

FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT 85

Message

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@fb.com]
Sent: 8/18/2020 3:35:43 PM
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@fb.com]; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@fb.com]; Vaishnavi J [REDACTED]@fb.com]; [REDACTED]@fb.com]; [REDACTED]@fb.com]; [REDACTED]@fb.com]; [REDACTED]@fb.com]; [REDACTED]@fb.com]
Subject: RE: Device blocking on IG
Attachments: image001.png

+ @ [REDACTED], @ [REDACTED] and @ [REDACTED] per discussions around last week's CIPCO Incident Review.

Hi [REDACTED] and all,

Circling back here about suggestions on Policy and Treatment regarding device blocks. In Escalations, we get feedback from Public Policy and Comms partners that we are not doing enough to curb recidivism so my thoughts reflect that consideration.

Policy suggestion: I'd suggest to reorganize the policy per 29 IS violation types and "temp block" – "perm block" or "no block". This would make the policy implementation easier.

I compared the existing disable codes' device block treatment per the policy wiki you shared. Below IS violation types are not covered in device blocking if I understood the codes and their corresponding IS policy right. I shared my thoughts next to each missing violation type:

- 11. Privacy Violations and Image Privacy - shall we consider device block?
- 16. Cruel and Insensitive – shall we consider device block?
- 21. Inauthentic Behavior – shall we consider device block?
- 22. False News – shall we consider device block?
- 23. Manipulated Media – not necessarily needs device block imo
- 24. Memorialization – not necessarily needs device block imo
- 28. Locally Illegal Content – not necessarily needs device block imo
- 29. Inmate Takedown Requests – shall we consider device block?

Please see the "Policy Discussions" tab of this Sheet to check the full table. Right now we need to manually specify the device block and whether it is perm or temp so I do not think the policy should be based on disable codes anymore.

Device Block Treatment

Right now, our team takes the device block action by explicitly ticking the device block box in Bouncer or IG Admin Tool as automatic block does not work through disable codes. We discussed the treatment with Anna and Aditya, and confirmed that there is no difference in treatment between "Recent Devices" and "Legacy Devices" when we take action by ticking the box. Right now, the system blocks all linked devices, the e-mail and the phone number. I believe this is a correct and balanced treatment. My thoughts from the escalations perspective in terms of treatment are:

1. Device block on IG should not automatically disable all accounts in the device to avoid over enforcement with the current policy but it would be handy to have the technical capability like the IIC code in FB for exceptional cases. It would be great to define the policy or process for exceptional cases where we should disable all accounts on the device.
2. The current treatment of reducing the visibility of live accounts in a blocked device is fine from our side. We would not consider it overenforcement as it is very difficult to tell if these accounts are really innocent or intentionally help bad actors' recidivism. Automatically disabling all of them may be disproportionate for the same reason.
3. I am really not sure whether we should block logins to existing accounts on a blocked device. The trade-offs I have in mind:

- a. Bad actors may utilize the other accounts to continue recidivism so it is good to block them from logging in.
- b. We may be overenforcing against innocent accounts that have nothing to do with any violating content.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I'd be happy to be part of the discussion from the Escalations perspective as device block is an important mechanism we use. I look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Best,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Global Escalations | Risk & Response

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2020 3:28 PM

To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] [Vaishnavi J](#); [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Device blocking on IG

Hi [REDACTED]

Sorry for not reverting earlier. Thanks for sharing the Wiki! I see that there is a distinction between how the "Recent Device" and the "Legacy Device" is treated. I was not aware of such a dichotomy and thought the device block action has been blocking all linked devices. @ [REDACTED] could you confirm the current treatment in the backend please?

The wiki includes all IS violations as far as I can see per the IG disable codes. However, my testing shows that no disable code automatically blocks the devices unless we manually select the device block treatment (perm or temp) when taking the action in the IG Admin Tool or Bouncer. Since we need to select the type of the block on tooling, I think it will be more helpful to have this per IS violation types. I will turn this table into IS violation types and will advise if there is any IS type should be revisited.

The CIPCO Investigation on the Iranian Celebrity Recidivism revitalized discussions around device blocking policy and enforcement. I have been in touch with the investigator Henry and conveyed esc's perspective this week. I will send an invite to you and Ion to discuss the identified problem areas from the investigation. As a spoiler, I don't think the "over-enforcement" of reducing the visibility against the live accounts on that particular case is a major issue. I think the utility of device blocking probably outweighs the risk from the "punishments" being applied to other accounts as the punishment is temporary and not existential. But happy to discuss further.

I will share the invite soon and have the IS violation types by then.

Best,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Global Escalations | Risk & Response

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:36 PM

To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] [Vaishnavi J](#); [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Device blocking on IG

Also – confirming that the chart to be used is in this wiki:

https://www.internalfb.com/intern/wiki/Instagram_Admin_Action_Service/device_block/

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 at 7:35 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Vaishnavi J <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: Device blocking on IG

I'm fine with creating a section of the wiki that uses violation types rather than disable codes if you'd like to codify that? I can review once it's complete. Alternatively, please feel free to send over the list of disable codes that aren't currently included and we can add them. When teams create new disable codes, if we're not notified specifically re device blocking, we won't know to add them to the logic.

From: [REDACTED] <tolgab@fb.com>

Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 at 3:25 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Vaishnavi J <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: RE: Device blocking on IG

Hi everyone,

Circling back here as I completed the [IG Escalations Playbook](#) thanks to @ [REDACTED]'s assistance. It is originally addressed to R&R investigative teams but sharing here if helpful. Please take a look and let me know if you have any questions or feedback

@ [REDACTED] I referenced the IG device block policy [per this wiki](#) and it is the same as the slide I shared earlier. Could you let me know if there is another source I may be missing? If this is the policy, it would be great to revamp it. It covers violations per IG Disable codes. It also misses certain violation types like violence and incitement, fraud etc. Currently, we need to escalate to IG Content Policy for violations not covered under the policy and you know the challenge due to timezone limitations. I am happy to sync over VC too.

