

Message

From: Pratiti Raychoudhury [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXTERNAL (FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]
Sent: 11/29/2021 3:46:20 PM
To: Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]@fb.com]
Subject: Re: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

Plaintiff's Exhibit Markers	
PLAINTIFF	United States District Court Northern District of California
	Case No. MDL No. 3047 (N.D. Cal.)
	Case Title In re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction
	Exhibit No. 0076
	Date Entered
	By: Mark Busby, Clerk Deputy Clerk

Also apologies regarding the timing. Believe it or not that was the first thing I asked the team to confirm. And that's what they came back with. I am digging into what broke down here. We'll also start sending you short daily updates.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 29, 2021, at 7:15 AM, Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com> wrote:

Holy S***. That was a complete miss to not cc the app leads. I need to double check next time before I hit send. Really sorry about that.

From: Adam Mosseri <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 6:32 AM
To: Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Fwd: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

Why am I not on this email?

From: Adam Mosseri <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 6:31:16 AM
To: Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Fwd: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

Announcing this after my testify is worse than before, and we talked this. It will leak, and it will make it look like I was hiding something. It also will make claims I make about research in testimony less credible.

From: Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 06:22
To: appleads
Cc: Pratiti Raychoudhury; Jennifer Newstead
Subject: FW: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

A/C Priv

Hi all, just making sure you are all seeing where this is netting out and the language / proposal that's been sent back to Mark.

From: Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Friday, November 19, 2021 at 2:56 PM

To: Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Scott Tucker <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Molly Cutler <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Brady Lauback <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Chris Sonderby <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Naomi Gleit <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Andrea Besmehn <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Brady Lauback <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Lori Goler <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Cc: A [REDACTED] W [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, James Turner <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: RE: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

A/C Priv

Hi Mark,

We are circling back on where we landed with our recommendation on centralizing Research and DS on key societal issues following conversations with Chris and the App leads - to ensure we are aligned on the plan to move forward.

TL:DR:

- We are recommending centralizing only User Research for societal topics and not DS/DE.
- We plan to announce on 12/14, but it will go into effect in Q1 of 2022.

More details below -

Background:

We've spent time fleshing out the core problem statement, evaluated options, and assessed the potential cost / benefit of centralizing UXR teams only, or UXR + DS / DE. We also evaluated centralization of all functions working on societal issues.

Problem We are Solving For:

Inconsistent, fragmented, variable quality research on highly visible and important societal issues.

Recommendation:

1. Centralize UX Research teams only
The incremental benefit of centralizing DS / DE orgs is minimal relative to the scale of disruption, and therefore the recommendation is to proceed with UXR only org changes.
Existing gaps for DS / DE can be primarily addressed by process, training, and tooling.
For UXR, process, training & tooling may not be enough to solve the problem.
1. Invest in Tooling / Training / Process (L&D & Eng support required) for UXR, DS & DE teams to create more consistency & controls

Teams & Organizations Impacted:

1. All FOA and RAI UXR teams working on the following topics: Civics/Politics, Well-being (including Youth well-being), Climate, Equity
In the coming days, we'll work with research leaders on affected teams to identify risks to teams / orgs / individuals and to put mitigation strategies in place.

Next Steps:

1. We will need to work with L&D and enterprise engineer resources to build tooling and training improvements.
2. Given Adam's testimony on 12/8, our recommendation (aligned with Comms and Public Policy stakeholders) is to announce these org changes on 12/14/21. In the event that this leaks, we will be prepared with reactive internal & external comms for Adam ahead of his testimony.
3. Org changes would go into effect in Q1 2022 (exact date being finalized with HR, PSC, and Mission Control teams).

Please let us know if you have any questions, concerns, or feedback.

Thanks,

Pratiti

From: Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 19, 2021 4:01 PM

To: Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Scott Tucker <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Molly Cutler <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Brady Lauback <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Sonderby <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Naomi Gleit <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Andrea Besmehn <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Brady Lauback <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

Mark,

This group spent time trying to frame up the current situation, including at other companies, and options we could pursue. This is a preliminary/directional exercise but we think it can help to paint a picture of the spectrum of options.

While the two are related, we think it's useful to separately describe the options for (A) internal research and (B) external research. Options on each one of these are below.

Jennifer:

PRIV

A. Internal Research

What FB teams are we talking about?

1. UX Research: decentralized, overall functional leadership by Pratiti
2. Data Science: decentralized, overall functional leadership by Brady
3. Core Data Science: centralized in CP, under Danny
4. Marketing Insights: centralized in CP, under Rick Malins/Pratiti
5. Demography & Survey Science: centralized in CP, under Curtiss/Pratiti
6. Integrity Investigations (fka "threat intel"): centralized in CP, under Chad/Guy
7. There are also other teams outside of the core research function that have researchers or non-researchers (e.g., PMM, Marketing Science), as well as teams that commission or sponsor research activities like Policy.

