



Stacia Cardille

July 8, 2020 at 11:30 AM

Re: PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL - DOD next steps

To: Angela Sherrer, Jim Baker

Jim, Angela and I discussed attendance at this classified briefing. I heard from Facebook that they are securing SCIFs in DC and San Francisco for a meeting, possibly on Friday.

I have some significant concerns that the motivations for classifications are slightly different than the ones you outlined in the email below. I think it is possible DOD is using retroactive classification to obfuscate their activity in this space, and that this may represent an overclassification to avoid embarrassment.

Angela and I think you would be more effective in this meeting than me, as the officials will view you more seriously.

Thoughts on this?

(Separate and apart from the merits, I have some concerns with attending due to Covid exposure and my two immune-compromised family members.)

On Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 9:48 PM Jim Baker [twitter.com](#) wrote:

Hi folks.

There is a lot going on here, but bottom line up front I agree with Yoel and I am also in favor of hearing what DoD has to say in greater detail if that can be arranged. I think having a deeper understanding of what is going on will help us make a better decision, especially if DoD is going to ask us to leave the accounts up for some limited period of time (as discussed below).

I don't think that everyone on our team who needs to hear what DoD has to say actually has to have a clearance to do so. DoD can decide to make disclosures to identified people at Twitter without requiring each one of them to have a clearance or DoD could ask our folks to sign an NDA. I think we should decide first who on our team needs to be involved in the process and then see what DoD might be willing to do. Of course, they can refuse to disclose further information to anyone who does not have a clearance. We can then decide what to do independently. For what it's worth, I currently have an active TS/SCI clearance through the FBI, but Patrick and Stacia could also represent us and report back in an unclassified way.

My (unclassified) guess about what is going on here is that either: (a) these accounts are relevant to some ongoing DoD operation that they want to wind down in a secure and orderly way; (b) shutting them down simultaneously (or nearly so) may reveal that they are linked to each other or to DoD or the USG; or (c) similarly they used poor tradecraft in setting them up and operating them such that shutting them down all at once may compromise other operations that rely on the same poorly crafted backstopping infrastructure. In such circumstances, DoD might want to give us a timetable for shutting them down in a more prolonged way that will not compromise any ongoing operations or reveal their connections to DoD. But of course all that is just a guess.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks.

Jim

On Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 4:57 PM Yoel Roth [twitter.com](#) wrote:

*Privileged & Confidential*

Hi team,

As I've mentioned to several of you today, Facebook have had a series of 1:1 conversations between their senior legal leadership and the DOD's GC re: the inauthentic activity on our platforms. Per FB, DOD have indicated a strong desire to work with us to remove the activity - but are now refusing to discuss additional details or steps outside of a classified conversation.

Neither Nathaniel nor I have clearances, so the FB team is working to identify the right group of people to potentially participate in a classified conversation with DOD. DOD have not specified what level clearance they're looking for, nor precisely how the conversation would take place. (FB are assuming people in the Bay Area / DC would go to SCIFs in their respective locations.)

On the FB side, current plans are to send:

- Chris Sonderby, VP FB Legal
- David Agranovich, lead on Nathaniel's team (former DOD)
- Steve Siegel, AGC FB Legal

Based on the information we have now, my recommendation would be for Twitter to participate in this discussion in some form. Keen to get Jim, Angela, and Stacia's perspectives here as well - especially if you can think of any reasons *not* to engage.

From discussions thus far, my understanding is that the folks with active clearances on our side are Stacia, Patrick, and Matt. I think Stacia and Patrick could effectively represent the different issues and next steps here in a discussion, but, Jim/Sean, would like your perspective there as well.

I'd like to get back to the FB team by EOD today (Monday) with the contacts to include on our end - or an indication that we're not interested in participating. **Sean**, you're the overall approver here - will wait for your response before taking any action.

Thanks,

Yoel