EXHIBIT C

Message

From: Antigone Davis [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXTERNAL (FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=212B51BC6176494E94698067AE73F20D]
Sent: 12/6/2022 2:32:53 AM
To: Nick Clegg [@meta.com]; Emily Dalton Smith [@meta.com]; Curtiss Cobb [@meta.com]; Alex Schultz [@meta.com]; [@meta.com]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [@meta.com]; Danny Ferrante [@meta.com]; David Ginsberg [@meta.com]; Tucker Bounds [@meta.com]; Scott Tucker [@meta.com]
CC: [@meta.com]; Lauren Bachan [@meta.com]; [@meta.com]; [@meta.com]
Subject: Re: [AC PRIV] [Feedback Needed] Youth Well Being: International Youth Study and NAS

I also agree with EDS's analysis and suggested path forward.

From: Nick Clegg <@meta.com>
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 5:31:11 PM
To: Emily Dalton Smith <@meta.com>; Curtiss Cobb <@meta.com>; Alex Schultz <@meta.com>; <@meta.com>; Pratiti Raychoudhury <@meta.com>; Danny Ferrante <@meta.com>; David Ginsberg <@meta.com>; Tucker Bounds <@meta.com>; Antigone Davis <@meta.com>; Scott Tucker <@meta.com>
Cc: <@meta.com>; Lauren Bachan <@meta.com>; <@meta.com>; <@meta.com>
Subject: Re: [AC PRIV] [Feedback Needed] Youth Well Being: International Youth Study and NAS

Apols for delayed response – have been traveling a fair bit etc.

Agree with Emily's response on participating – that seems like a good thing to do.

Also seems sensible to regroup re pursuing the IYWB with NAS once you know more – pursuing it with another organization might turn out to be a better path forward if NAS's new report drives them in a less promising direction.

N

From: Emily Dalton Smith <@meta.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 at 7:04 PM
To: Curtiss Cobb <@meta.com>, Alex Schultz <@meta.com>, Nick Clegg <@meta.com>, <@meta.com>, Pratiti Raychoudhury <@meta.com>, Danny Ferrante <@meta.com>, David Ginsberg <@meta.com>, Tucker Bounds <@meta.com>, Antigone Davis <@meta.com>, Scott Tucker <@meta.com>
Cc: <@meta.com>, Lauren Bachan <@meta.com>, <@meta.com>, <@meta.com>
Subject: Re: [AC PRIV] [Feedback Needed] Youth Well Being: International Youth Study and NAS

Hi, Curtiss.

This seems like a good opportunity to engage and share our work – and it would seem odd to me if we declined participating in a forum we'd hoped to sponsor. I'm supportive of an expert on well-being from Meta presenting

provided the person is trained to field a variety of questions and redirect as needed, and the public affairs team thinks the risk is manageable.

Given NAS is already working on the study, it would be good to find out what their plans and funding needs are, then regroup on whether we should try to fund the NAS study or a complementary effort.

From: Curtiss Cobb <[redacted]@meta.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 at 8:31 AM
To: Alex Schultz <[redacted]@meta.com>, Emily Dalton Smith <[redacted]@meta.com>, Nick Clegg <[redacted]@meta.com>, [redacted] <[redacted]@meta.com>, Pratiti Raychoudhury <[redacted]@meta.com>, Danny Ferrante <[redacted]@meta.com>, David Ginsberg <[redacted]@meta.com>, Tucker Bounds <[redacted]@meta.com>, Antigone Davis <[redacted]@meta.com>, Scott Tucker <[redacted]@meta.com>
Cc: [redacted] <[redacted]@meta.com>, Lauren Bachan <[redacted]@meta.com>, [redacted] <[redacted]@meta.com>, [redacted] <[redacted]@meta.com>
Subject: [AC PRIV] [Feedback Needed] Youth Well Being: International Youth Study and NAS

[AC PRIV: Scott—

PRIV

PRIV

Hi Everyone,

As you know, we have been working with Litigation Legal for the past six months to unblock the International Youth and Wellbeing (IYWB) project that we all aligned upon previously. A key feature of the IYWB project was to work with the National Academies of Sciences (NAS) to facilitate an independent report and co-sponsor the subsequent international study. However, a few weeks ago the NAS announced independently that a private nonprofit donor is already sponsoring a report entitled "Assessment of the Impact of Social Media on the Health and Wellbeing of Adolescents and Children." Due to our internal delays around alignment and mitigations, we missed the opportunity to get credit for asking the NAS to do the assessment and to greatly shape the nature of the questions they will explore.

Fortunately, we have a second bite at the apple with the NAS. We have been invited to give a brief presentation at the NAS committee's first meeting on January 9th to present on the uses and limitations of industry data to understand the relationship between social media use and adolescents' well-being. This would be a public, open Zoom meeting. **We need your guidance and alignment on if and how we engage with NAS on their current review study.**

[FAQ about the NAS Report on Social Media and Youth Well-being]

Specifically, we need to know:

- Is this group supportive of Meta presenting to the NAS on the topic they requested?
  - PRO: Would continue to fulfill our congressional commitments and may be seen as more proactive. May create an opportunity for us to provide expert advising to the committee and seed some of our perspectives on how work in this space gets done.
  - CON: The focus and questioning is likely to extend to topics of design that we had hoped to avoid.

- [IF YES] Who should take lead on the presentation?
  - Recommendation: Since NAS is requesting information that is methodological in nature to be presented to a group of scientists and reached out to internal researchers through their informal academic networks, we recommend that someone from Research or Data Science speak on behalf of the company.

- Are we still supportive of raising the IYWB project with NAS and should we do so at the presentation?

- PRO: NAS reports frequently advocate for new funded research programs and result in an increased interest among researchers. This may be an opportunity for us to still be proactive and claim some of the credit for pushing for more study in this area while also shaping the nature of what is immediately considered to be studied in a way we intended to originally.
- CON: There are no guarantees that we can shape what studies are recommended. When the report eventually comes out, the report may call for research designs and data sharing specifics that we are unable or unwilling to fund or otherwise enable.
- Given the recent company constraints around OPEX for 2023 and beyond, do we still have the internal budgetary support for pushing a study of this nature and cost?
- Alternatives: (1) We scrap plans for IYWB altogether and still participate in the NAS process; (2) we decide to pursue IYWB with another group (e.g., Lancet Commission) where we scope the report more fully and continue to ensure product feature evaluations are excluded.

We would like to get back to NAS about the invitation to present by the end of the week. Please let me know if you have questions or want to discuss. I am happy to assemble us for a quick sync.

Thanks.

~curtiss cobb