

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT 31

Message

From: [REDACTED]@meta.com]
Sent: 3/20/2024 3:15:25 PM
To: [REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]@meta.com]; [REDACTED]@meta.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":null,"threadFbId":7414057508683885}]

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:06:40 PDT):
>Hello friends!

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:06:53 PDT):
>heyyy! timezone happiness yay

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:07:00 PDT):
>hahah yes!!

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:07:13 PDT):
>I was just catching up w [REDACTED] on this in a 1:1 - good idea to bring us together, thank you!

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:07:22 PDT):
>I thought it might be easier to share info with all of you! Was chatting with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] this morning

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:08:36 PDT):
>We previously confirmed that [REDACTED] is not available on [REDACTED] (and consequently for [REDACTED] because of privacy decisions that [REDACTED] has taken in the past.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:08:56 PDT):
>> Do you know whether that unavailability is (1) due to an insurmountable technical limitation or (2) more a matter of us just not having built the ability to capture [REDACTED] into Armadillo. Do you have a sense of which one it is at this point?
>Eng: "My sense is that this was an intentional decision, largely driven by privacy concerns. For example, when media is captured it is stripped of metadata such as [REDACTED] is even more sensitive user data than [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:09:16 PDT):
>This is the eng response that I've got about this a few months back!

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:10:04 PDT):
>Yes this makes sense and is consistent with my understanding

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:10:28 PDT):
>It's squarely a privacy decision, here are my thoughts
>
>1. we'd need to capture

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:10:28 PDT):
>And then this is why this is so valuable: "The NCA in UK let us know they had someone in custody based on a NCMEC report sent from FB. They could not locate the [REDACTED] in the report and were going to have to release the subject without that yesterday. We ended up helping them find that in the report which was not in an ideal location of the report and difficult to identify. But that being said it's an example of how important the [REDACTED] is in these reports. The NCA said they would not have been able to move forward with just the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:12:48 PDT):
>Why is this now being re-litigated for [REDACTED] Is NCMEC asking for this info?

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:12:51 PDT):
>It's squarely a privacy decision, one of the really important aspects of that decision as I understand it is that we'd need to capture [REDACTED] for *every* media send - not just media that later gets user reported.
>
>This compromises privacy for everyone, for a very small set of violators
>
>One thing I dont understand fully is why it matters so much where the user was when they sent the media. They could have been anywhere? People don't only send messages from their place of living.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:14:27 PDT):
>It has come up for two reasons
>
>1 - They're asking Meta, and [REDACTED] gets swept into that ofc

>2 - last november it came to everyone's attention that the 2017 implementation of including [REDACTED] in CyberTips was in fact [REDACTED] (which is what we log). Somehow in the implementation, it was in the field called "[REDACTED]"

>

>NCMEC / LE were very unhappy when it became clear that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:14:47 PDT):

>Got it, that's an interesting additional detail that I didn't know!

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:15:21 PDT):

>auch!

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:15:41 PDT):

>Ok let me check my older chats on this topic to see why exactly they need this info

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:15:48 PDT):

>Simultaneously, [REDACTED] is in the spotlight for meta because of our user report [REDACTED] problem. So it's a bit of a double whammy of mistrust atm.

>

>Our immediate prio is to align on

>

>1 - short term mitigations to make CTs more actionable (short of escalating Upload IP!)

>2 - talking points for [REDACTED] / comms etc - we don't think he's sufficiently armed and we can do a better job of this

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:16:05 PDT):

>We'll do this within WA, and can keep this group informed

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:16:21 PDT):

>Got it. Yep, [REDACTED] was one of the POCs we talked to about this

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:17:16 PDT):

>FWIW, the ask for messenger was to adjust the infra and start sending u [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. I think this is likely to be surfaced again.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:18:05 PDT):

>Yeah - I think we should absolutely challenge this ask on privacy grounds

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:18:19 PDT):

>And that we should do that as a unified front across MSGR/IGD & WA

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:19:02 PDT):

>As I understand it, [REDACTED] reps both Meta and WA for NCMEC...

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:19:14 PDT):

>"I don't think we can compare WA with FB/IG here because of how WA is used and the implications of that for investigations. Whatsapp is on your phone, is not easy to log into or use if you are not the true user. FB and IG, way easier to use on any other device/ by any person...you get the defences where someone is logged into their FB account on a device that someone else then uses, or someone knows someone else's password and logs into the account elsewhere to do bad stuff. When a suspect says- it wasn't me who uploaded that photo, and for example they say they were hacked, or that someone other than them accessed their account to do bad stuff, the [REDACTED] can help prove it one way or the other. Last log on is more sketchy. [REDACTED]"

[REDACTED] . Does that make sense? The bigger picture risk, on that basis, is that in the context of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:19:22 PDT):

>This is also from one of the chats

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:21:34 PDT):

>this is so hard to follow 🤔

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:21:44 PDT):

>haha this was from [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:23:02 PDT):

>> When a suspect says- it wasn't me who uploaded that photo, and for example they say they were hacked, or that someone other than them accessed their account to do bad stuff, [REDACTED]

>

>this I get - although [REDACTED]

>

>> It's way easier to prove that a WA user uploaded a photo when WA can only be accessed on their phone which is in their pocket.

>

>this I don't get

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:24:37 PDT):

>I think what I don't understand is why there is an assumption that [REDACTED]

>

>Is that because there's evidence that most people are storing CSAM on their computer's hard drive at home? Doesn't that seem a bit 1990s?

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:26:28 PDT):

>"oh, just a small infra adjustment. no biggie" ☐

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:27:44 PDT):

- which Eng was this ? (trying to figure out org lines)

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:43:03 PDT):

>On the second point, I think she mean that WA is inherently tied to a phone whereas you can log into IG/FB/MSGR from many different devices, some which may be shared among family members.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:43:41 PDT):

>This was someone on Messenger WLB side who investigated (I think it was [REDACTED] [REDACTED]).

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 06:44:52 PDT):

>I see. True re the phone number thing

>

>Altho the same is absolutely true of WA in the sense that we know plenty of users device-share (and in fact account-share). And one user might be logged into WA on their work computer, home computer, and phone all at the same time....

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 07:05:21 PDT):

>Yes agree. I think this is more a perception thing.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 07:53:09 PDT):

>>> It's squarely a privacy decision, one of the really important aspects of that decision as I understand it is that we'd need to capture [REDACTED]

>This is really interesting since my first guess would have been that we should be able to [REDACTED]. I can check in with [REDACTED] (eng who previously looked at this) to understand why that's the reason.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 07:53:28 PDT):

>>> It's squarely a privacy decision, one of the really important aspects of that decision as I understand it is that we'd need to capture [REDACTED]

>

>This is really interesting since my first guess would have been that we should be able to [REDACTED]. I can check in with [REDACTED] (eng who previously looked at this) to understand why that's the reason.

[REDACTED] (3/20/2024 08:15:25 PDT):

>Ah, I forgot that we need the [REDACTED]. Ignore my previous message :)