

For Public Release

Lessons Learned Spamouflage

What was done right:

- RRM Canada's response is setting a good precedent by releasing this public statement.
- The demarche put in place by RRM Canada has ensured that the Chinese speaking dissident felt secure after months of uncertainty and fear. In his own words, "the fact that we followed up on his case, called out the PRC and publicly reported it may have saved his life".
- Overall smoother process in comparison to the Chong report. Slowly improving and getting more efficient.
- Outreach to social media platforms was a success. We were able to establish a working relationship with them. They were very receptive and open to working and partnering with us in the future. Overall positive experience.
- We built a toolbox/package that can be reused for future reports
- Less complications when it came to the distribution lists (was addressed and put together in advance)
- Discussion with the Chinese speaking dissident was flagged back to PCO (generating attention to RRM Canada and our work).

Room for improvement:

- On the digital side, there was minimal engagement following the release of our statement within Canadian and Chinese social media spaces. We will have to find ways to generate traffic and interest on social media following release of future statements.
- Overall frustration regarding *DMSIR* and the fact that it is lagging on the response part. None of the agenda items called for action. Overall passiveness of the DM committee.
- We will have to ensure that our future RRM reports get a high-level view/approval earlier in the process as getting final approvals was chaotic.
- We should stay within the communications channel and intervene less when it comes to LCF's work/role. We should learn to micromanage less and rely on the existing system/mechanism a bit more. This would help save time and energy on the version control.
- We should be more assertive when it comes to seeking feedback/guidelines from other teams as it complicates and delays the whole process. We should limit feedback to red line reviews and broad suggestions.
- Consensus that RCMP needs to step up its game when it comes to TNR. Overall shock that there was no interest [redacted] to join our call with the dissident.
- Impression that the statement and sanitized report were too similar. We will produce a single statement in the future instead of two separate documents.
- We will have to put in place a public attribution framework to justify our set of actions and put into words, why we decide to take action or not on a specific incident.

For Public Release

- Maybe not the best idea to have provided the G7 email address to MPs. (Inbox might get overwhelmed)
- Potential privacy concerns once the whole media frenzy calms down (What have we shared with social media platforms, any data?). There is a need to elaborate a public facing document detailing how we engage with social media. Potential privacy impact assessment?
- It might be useful to consider a COMMS product in multiple languages on how to act when confronted with suspected instances of FI or TNR. Purpose is to raise public awareness and education on these matters.