

Message

From: David Ginsberg [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=]
Sent: 3/3/2023 1:10:56 AM
To: Joel Kaplan []@meta.com]; Nick Clegg []@meta.com]
CC: Probir Mehta []@meta.com]; Tim []@meta.com]
Subject: RE: IG adult > minor DM escalation a/c priv

I am aligned with the comms view below – I asked that it get escalated to you both bc I was surprised this wasn't getting the visibility.

I can understand position 3 – but I think the risks it opens up feels large to me. I also asked for Antigone's rationale, as she's pretty thoughtful on these things. The quick answer I got was just that she thought the risks were manageable. That may be true from a policy perspective. I think the comms risks here – esp with the riverside incident from last year, are larger.

From: Joel Kaplan <[]@meta.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2023 6:23 PM
To: Nick Clegg <[]@meta.com>; David Ginsberg <[]@meta.com>
Cc: Probir Mehta <[]@meta.com>; Tim []@meta.com>
Subject: Re: IG adult > minor DM escalation a/c priv

I haven't heard of the issue before now. At least as presented below, I'd be more sympathetic to the comms/legal view, but I have to assume Antigone had her reasons for being comfortable . . . Will check in with her.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Nick Clegg <[]@meta.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2023 6:18 PM
To: Joel Kaplan <[]@meta.com>; David Ginsberg <[]@meta.com>
Cc: Probir Mehta <[]@meta.com>; Tim []@meta.com>
Subject: FW: IG adult > minor DM escalation a/c priv

Joel, David – do you have strong stances on this one? N

From: Stephanie []@meta.com>
Date: Thursday, 2 March 2023 at 18:02
To: Nick Clegg <[]@meta.com>, David Ginsberg <[]@meta.com>, Tucker Bounds <[]@meta.com>
Cc: Lena Pietsch <[]@meta.com>, Gail []@meta.com>, Antigone Davis <[]@meta.com>, Ravi Sinha <[]@meta.com>, Nicole []@meta.com>, Liz []@meta.com>, Mel []@meta.com>, David []@meta.com>, Rachany []@meta.com>, Katie []@meta.com>
Subject: IG adult > minor DM escalation a/c priv

a/c priv – Mel

PRIV

Nick,

Flagging a recent product leadership decision to you for awareness.

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

META3047MDL-187-00001257
METANMAG-048-00001257
PLTF EX-01906_0001

PLTF EX

PLTF EX-01906

Context: following a recent child safety incident (detail) an XFN team across Policy, Product, Legal and Public Affairs came together to re-evaluate an exception that allows 18-20yo to message minors (13-17yo) on Instagram. This exception stands in contradiction to our public statements and witness testimony that adults are not allowed to message minors on Instagram that don't follow them.

Decision: The XFN were unable to align on a path forward and escalated three options to product leadership last week, with Adam attending as decision maker.

- **Option 1: *Status Quo***, 18-20yo can continue to message minors that don't follow them
- **Option 2: *Remove the exception altogether***, effectively bringing us into compliance with our public commitments. Minors would still be able to initiate conversations with 18+ adults. The new added requirement is that for 18-20yo to message minors, the minor is required to proactively follow the adult.
- **Option 3: *Keep the exception with an age gap cap of 2 years***, meaning a 19yo could message a 17yo but not a 15yo, for example.

Adam supported option 3 as it allows teens in similar age ranges to continue messaging one another, supported by Product and Policy. Legal: PRIV See more detail on the options and key considerations in the linked doc above.

Public Affairs POV:

In practice, option 3 may represent significant legal and reputational challenges. It will require us to update public materials on this protection, trigger briefings to regulators like the IDPC, FTC and ICO to flag the change (therefore disclosing the gap), and may necessitate updates and corrections to prior congressional testimony.

While it's reasonable that 18yo and 17yo should be able to message one another, there are ramifications to publicly disclosing the longstanding and continued existence of this gap. Specifically, we believe that we'll likely have to confirm that 20yo have been able to message 13yo for a number of years following the launch of this protection. Furthermore, it could be perceived that a decision to formally adopt the exception (even with the age range cap) contradicts our youth well-being campaign goal to demonstrate aligned interests with parents.

Option 2 would bring us into compliance and not require us to make such disclosures or corrections. We believe we can explain the existence of the initial exception if it became a matter of public knowledge, provided it's remediated.

Next steps:

Legal: PRIV Policy believes that option 3 is explainable to policy makers, and agrees with Product on the minimal safety risks.

PRIV legal: PRIV

Let us know any feedback or direction you may have on this matter - thanks,
Stephanie + David