

Message

---

**From:** Adam Mosseri [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXTERNAL (FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 6/16/2018 3:14:12 AM  
**To:** Guy Rosen [REDACTED]@fb.com]  
**CC:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED]@fb.com]  
**Subject:** Re: Question about the value of message data

Let me talk to the guys and circle back.

Sent from my phone

---

**From:** Guy Rosen  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 14, 2018 9:57:33 AM  
**To:** Adam Mosseri  
**Cc:** Alex Schultz  
**Subject:** Re: Question about the value of message data

We can do reasonably well in an hour. Can I go ahead and schedule?

On Jun 13, 2018, at 6:50 PM, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]@fb.com> wrote:

Seems compelling, how much time do you think it would take to so a shadow session? I'm still also interested in quantifying the value, even if that just ends up being a list of issues we can't address unless we scan, but totally get that this might be compelling.

---

**From:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED]@fb.com>  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 13, 2018 at 10:11 AM  
**To:** Guy Rosen [REDACTED]@fb.com>, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]@fb.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Question about the value of message data

That is a better idea

---

**From:** Guy Rosen  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:10 AM  
**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]@fb.com>  
**Cc:** Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Question about the value of message data

How about we organize a shadowing session for you & them to see the kind of stuff CO / investigators find? It helps to paint a picture.

For grooming - or rather, the broader bucket we're calling IIC (inappropriate interactions with children) splits roughly into these tiers (going from least worst to worst worst):

- Tier 3: non-policy violating creepy behavior  
e.g. adult contacting 100s of minors on messenger with "hey sexy"
- Tier 2: online sexual harassment



e.g., sending photos of (adult) genitalia to a minor

- Tier 1: soliciting or real-world harm

- c. soliciting CEI

- b. contact offense (suggesting an in-person meeting)

- a. content sextortion (using obtained CEI to force further acts) <-- this is the worst of the worst stuff that gives you nightmares, over which children have taken their own lives :(

Of the above, we can't do much of anything on Tier 1 & 2 without proactive scanning. Also, because kids are either embarrassed and/or think they're in a real relationship, this tends to go unreported.

There are also other things which we should discuss but I am okay to tackle the child stuff first, e.g. financial scams which aren't necessarily targeted at minors, but can also include financial sextortion (getting intimate images and then asking for money). These are typically run as little business out of (usually) West Africa, and often intersect with impersonation (fake attractive female, military and public figures, celebrities - even posing as Mark or Wehner to scam people on a "Facebook lottery", etc. -- the latter we can probably tackle from the impersonation work though).

The meta way I think about it is that both FB & IG are discovery services, not just communication services: you can do discovery e.g. search for girls a certain age in a certain place, etc. and then engage them. (At least on WA you can't do the discovery bit.) I think we have to be extra protective of what's happening on discovery services because otherwise they are basically massive "victim discovery services".

On Jun 13, 2018, at 9:26 AM, Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]@fb.com> wrote:

Kevin and Mikey are uncomfortable scanning Direct message data, which I didn't realize until last week, though they're supportive of using meta data. I'd like to make the value of scanning messages directly clear — do you guys have any idea how we might quantify the value for problems like grooming more specifically? There is the added complexity of being inconsistent across surfaces, but I thought I'd start by trying to clearly articulate the up-side.

Thanks,  
Adam

Sent from mobile