

EndControl : METANMAG-002-021473
08

BegControl : METANMAG-002-021473
07

BegAttach : METANMAG-002-021473
07

EndAttach : METANMAG-002-021473
08

Custodian - All : Davis_Antigone,
Protti_Michael

Custodian :

MDL BEGBATES : META3047MDL-034-001
81096

Deponent & Exhibit Number :

File Name : Message summary
[{"otherUserFbId":1
00022110603111,"thr
eadFbId":null}]

File Type :

File Size :

File Extension :

Hash Value : 3f05408563cb18bbb73
87cd8af32b85f

E-Title :

E-Author :

Date Created :

Date Last Modified :

Date Sent :

Email From : [REDACTED]@meta.com

Email To : Michel Protti
<[REDACTED]@meta.com> Antigone Davis

Due to size limitations, not all document information was included on
this page.

Protti
5/1/26
State of NM v. Meta

15

PLTF EX-07776_0001

PLTF EX-07776

From: Michel Protti[/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXTERNAL
(FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]
Sent: Wed 8/30/2023 9:52:49 PM (UTC)
To: Michel Protti [REDACTED]@meta.com]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]@meta.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":100022110603111,"threadFbId":null}]

Michel Protti (8/30/2023 10:46:37 PDT):
>You around? Any chance I can call you for 5 mins re: Arkansas?

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 10:48:01 PDT):
>I am on a plane for the next hour and 10 min. I can talk when land before my next flight.

Michel Protti (8/30/2023 10:50:02 PDT):
>Will try quick message thread - my take on this escalation is that, if we get a stay, we should clearly hold on our compliance plan while we assess the landscape given how invasive the age verif requirements are and how bad the user experience is with blocking new users.

Michel Protti (8/30/2023 10:50:39 PDT):
>Are you advocating though that we should hold on compliance even absent an injunction?

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 10:54:50 PDT):
>I agree with your position. Absent an injunction is a tougher call from the policy perspective. +s and -s.

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 10:56:09 PDT):
>Sorry misunderstood

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 10:57:11 PDT):
>Do you mean absent hearing from the court? If so, I'd recommend we wait on compliance.

Michel Protti (8/30/2023 10:58:42 PDT):
>My take is:
>-if we don't hear anything from the court we turn on our compliance plan as planned
>-if/when the court rules that there's a stay on State enforcement we would pull back our compliance plan and assess the landscape
>-we'd then monitor the landscape and legal developments to decide if/when we turn our compliance plan back on

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 10:58:58 PDT):
>If you mean the court rules against the injunction, then I remain okay with plan of record (but generally have worries about compliance requirements outpacing our ability to push for OS solution)

Michel Protti (8/30/2023 10:59:31 PDT):
>I'm saying if the court rules against or the court is silent I think we have to proceed

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 11:00:26 PDT):
>I think we wait to hear from the court. If they miss the effective date, they will quickly follow — that is the whole point of a preliminary injunction

Michel Protti (8/30/2023 11:01:38 PDT):
>OK this is the issue to discuss today then since I think what we do if we hear nothing from Court by tomorrow seems like the only area of disagreement

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 11:02:51 PDT):
>Agree. I will try to join. Dependent on my flight landing in time... If not, Rob will represent and is aligned with what I just said. Thanks for checking in!

Michel Protti (8/30/2023 13:30:35 PDT):
>Rob and the rest of the policy team on the call were of the opinion that, if we hear nothing from the court by tomorrow 6pm, we should proceed with launching with our compliance plan (and pull it back if the injunction is granted). That was the decision we took in meeting but I asked Rob to follow-up with you to clarify that position given that it diverges from what you wrote above.

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 14:25:53 PDT):

>Thanks! I trust from the conversation they determined that made more sense.

Antigone Davis (8/30/2023 14:52:49 PDT):

>Checked in with Rob and Dan and sounds like Jonathan's take that failure of ct to make a decision by 9/1 indicates might not grant shifted policy perspective — makes sense to me and sounds like we landed in the right place. Appreciate the sidebar.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (COMPETITOR)
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL (ATTORNEY'S EYES ONLY)

META3047MDL-034-00181097
METANMAG-002-02147308
PLTF EX-07776_0003