

Exhibit G

Message

From: Nick Clegg [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN= [REDACTED]]
Sent: 3/5/2019 6:40:20 AM
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@fb.com]
Subject: FW: Instagram SSI Postmortem

FYI

From: Nick Clegg [REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Monday, March 4, 2019 at 10:40 PM
To: Molly Cutler <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Instagram SSI Postmortem

Thx Molly – a thankless task, but am grateful to you for doing this.

It's all accurate – except that four days after the BBC story broke I said publicly (carried in all UK headlines on the day) that we would review all our policies, and that we would do “whatever it takes” to address the legitimate concerns raised. Javi, Guy and I were in touch by email – and I had alerted Sheryl, Mark and even the Board to the gravity of the issue.

Yet, despite Guy's team's great cooperation, it was not till the large meeting in Sheryl's office – I can't remember the date – with myself, Chris C, Schrep, Dave Wehner and others that there was any recognition that the policy was too heavily skewed towards the needs of those committing SSI rather than those susceptible to copying it.

This lack of connection between what we commit to publicly and what we do internally really worried, and slightly shocked, me.

I don't know how/whether you want to reflect any of this – but it is important context.

N

From: Molly Cutler [REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Monday, March 4, 2019 at 10:19 PM
To: Nick Clegg [REDACTED]@fb.com>, Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Instagram SSI Postmortem

I've badly dragged my feet on getting this [Instagram SSI postmortem](#) to Sheryl, in part because I know that some of the key stakeholders in product policy would disagree with this characterizations. I would like to send the overview and root causes sections of this to Sheryl in an email, copying you all and noting that we have internalized lessons learned here, and move on. Please let me know if you'd like to change or discuss any of this or if there are any specific follow ups that you think we should document.

Overview

On January 22, the BBC reported that exposure to graphic images of cutting and self-injury on Instagram contributed to the suicide of 14-year-old [REDACTED]. Our policy permitted these images unless they clearly promoted or celebrated suicide or self-injury. Graphic images shared with no caption or context did not violate our policy. These non-violating images were discoverable in Instagram Explore and did not count in the >30% threshold used to implement the “hashtag

playbook” on Instagram, which reduces the discoverability of hashtags with a high proportion of violating content.

We faced several weeks of intense press and policymaker criticism, largely confined to the UK, focused primarily on the availability of this content on Instagram, and secondarily on the discoverability of this content on Instagram. Throughout this period, our product policy team appeared confident that our policy permitting graphic cutting content was likely to remain largely in place, as informed by consistent engagement with experts on these issues, and we worked to pursue a long-term product strategy of reducing the discoverability of non-violating graphic cutting content, an incomplete but meaningful response to the criticism. Starting on January 26, in response to escalating criticism, we said that we would “undertake a full review of our enforcement policies and technologies” around self-harm.

On February 4, we met with experts and decided to change our policy. Going forward, we will remove graphic cutting images even in the context of admitting one's mental health struggles, because we now recognize that the potential for modeling how to self-harm, normalizing self-harm, and/or triggering self-harm in others outweighs the value of sharing the content. In addition, we will make product changes to reduce the discoverability of non-graphic self-harm content—such as healed scars—by preventing it from appearing in search, hashtags, the explore tab, or recommendations. These announced changes have landed well and we got credit—but do not undo the damage we have incurred as a result of this protracted cycle.

Root Causes

1. We had the wrong policy on graphic cutting images, and were too slow to reconsider/schedule engagement with experts about our policy in response to escalating criticism.
 - a. There appears have been ineffective escalation/resolution of the issue at the Director/VP level of the policy team, particularly during the first week of the crisis.
 - b. The safety policy team was slower than they could have been to schedule meeting with experts even after VP request to reconsider policy, and failed to communicate/anticipate eventual policy changes. The outcome of February 4 policy meeting was a surprise to most XFN stakeholders, who had been conditioned to expect outcome at expert level would be to hold the line on policy.
2. Communication channels and XFN coordination were ineffective between UK/MPK time zones and IG/FB teams across Comms, Policy, Product, and Ops. Most teams did not become aware until the story was already locked.
3. We strategically de-prioritized SSI product work on IG. This was due in part to the previous narrow policy resulting in low impact of work—relatively small proportion of content eligible for removal under previous policy.

Timeline

Jan 8 - BBC first reaches out to IG UK Comms, asks for interview to discuss SSI; IG UK Comms loops in IG and FB EMEA Policy; statement and background briefing offered; background briefing declined

Jan 8 - Issue escalated within Comms, FB Policy looped in

Jan 16 - UK Comms provides our statement back to BBC (see below for statement)

Jan 21 - MPK Comms looped in

Jan 22 - BBC story runs

Jan 23 - Strategic Response team looped in; first XFN meeting conducted; based on feedback from safety policy, IG policy and product, team aligns on strategic approach to explain our existing policy line more emphatically

Jan 24 - 2nd XFN; strategic approach continues to be explain our stance better; coverage slowing down

Jan 25 - coverage further slowing down; fact gathering on accounts related to ██████████ completed

Jan 26 - news about Sunday Times story prep; Nick BBC interview on Monday; Nick re-escalates issue; 3rd XFN; strategic approach moves from “explain our stance better” to “we need to change and communicate it quickly”; changes on product and enforcement agreed on, no major changes contemplated on policy but discussion about scheduling meeting with experts to validate our existing policies and proposed product/enforcement changes

Jan 27 - our 2nd statement issued; Sunday Times story; coverage picking up further; begin executing product and enforcement changes, no major changes contemplated on policy