Today, any one of these teams currently can and do engage in sensitive topic research independently. This variation fragments consistency in decision making, research oversight, and quality.

The majority of leaked / sensationalized research that has caused issues for us has come from 1+2+3. Much of the dynamic is driven by the way individuals are empowered to independently explore areas and are goaled on their ability to motivate product teams to actually do work. This can cause an incentive to rile up findings, to optimize for speed over quality and to socialize findings extensively – particularly on Workplace.

What happens at other companies?

We believe that all peer companies do research on societal impact, at various quality, but the clear differentiator appears to be the control they exert on the output and the internal collaboration tools:

	Do they conduct research?	Is rigor tightly controlled?	Is research shared internally?	Do they have leaks of research?
Apple	y	very	very tight	no
Google/YouTube	y	poor control	tight	few
Twitter	y	don't know	don't know	no
Microsoft	y	poor control	tight	few
Facebook	y	fair amount of control	broadly, on Workplace	high

Possible spectrum of our options:

1. **Option 1: Status quo + improved access control, internal guidelines and leak investigations**

Since April 2021 we've had work underway coordinated by the integrity team in partnership with research, analytics, comms and legal to reduce leaks, focusing on three lines of work:

- a. **Internal access control:** as a pilot on integrity, we plan to close down groups and are building Workplace mechanisms to enable information sharing *inside integrity* while closing down access from the rest of the company by default. This will reduce the surface area for leaks on this topic across the company (there are >100k people on Workplace, less than 10k should have any access whatsoever to any integrity-related content). It will not mitigate targeted leaks from the people who actually work on the teams. We plan to begin rolling this out in October. We can later learn from this to apply to other areas.
- b. **Narrative excellence:** we've been compiling new guidelines for analysts/researchers on how to write and share internal material. This includes: being aware of sensitivity; scoping down distribution; speaking to the specific data at hand; delineating fact from commentary; defining concepts better; interrogating own point of view; using straightforward prose and not sensational language; clearly marking preliminary results. These guidelines will be factored into the PSC process. Narrative excellence is launching at the end of Sept.
- c. **Leak investigations:** we created a new team created under employment law to investigate leaks. Filled 2 of 4 open roles and are starting to see results (e.g., Project Veritas, WSJ).
- d.

Option 2: Additionally, build centrally managed controls and process to enforce guidelines and access control

Under this option, in addition to the above we'd invest in dramatically improving the process and tools for reviewing and approving research, enforcing hygiene of writing and access control (similar to Privacy XFN). All sensitive topic research would have to go through this and be subject to approval, oversight and review.

- a. Pros: improves ability to enforce quality across teams while mitigating need for disruptive changes (vs. next options).
- b. Cons: heavyweight process will slow us down, may be high complexity for a federated org, will require strong accountability from app leads, might not provide sufficient oversight, may create conflicts between local org needs and central XFN approval.

Option 3: Centralize research / sensitive research / sensitive product to improve oversight

There are a number of variants here where we could reorg to manage centrally work that looks at human behaviors / attitudes / needs or is related to key sensitive topics, assesses the impact of our products or measures progress against company / team missions. Centralized approaches would help enforce quality and access control discipline, ensure coordination, increase consistency, and present unified messaging/narratives. It would also de-risk steps throughout definitional, data collection, analysis and communication stages of projects.

Variants:

- a. **Option 3a: Centralize research/DS teams on sensitive topics.** Other research/DS teams will be prohibited from engaging in these areas. We'd consider centralizing all research + DS teams working on integrity/wellbeing/fairness/equity/etc areas that are currently embedded into FB App, IG, Msgr, WA, ABP, AI, etc. (Note, Privacy research is already

centralized into the Central Privacy team. It is highly controlled and it is encouraging that we have not had leaks from there.)

- i. Pros: helps enforce hygiene through direct management of these functions
 - ii. Cons: breaks some XFN alignment with other functions; complicates Product XFN HC accounting and reduces flexibility; app teams will feel loss of control over research; difficulty of defining what is “sensitive”.
- a. **Option 3b: Centralize ALL research/DS teams (on all topics).**
- i. Pros: more consistent org design because all research/DS would roll up together, would avoid singling out sensitive topics which may evolve on a continuum vs. being a clear binary choice.
 - ii. Cons: a much larger company-wide move that would impact all research and DS.
- a. **Option 3c: Centralize ALL research/DS teams AND all product/eng teams on sensitive topics.** This would centralize the federated teams working on integrity, wellbeing, equity etc that are embedded into different apps.
- i. Pros: keeps XFN alignment to ensure cohesive teams, helps enforce hygiene across the full XFN not just research/DS.
 - ii. Cons: much larger org changes, moves teams away from their product groups, limits the ability of these teams to execute effectively within their product surfaces (e.g., FB App Integrity engineers are embedded into FB App), and in some areas centralizing may severely limit ability to build products (e.g., would we reorg IG Youth from IG into a central team?).

