



Senate Economics References Committee’s Inquiry into the Influence of International Digital Platforms

Meta, Public Hearing on 22 August 2023

Questions on Notice

Question 1 – Question from the Chair: The CEO of Barclays in the UK, Matt Hammerstein, has said that scams originating from Meta platforms account for 80 per cent of the fraud within the three biggest fraud categories: purchase, investment and impersonation scams. Do you have a view about these statements?

Answer: We are not aware of this statement nor whether it is accurate. Scams are a challenging issue that impact many different digital platforms and frequently intersect with other sectors, including the banking and telecommunications sectors. In an effort to prevent fraudulent activity on the platform that can harm people or businesses, our policies prohibit content and action that are intended to defraud users or third parties. This includes investment and financial scams. We invest in proactive detection technology and our community operations team to identify and act on this type of content and behaviour. We have also [brought](#) litigations against people who we believe perpetrate this activity. Cross-industry collaboration is critical to disrupting this abuse and to Meta’s broader efforts to combat online impersonation. We partner with a wide range of organisations including the Australian Small Business and Family Enterprise Ombudsman, IDCARE and the Puppy Scam Awareness Australia as part of our work to combat scams and educate the Australian public more broadly to look out for scams. It is challenging to comment on the specifics of another industry stakeholder’s statement without seeing the underlying data.

Question 2 – Senator Shoebridge: When will the White House Commitments on AI with respect to provenance and watermarking be rolled out in Australia?

Answer: We don’t have any more to share about timing at this stage.

Question 3 – Senator Shoebridge: what, if anything, Meta has done in response to the allegations made by whistleblower Frances Haugen and the thousands of documents that she produced that appeared to pretty clearly identify Facebook prioritising profits over safety. What, if any, changes have happened since 2021 and the release of that material?

Answer: We don't agree with the characterization of many of the claims made by Ms Haugen. Certainly, we reject any suggestions that we put profit before safety. We have absolutely no commercial incentive, no moral incentive, no company-wide incentive to do anything other than to try to give the maximum number of people as much of a positive experience as possible across our apps. People will not continue to use our services if they do not have a positive experience on them, so investments in security impact our bottom line. To say we turn a blind eye to feedback ignores these investments, which includes \$13 billion since 2016, as well as tens of thousands of people working on safety and security at Meta. We continue to work constructively with safety partners, the broader industry and governments on these important matters.

Question 4 - Why can't you report content as racism?

Answer: In our [Community Standards](#) and our user reporting flows, we use the term “hate speech” to refer to content that is a direct attack against people – rather than concepts or institutions – on the basis of a number of protected characteristics, not only race; this includes ethnicity, national origin, disability, religious affiliation, caste, sexual orientation, sex, gender identity and serious disease.