EXHIBIT D

Tensions at the Company for Well-being (CSN)
A/C Priv

Category	Tension	Description	Example(s)
Strategy	**Definitional mayhem**	INTERNALLY, there is misalignment on what the definition of well-being is. The definition is often dictated by the internal org structure. These definitions cause internal tensions in vocabulary, product proof points, prioritizations, and more. This happens at both the higher level "well-being" level, but also at the individual topic/issue (e.g., is "problematic use" a synonym for social media addiction or a catch-all for all issues, like body image?) EXTERNALLY, these internal definitions often do not align with the external definitions and critiques, causing tension with how the world sees us solving these issues.	- Internally, IG considers "equity" as well-being, Messenger considers "privacy" as well-being - Internally we focus on agency and control solutions (if at all); externally they critique core mechanics (which led to a mismatch on the interpretation of Project Daisy work externally) - IG has strong B&H product support-oriented solutions, FB relies mostly on integrity measures and content takedowns does not (even though it's a top area concern for both) - Anger workstream was not considered as "well-being" work by FB app - Tensions around where "agency & control" should live as a company
	Lack of formalized decision-making process	There is no centralized decision-making process for well-being products, and no single-threaded owner. This has led to a lack of cohesive evidence-based decision making for where we need to focus as a company, and how – leaving it up to teams to independently decide, and ad-hoc escalations with various inconsistent stakeholders present to resolve tensions as they arise.	- Project Daisy - Tension between Central Well-being prioritization process and IG's well-being prioritization process for what to focus on – and drive to finalize a narrative.
	Confusion around topic priority	Well-being is too broad of a construct, and we have to take a topics approach to make progress. Leadership aligned on prioritizing 5 topics (problematic use, emotional impact, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI) last year. This topic selection still has not landed, and needs reevaluation to keep the work moving – should we narrow in to focus on one or two of the topics? Do we take a broad approach (e.g., problematic use) or narrow approach (e.g., SSI, body image)? Which apps need to focus on which topics? How do we think about well-being topics vs. integrity topics? Do we need to pick an audience focus (e.g., youth)?	- IG is prioritizing appearance comparison over problematic use - Some topics fall into both integrity and well-being (e.g., bullying and harassment, SSI) - The youth team functions independently than the well-being teams.

		These remain unsolved questions that leave us jack of all trades, and master of none.	
	Our company strategy is unclear	Rather than have a formal company strategy, we currently just continue to make progress on our org chart, and ship that, and occasionally try to link to well-being. One major downstream effect of this tension is that it is unclear our stance and prioritization of an offense vs. a defense approach to well-being. Traditionally, most of our work has been very reactive, defense-oriented (and mostly focused on content policies), leaving teams with confusion on how to think about offense work in this space (and if they should be at all).	- Our last major proactive announcement in this space was in 2018 - Until recently, most bullying and harassment work focused on content policy, and not support and resources for prevention or victims
Resources	**Uncertainty around level of investment**	There isn't alignment on how much we should be investing in this space as a company, and who at the company should be invested. Do we need all teams to be thinking about this space and a massive company overhaul approach involving guardrails and review processes? Or do we need a leaner and more targeted team that churns out very purposeful evidence-based case study products? Current resourcing is very low. Many former teams have been started up and disbanded. Current teams wonder if they will get defunded soon.	- IG has dedicated product headcount for well-being, most other services (including RL) do not; FB app used to have a well-being team which was disbanded - Many well-being products are in maintenance mode (e.g., Your Time, memorialization)
	Enormous PXFN approval hurdles	A lot of the required research and product work in this space is high risk for the company from a PXFN POV. Many legal, comms, privacy, and policy people are unclear what's allowed or not allowed or how much risk is worth inheriting. This has caused significant delays or pausing of important research and products.	- The Nielsen deactivation study spent more than a year and a half in privacy review - OII correlative study has been in the works for two years
Employee Morale	**Disagreement on our impact**	There is a disagreement internally among employees on the effect that our services have on people's well-being as well as how much the company cares about this topic. There are a multitude of reasons why they may believe this from personal anecdotes to lack of access to the research to witnessing lack of product proof points and company investments (e.g., engagement over well-being decisions). The WSJ leaks and senate hearings have only exacerbated this tension.	- Workplace Notes employees have written (as well as posts, comments, and emails) - Questions asked during Q&A
	Team thrashing	Those who have worked on well-being-related teams have experienced a lot of thrash over the past 5+ years. Teams have been spun, spun down; products have been put on maintenance mode leaving some employees upset and confused.	- Disbanded the FB app well-being team - Re-orged the IG well-being research team

	Ethics	Well-being research and product investments come with a lot of ethical hurdles around emotional manipulation, social engineering, and paternalism. This leaves a lot of tension for employees to figure out how to do this work in the right away. The company has attempted new processes to help do this work more responsibly, but given the current bottoms up org structure, these efforts often come off as "blocking" the work potentially reinforcing the notion we don't care as a company.	- "Anger" workstream by FB - Emotional contagion study in 2014