Option 4: No internal research teams at all for sensitive topics, externalize what’s needed to vendors

Under this option, we’d disband the research and analytics teams (in sensitive areas, outside of explicit product usage analytics and research). Any product and strategy input will be supported through external vendors and resourced via operational expenses.

- a. Pros: clean shutdown of internal analysis on these issues
- b. Cons:
 - i. Not knowing does not mean that these problems or external criticism will go away. External research on these topics will persist, and will happen without high quality data, or ability to accurately contextualize insights.
 - ii. External criticism on shutting down research and internal employee morale
 - iii. Challenges managing rigor and quality of vendors
 - iv. Leak risk from vendors
 - v. Difficulty / inability to execute in related / adjacent areas that need to be run internally (ranking, integrity experiences, integrity measurement, youth products, wellbeing, AI accuracy, etc.)
 - vi. One-way door: if we change our minds it will be incredibly difficult to rebuild

B. External Research & Data Sharing

What do other companies do?

	Share data sets for independent analysis or co-analysis	Sponsor - no data sharing (funding, SMEs, special collaborations)
Apple	Don't know	Y
Google/YouTube	Y (medium)	Y
Twitter	Y (high)	Y
Microsoft	Y (medium)	Y
Facebook	Y (high)	Y

What efforts are we talking about?

For context, the scope of our current external research and data sharing products spans government reports, CSER, WVCR, CIB/security reporting, Ad Library, FORT, and CrowdTangle.

Strategy vs. Execution:

Below are options on our strategy, which could help guide what we do and don't build. But, we must strongly consider our ability to execute well. Mistakes on data sharing have been downstream of organizational thrash, under-investment, execution issues and a desire to move fast. We can never be 100% perfect, but whatever we do – if we do it – we must make sure it is set up for success to minimize mistakes.

Possible spectrum of our options:

1. **Option 1: Do only what's necessary to meet regulatory requirements**
 - a. Under this option, we'd only serve government data requests (e.g., India IT rules reports, EU code of conduct, etc.)
 - b. We'd shut down most of our external data sharing and research efforts
 - c. Pros: lower effort to execute, lowest risk of data being misused or misinterpreted, lower risk of execution mistakes
 - d. Cons: major shift from current posture, would not build much stakeholder trust, research probably still happens but with poorer-quality data (e.g. Lazer vaccine study, studies using CrowdTangle alternatives like NewsWhip)
2. **Option 2: Inform regulation**
 - a. Under this option, we'd also pursue data transparency in ways that we think reflect how we should be held accountable and inform future regulatory frameworks.
 - b. We'd keep CSER, WVCR (including pursuing independent audits), CIB reporting, Ad Library – and sunset the rest. As needed given regulatory forecasts, we may expand

reporting but will stick to a similar playbook of sharing of digested information + independent audits.

- c. Pros: medium effort to execute, works towards a clear goal of aligning external + internal accountability, still relatively low data misinterpretation risk, independent audits can build credibility.
- d. Cons: will not answer big picture questions about our impact, independent audit won't build as much trust as handing over raw data

3. **Option 3: Enable study into key topics**

- a. Under this option, we'd also keep FORT to enable independent study into topics (specifically related to ATW – e.g., elections, wellbeing)
- b. We'd sunset / pivot CrowdTangle (timing / execution / ramp-down tbd)
- c. Pros: produces credible independent data about our impact, still maintains some measure of mitigation for data misinterpretation
- d. Cons: requires really good execution to do well and minimize mistakes (but there will always be mistakes), hard privacy requirements mean researchers will see it as overly controlled, bad faith researchers will still look for the bad data

4. **Option 4: Win on transparency**

- a. Under this option, we'd strive to win on "being a transparent company", meeting stakeholder expectations and sharing as much data as possible across all topics, enabling fully independent collection of data.
- b. We'd keep all products including doubling down on CrowdTangle-style real-time queries.
- c. Pros: *if we succeed*, most transparency and trust
- d. Cons: high investment, high risk of misinterpretation, expectations are arbitrary and ever-growing and will be difficult to ever satisfy.

From: Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 1:45 PM

To: Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Scott Tucker <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Sonderby <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Naomi Gleit <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Molly Cutler <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

Mark, a smaller group of us met today and are pulling together a framing for a more structured conversation here, including:

- A framework for what types of social science research we do and how to think about pros / cons. For public perception but also (and more importantly) for user experience. This will include external research and research partnerships. We will need to be careful not to conflate them as we ask these questions. Crucially there is not a clear line between social science research and UEX research so we need to look at the pieces.
- More detail on what we see YT, Apple, and others doing here (both for research and for integrity as you allude to).
- Internal communication. We will propose a more fundamental re-examination of Workplace and our culture of how things get communicated and to whom. I personally think we should

continue doing almost all of this research and lean into it – it's important science, it's important for UX, and as the company's leaders we should know the answers – but flip a bit on who gets to see it and where it's shared. Others are helping me see that this is much closer to how peer companies operate.

