Message

From: Tara [redacted] [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[redacted]]
Sent: 3/30/2020 5:16:33 PM
To: Karina Newton [redacted]@fb.com]; Emma [redacted]@fb.com]; Alexander [redacted]@fb.com]; Lauren [redacted]@fb.com]; Vaishnavi J [redacted]@fb.com]; Lauren [redacted]@fb.com]; Flo [redacted]@fb.com]; Tara [redacted]@fb.com]; Liz [redacted]@fb.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":null,"threadFbId":2818036594949951}]
Attachments: 91388989_504111063617066_7064167066621706240_n.png

Tara Ann [redacted] (3/30/2020 08:48:37 PDT):
>Hi, good morning SF. One of the issues the German CEI escalation highlighted was the wording of the review language. The top line - "We couldn't review your content' has caused concern and questions from the creators who have highlighted this content, and from the police. The bulk of the message reads well but the top line gives a false impression it hasn't been reviewed even if it is CEI. Do you think we can change it or even just remove that top line?

Tara Ann [redacted] (3/30/2020 08:48:56 PDT):

shared: 91388989_504111063617066_7064167066621706240_n.png

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:08:05 PDT):
>Thanks for flagging this - I thought the language was more "We have fewer reviewers than usual" so this is concerning.

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:08:54 PDT):
>I'd support removing that line or modifying it

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:11:00 PDT):
>@Karina Would this be one for Adam Faul / Taylor?

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:11:19 PDT):
>Adding content strategist @Flo Wen and @Liz Arcamona

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:11:46 PDT):
>@Liz Arcamona weird that we sent this back for CEI

Florence [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:16:42 PDT):
>Adding @Lauren [redacted], the CS supporting this flow :)

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:17:30 PDT):
>

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:25:11 PDT):
>@Lauren, is this the close the loop language from benign content/auto close classifier

Florence [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:27:08 PDT):
>no no it's impossible to keep track!!!!

Lauren [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:29:12 PDT):
>hello!! i think the issue here is that we shouldn't be auto-closing CEI - this is the new language for benign/auto close as karina mentioned!

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:29:31 PDT):
>Could that also be a function of how the reporter reported it?

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:30:35 PDT):
>Maybe they reported it as something other than CEI?

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:31:00 PDT):
>it doesn't actually matter what people chose in the reporting flow

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:31:21 PDT):
>We run classifiers to categorize

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:32:12 PDT):
>Ahh I see!

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:32:21 PDT):

>I think there are 2 questions - one, knowing we're going to get it wrong, should we tweak this language. Second, why did we get this wrong

Lauren [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:34:29 PDT):
>the FB team changed their header to "We couldn't prioritize your report" because of NetzDG, and liz and i discussed making the same change last week. not sure if that would solve this, though, because we'd still be saying we didn't think this content was problematic

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:35:42 PDT):
>Did they make the change only for Germany?

Lauren [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:35:58 PDT):
>across all flows

Alexander [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:39:03 PDT):
>If you report potential CEI, this wouldn't solve the problem from my point of view. No one who reports CEI should see a msg that we couldn't prioritize it.

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:40:31 PDT):
>Yes, we need to debug but I do think it softens the blow. I wonder also if we should suggest language to re-report if you think we got it wrong at a precision where we're unsure - Liz/Lauren will start a focused thread

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:40:49 PDT):
>If CEI is determined by classifiers, not the queue it's reported in, then it seems we'd always have this issue. During this time where we're only reviewing the most severe harms, have we considered specific reporting flows for those harms?

Elizabeth [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:41:08 PDT):
>We don't have an in-app reporting option for CEI that I'm aware of

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:41:12 PDT):
>(I'm sure that's harder than it sounds but still wondering ☺)

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 09:41:24 PDT):
>We do not

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:42:50 PDT):
>I can understand that there are usually concerns (legal / reputational) around displaying these reporting options, but we could offer those flows temporarily as a response to covid

Elizabeth [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:43:43 PDT):
>I don't think updating our reporting flow options is minimal product work and I'd be concerned that people would abuse this reporting option to report anything they want reviewed, and we'd need to review it because it's been reported as CEI

Alexander [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:44:23 PDT):
>I also thought of that, but we would need to explain why it disappears again after covid times

Lauren [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:44:27 PDT):
>if it's reported again and we use the same classifiers to determine whether it's CEI or not, would they probably just get another ignore/auto-close?

Elizabeth [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:45:06 PDT):
>I think the best option here is 1) understand why the content was ignored; 2) if re-reported, it should not be ignored again - and we should confirm that is working properly; 3) evaluate whether to soften the auto reject language header (which I think we're doing anyway)

Tara Ann [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:47:21 PDT):
>Softening the header to a simple 'Thank you for your report' - and we keep the language already in the pop up which covers the constraint but we say 'the most potential harm' so the reporter would assume their report was being reviewed? I'm not sure I understand why we would be asking a reporter to report CEI twice?

Tara Ann [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:47:40 PDT):
>maybe I'm not understanding it

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:50:00 PDT):
>If reports are being categorised using classifiers, I'm not sure that re-reporting the content is going to change that. The best option is one where our classifier just doesn't get it wrong, but where it does, re-reporting may not help.

Alexander [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:51:27 PDT):
>and what if re-reporting would lead to manual review? Or would that still lead to a too high workload for the few reviewers still out there?

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:53:07 PDT):
>That'd be great but I think the workload would indeed be too high

Lauren [redacted] (3/30/2020 09:53:20 PDT):
>this could be misleading because people will expect to eventually get an update on their report

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 09:54:24 PDT):
>What do we send back now to reporters when their report accurately flags CEI?

Karina Lynn Newton (3/30/2020 10:01:49 PDT):
>We don't differentiate close the loop language for reporting type. If someone reports it again, it overrules our classifiers under normal circumstances.

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 10:06:32 PDT):
>That's perfect - if the classifiers are still being overruled by re-reporting in this situation, it would go to manual review and presumably we have enough people to review the content?

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 10:16:19 PDT):
>Following up on this - was just playing with the FB app and it looks like we do have the option to report CEI there, so doing it on IG (aside from what I'm sure would be significant product life) would not be unexpected.

Vaishnavi Jayakumar (3/30/2020 10:16:33 PDT):
>*lift not life :/