-known definition?

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:01:48 PDT):

>I'm going to defer to [REDACTED] there as owners - but generally speaking, I think referring to it as an actor-behavioral policy makes sense? Are there alternatives for how it could be described? It may be more accurate as an "interactions" policy but that would likely cause more confusion.

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:02:32 PDT):

>They were trying to say heuristics and I was like ... this is more than that. It's Policy-backed, so is an actor-behavioural policy

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:04:22 PDT):

>Yeah that feels right to me, but tagging [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to weigh in

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:05:40 PDT):

>too late lol, slide it locked

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:07:42 PDT):

>oop

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:08:38 PDT):

>I'm fine with that language. It's broadly accurate (which is why our team owns it) but would have slightly reframed to it being e2ee resilient method for actor-level enforcement on behavioral violations

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:08:50 PDT):

>It's close enough that I'm not concerned though

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:08:57 PDT):

>TY for flagging [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:45:17 PDT):

>Full text:

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:45:19 PDT):

shared: 353026895_799041661741337_7059335377477466097_n.png

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:45:35 PDT):

>Hope that thorough enough :)

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:46:20 PDT):

>This situation moved so freaking fast

[REDACTED] (6/14/2023 10:46:27 PDT):

>I was like ... hold on ... what?