- Centralizing research. There's consensus that lack of centralization is a big part of the problem here, notwithstanding a laundry list of other process improvements that are already underway. We will look at some options.

We'll have more soon and pull a group together to discuss with you.

From: Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Date: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 at 12:13 PM

To: David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Scott Tucker <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Chris Sonderby <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Naomi Gleit <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Molly Cutler <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: RE: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

+ Naomi and Molly who are driving the process for us.

From: David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 11:08 AM

To: Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Scott Tucker <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Sonderby <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: RE: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

PRIVILEGED:

I have conflicting views on this given my past role in Research alongside Pratiti and my current CCT focus. In my current role, these leaks are obviously incredibly damaging and hurting us – the downside here is huge, as we all know.

That said, after a lot of wrestling with this myself the past few days, I find myself fairly close to Javi's view – I think the internal work is important for providing a good product and a good user experience – separate and aside from any societal issues goals.

PRIV

Jen

PRIV

PRIV

From: Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 2:00 PM

To: Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Guy Rosen <guyro@fb.com>; Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Scott Tucker <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Sonderby <[REDACTED]@fb.com>

Subject: Re: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

0076_0009

CONFIDENTIAL

META3047MDL_REPROD_VOL021

META3047MDL-267-00000040

PRIV

+Scott and Chris S.

From: Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Date: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 at 10:48 AM
To: Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>, Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: RE: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

+ Pratiti

A couple of thoughts since this has been a controversial topic for many years. There are two very different areas here:

External research:

- We should not live under the illusion that there won't be mistakes or plenty of areas to criticize. Missing rows in this data set was a dumb mistake, but there are plenty of really hard tensions to square between user privacy / value of the data sets / who gets access to them, etc... so if the media wants is to pick on it (vs. see the best effort side of it) / assumes bad intention, this will always be a fruitful area to write plenty of negative stories.
- Given that – we should decide whether it is a net positive or not. Nick made a compelling case on why it is still better on net, but I want to make sure we are all clear that there will be no lack of 'easy to criticize' limitations on the data sets we open / mistakes will happen.

Internal research

- Leaks suck, and will continue to happen, unless we find a way to eradicate them.
- Given that – is it still worth trying to understand these issues? I think it is the responsible thing to do / I would love for us to continue trying to understand how can we make our products better for everyone, but maybe we should limit the surface to those areas where we at least see some clear degree of correlation between usage of our products / the specific issue.

From: Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 9:31 AM
To: Javier Olivan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Danny Ferrante <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Chris Cox <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; David Ginsberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Jennifer Newstead <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Guy Rosen <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Andrew Bosworth <[REDACTED]@fb.com>; Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]@fb.com>
Subject: Social issue research and analytics -- privileged and confidential

Recent events have made me consider whether we should change our approach to research and analytics around social issues.

Apple, for example, doesn't seem to study any of this stuff. As far as I understand, they don't have anyone reviewing or moderating content and don't even have a report flow in iMessage. They've taken the approach that it is people's own responsibility what they do on the platform, and by Apple not taking that responsibility upon themselves, they haven't created a staff or plethora of studies examining the tradeoffs in their approach. This has worked surprisingly well for them. Instead of being harshly criticized for not doing anything to fight CSAM historically, we have faced more criticism because the fact that we report more material makes it seem like there's more of that behavior on our platforms. Interestingly, when Apple did try to do something about CSAM, they were roundly criticized for it, which may encourage them to double down on their original approach.

YouTube, Twitter and Snap take a similar approach, to lesser degrees. YouTube seems to intentionally bury its head in the sand to stay below the radar and not be the center of attention. Twitter and Snap may just not have the resources to do this kind of reearch.

I think we should be commended for the work we do to study, understand, and improve social issues on our platforms. Unfortunately, the media is more likely to use any research or recommendations produced to say we're not doing everything we can (implying for craven purposes) rather than that we're taking these issues more seriously than anyone else in our industry by studying them and looking for solutions, not all of which are reasonable to implement because everything has tradeoffs.

Leaks undermine our ability to do this work in a way that isn't incredibly destructive. This may be part of why the rest of the industry has chosen a different approach towards these issues.

Further, when we've tried to enable independent academic research -- way beyond anything the rest of the industry is attempting -- it is questionable whether execution errors undermine our efforts and destroy more value than is created by the research we're enabling.

Given these realities, I'm interested in recommendations for how we might adjust our research and analytics programs going forward.

Jen: PRIV legal: PRIV
PRIV