All the best,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Global Escalations | Risk & Response

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, May 22, 2020 9:59 AM

To: [REDACTED] Vaishnavi J; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Device blocking on IG

Hello all,

Taking advantage of my oncall shift during the company holiday :) Hope you all are having a chill long weekend!

The limit on # of accounts is only relevant for FB device block codes. If there are more than 5+ FB accounts on a device the device block would fail on FB. My understanding is if you are using a IG device block code, there is no limit. The only implication may be that the device block on FB accounts could fail. @lon to keep me honest here.

The only device block code that would automatically disable the accounts at the moment is a FB device block code: "IIC_Blocked". This code disables other active Facebook accounts in a device and prevents logins. It does not however automatically disable IG accounts on the same device. None of the other device block codes do not automatically disable the other accounts in the device. Below are the existing device block codes (not account disable codes) for context:

Facebook:

1. ECRIME_BLOCKED
2. TERRORISM_BLOCKED
3. ONLINE_SAFETY_CHILD_SAFETY_BLOCKED
4. ONLINE_SAFETY_CT_BLOCKED
5. MEDIA_OPS_BLOCKED
6. IIC_BLOCKED
7. BULLYING_HARASSMENT

Instagram:

1. INSTAGRAM_PERM_BLOCKED
2. INSTAGRAM_TEMP_BLOCKED

@ [REDACTED] thanks for highlighting the changes on the device block policy. Is there a tribe or a channel where we can follow when a change is made? We'd update our training materials within R&R accordingly.

All the best,

[REDACTED]
Global Escalations | Risk & Response

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2020 11:34 PM
To: Vaishnavi J; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Device blocking on IG

Currently IG blocking **does not block logins** on other active IG accounts on a blocked device, but it **does prevent new account creation** on that device. Device blocking also reduces the reach of active IG accounts on a blocked device.

Not sure I have bandwidth to join XFN convos but would love to be kept in loop as things progress!

T

From: Vaishnavi J <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2020 at 3:11 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Device blocking on IG

Got it - this is very helpful. At the moment, does IG's blocking logic not block both new account creation and logins from that account?

On the first question of how many devices we can block, I take it from the wiki that there's no limit, unlike on the FB side?

- Consumption side: We will fan out to all users that have ever used any of the blocked device in the past two years, and reduce their visibility. During the visibility period, all their media will have reduced visibility in tag feed and location feed, meaning that the media is only visible to their followers and themselves. We are currently only RV'ing for devices, and will be QE'ing RV for cookies.

I'm conscious of adding more things to this very busy group's plate, but if someone would like to be looped into the broader conversation with the xfn team, please let me know.

cheers, and happy long weekend!

Vaishnavi

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2020 11:48 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Vaishnavi J <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Device blocking on IG

Sent too soon. Also, re aligning with FB – it's a little more complex than that. FB's logic works differently – it blocks new account creations AND logins from that account. We are re-evaluating IG's logic now to determine which should disable codes should be new account creation blocks ONLY and which should include login blocks.

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2020 at 8:47 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Vaishnavi J <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Device blocking on IG

Flagging that the bullet below are potentially somewhat outdated at this point. I recommend relying on the linked wiki as source of truth (for example, self harm promotion disables should be triggering a temp 2 week device block).

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2020 at 8:40 AM
To: Vaishnavi J <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Device blocking on IG

Hi!

Glad to hear the team is thinking more re: device blocking. Adding in [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who have been working closely on this as well. This [Wiki outlines](#) all the violation types that we device block for – but main buckets are:

- Perm block (actually just one year): Terrorism, CEI, CEI solicitation, revenge porn, content-based extortion, and sextortion

- Temporary block (two weeks): Nudity, bullying, nazi, drug, gang, hate speech, cartel, graphic violence, and impersonation
- Do not block: Self-harm promotion, eating disorder promotion, copyright, trademark, counterfeit, spam, U13, sex offender, etc

We are discussing moving to align with FB and only doing “permanent” blocks. As far as I know, we don’t have a limit of # of devices we can block, but blocks fail when there are more than FB active accounts in the past 90 days on the device.

We are also running into issues re: team’s understanding of device blocking, because while the Wiki [here](#) and linked above states that certain codes auto-block devices, but in Bouncer and IG admin you need to select this, and more concerning, SRT disables don’t seem to apply this nor do Centra disables. I’ve filed a high pri task with the Centra team and plan to do the same with SRT COE team.

██████████ LMK what I missed!

From: Vaishnavi J <██████████@fb.com>
Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 at 8:49 PM
To: ██████████ <██████████@fb.com>
Subject: Device blocking on IG

Hi ██████████

Following this [child safety network disruption](#) across LatAm that spanned FB Groups as well as Instagram, I wanted to get your thoughts around how device blocking works on Instagram. The xfn team discussing this seems to be thinking about the issue of recidivism and how to minimise the risk of the same users creating new accounts / groups for this purpose. One potential option might be device blocking.

My understanding is that Instagram uses device blocking more extensively than Facebook does and across different policies. Could you share more on whether

- we have a limit on the number of devices we can block when a policy violation occurs
 - (I believe on the FB side, the current max # of accounts on a device we can disable is 5)
- which violations allow us to device block?

If the xfn team is going to be thinking about recidivism and device blocking, it’d be great to see how that aligns / diverges from what IG does, and whether we need to update policies on our end.

cheers,
Vaishnavi