

AMENDED Exhibit 181

PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Case No.: 4:22-md-03047-YGR

MDL No. 3047

In Re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation

Message

From: [REDACTED] [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[REDACTED]]
 Sent: 3/4/2020 9:48:31 AM
 To: [REDACTED] Liza Crenshaw [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 CC: [REDACTED]; Vaishnavi J [REDACTED]
 Subject: Re: First SSI focus groups initial takeaways

+ Vaishnavi who I think is still on to attend tonight.

All of the below is exactly what my notes say, plus:

- demonstrating investment - ie. "Surely it'd be quicker if they spent more".
- one remark I thought was interesting (thinking about suicide notes and fame) - different standard for high followed accts as more likely to trigger
- use of 'marketing language' - preferred it when we were much more direct and specific.

My biggest take away from last night was the change over time piece. It absolutely confounded them that we could be working on an issue so long, yet we are where we are. Rather than it seeming responsible, they took it as 'so you've known about this all this time and you still haven't fixed it'.

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 Public Policy Manager, Instagram EMEA
 [REDACTED]

On 3/4/20, 9:21 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi all,

Just sharing some topline insights from last night, will do a proper round up after tonight's sessions. Overall I found it really valuable

Other attendees pls feel free to add in.

We had two sessions last night - news informed parents and news informed young people (18-24)

Takeouts;

- they get this is nuanced and complex, and they get the balance argument. However they don't see IG as the natural or the correct place for people to get support. So they very quickly want us to take action and refer people to expert orgs. We need to be careful to not try and "own" being the place for support.
- they broadly agreed that people should be able to share mental health, but strongly believed that we should remove all content which could encourage or normalise this behaviour
- they also feel the messaging isn't credible if we don't acknowledge that IG was never intended to be a place for this, but now it is we have a responsibility to act.
- they strongly feel that if we can have such powerful algorithms to serve personalised ads that we can find this content, remove it and also serve people positive messaging/content/ refer them to expert orgs
- they see our power as being in building the best tech, not necessarily in research
- they didn't think the sensitivity screens were valuable as you just tap through - so we should explain that they stop people looking, if they do
- they liked it when we explicitly said we were removing and weren't recommending other content (but it was confusing)
- they liked when we were granular and explained the type of content we were taking about - eg in borderline
- they liked references to the Samaritans, working with industry, wanted to hear how we were working with government,
- they liked numbers, but needed them contextualised and wanted more clarity on what our goal was of how much we could remove
- they agreed social media had been good Destigmatizing mental health
- they liked when we acknowledged what is harmless for some, is harmful for others
- they wanted us to talk more about what else we were going to do. Not just what we were doing.

- some found the messaging about removing before reported confusing
- they did not like referencing we'd been working on this for a long time (as they said it hasn't worked), the parents didn't like deflecting to regulators. They all felt no one would sue us if we were saving lives.
- no one cared about privacy implications - saving lives is more important.
- the parents were much more critical and felt that we should be doing more. (Likely as they're thinking about their own children). They wanted us to alert parents, schools, emergency services
- The young people understood more that tech takes time to learn
- they got the borderline content highlighted the nuances, but some thought it was a waste of time.

Many mentioned it felt like we could over step the mark- concerns of thought police and censoring humour.

We've re-worked one of the narratives, pulling together all the most popular bits and will be testing that tonight.

This is a v quick read out - but hopefully useful. We have a few more spaces tonight if anyone wants to come?

And as I mentioned - others pls add.

██████

DOCUMENT SLIPSHEET

Bates Number: META3047MDL-040-00544758-META3047MDL-040-00544759

BEGATTACH: META3047MDL-040-00544758

ENDATTACH: META3047MDL-040-00544759

TNAG BEGBATES:

TNAG ENDBATES:

Create Date: 3/4/2020 1:48 AM

Last Modified Date: 3/4/2020 1:48 AM

Custodian: CRENSHAW_LIZA; JAYAKUMAR_VAISHNAVI; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Title:

Author:

Confidentiality Designation: HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)

META Pointer:

META Pointee: