

Exhibit G

Age Management Escalation

MEETING OVERVIEW

- **Tl;dr:** *The primary focus of this meeting is to determine whether and how to link accounts for the purpose of enforcing age across the FB Family of Companies. We hope to align our approach on this topic and prepare for a meeting with Mark on 10/14.*
- **Date/Time:** Tuesday, October 8th, 2:00pm- 2:30pm
- **Location:** Wood for the Trees
- **Attendees:**
 - Joel Kaplan, Erin Egan, Rob Sherman, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Karina Newton, Antigone David and Victoria Grand
- **Attachments?** Pre-read, Age Management Strategic Plan and Age Gating Guidelines attached
- **Precursor to a Mark or Sheryl meeting?** Yes. There will be a meeting with Mark on October 14th about this issue.

GOAL

1. Align on level of priority of proactive enforcement
2. Prepare for MZ discussion on cross-app enforcement

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. PROACTIVE ENFORCEMENT -- How important is it that we proactively enforce based on age (i.e., try to detect and challenge people lying about their age)?
 - a. Background:
 - We have recommended that, by 2021, we use machine learning models to proactively enforce if we believe a minor (<13) is falsifying their age. This is one of the main areas of concern we've heard from regulators/policy makers, and it is more likely to drive concern in the near term than questions about how we enforce across FB/IG/WA.
 - While there is consensus that we should pursue proactive enforcement, the Integrity team is concerned about limited resources and is asking for guidance on how the policy team prioritizes this against other priorities.
 - The Product Policy team previously prioritized areas for Integrity work.
 - Age enforcement could fall under "Authentic Age: False DOB" (which is listed as low severity) or "protection of minors" (which

4. Opt-out account link from inferred (transparent in settings)
 - a. Example: same as Option 3, but people can opt out of the link

ii. Recommendation:

- Option 3.
 - General justification: It is difficult to defend the use of inferred account links for advertising purposes without also using these links for age management
 - Product will likely push back on this by pointing out that the consequences of showing the wrong ad to someone is relatively low compared with the consequence of being checkpointed as an underage account.
 - However, taking this position will invite criticism that we are putting profits over people.
 - Transparency and control: If we are using the fact of an account link for enforcement or other purposes, we recommend being transparent about the fact that this link exists. However, we do not support providing an opt-out of the link because (1) the primary non-ads use of this link is for security and accounting purposes, and we don't want to give bad actors the ability to stop these activities; and (2) there is a separate ongoing discussion about the right control model for cross-affiliate ad delivery that will address this question in the ads context.
 - Application to ads: Note that Options 2 and 3 would allow us to use an inferred link to decide what ads to show on IG, WA, and Audience Network.
- Long-term, we recommend moving away from the concept of soft-matching -- a practice that is sensitive from a privacy standpoint and also not well understood -- and using tactics like common logins to encourage people to explicitly connect their accounts across services. But we recognize this isn't a realistic option in the near term -- in part because soft-matching is used for a range of purposes, including integrity/security, accounting (total number of users), and ads.