Exhibit 59

META3047MDL-064-00000057

Metadata

All Custodians	Clegg_Nick;Cox_Chris;DaltonSmith_Emily;Davis_Antigone;Gleit_Naomi;Hendrix_Kristin;Jin_Kang-Xing;Mosseri_Adam;Pietsch_Lena;Raychoudhury_Pratiti;Schultz_Alex	SEMANTIC

Well-Being Central Investment Nov 2021 Update

(A/C PRIV)

Why do we need a central well-being team?

Well-being work is similar to privacy or major social issues like Health and COVID19; it needs to be addressed consistently across our platforms and in an end-to-end manner (encompassing both policy/enforcement and product changes). We're not doing this, which introduces risk:

1. Product/Research Risks: *[KX/Emily, Pratiti]*
   a. Each platform prioritizes different topics and uses different definitions of success without clear rationalization.
   b. We end up with duplicative and contradictory research and product at times (e.g., IG research giving different recommendations for topic prioritization than Social Impact/DSS research).
   c. Lack of centralization akin to privacy or integrity means topics may be under-represented in prioritization at exec levels.
2. Policy Risks: *[Antigone]*
   a. Policymakers and stakeholders consistently press for evidence of senior leadership, a dedicated team and significant investment and offer solutions like criminal liability (e.g., director level criminal liability under consideration in UK Online Harms Bill).
   b. Policymakers and stakeholders see the lack of a consistent, comprehensive approach to problematic use and certain "harmful content" (e.g., SSI + ED content) across FOA as evidence we prioritize engagement/profits; they are offering solutions aimed at algorithmic personalization, which they believe drives "addictive" engagement (e.g., "Justice Against Malicious Algorithms).
   c. Our Youth XFN is not resourced to take an FOA approach, nor to rapidly address existing privacy, safety and well-being gaps simultaneously, meaning we will not meet policymaker expectations until end of 2022. The slower progress could fuel support for the more draconian measures in numerous online safety bills making their way through the legislative process globally.
3. Comms/Marketing Risks: *[[redacted]]*
   a. There is no proactive strategy for how we talk about our work on these topics outside of IG (e.g., when the WSJ leaks happened, Comms piecemealed material). Our last major company announcement was time controls in Aug 2018.
   b. There is a campaign being run against us and well-being is a key element. Well-being is also a core narrative/ATW that marketing research shows is a top 3 priority topic that could hold us back from being trusted to help build the metaverse.
4. Partnerships Risks: [redacted]*]*
   a. We're at risk of losing our public facing partners. Our lack of action has been noticed to the point of creating internal challenges for our partner POCs, and a lack of trust that we are acting on recommendations that they have facilitated for us in roundtables.

A central team would give us consistency on strategy, process and quality because these issues will continue otherwise. We have already seen early success with this model for Health and Equity.