

From: James Turner [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=REDACTED]
Sent: 10/17/2023 8:25:17 PM
To: Andy O'Connell [REDACTED@meta.com]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED@meta.com]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED@meta.com]; Kevin Martin [REDACTED@meta.com]; Jeana [REDACTED@meta.com]
Subject: Re: a/c priv - adult-minor connections

PRIV

From: Andy O'Connell <[REDACTED]@meta.com>
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 at 9:45 AM
To: Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, Monika Bickert <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, Kevin Martin <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, James Turner <[REDACTED]@meta.com>
Subject: Re: a/c priv - adult-minor connections

Quick updates:
1/ James PRIV Legal
PRIV

2/ Re "addressing minor --> MACSA PYMK recommendations -- we met with Product/Growth/XI yesterday and aligned on a near-term plan to start filtering minor-->MACSA adult recs, with a carve out for near-in-age recs. This should ship in next week or two. Specifically, this means that 16 year olds would be recommendable to MaCSA-classified 18 year olds, and 17 year olds would be recommendable to MaCSA-classified 18 and 19 year olds. Everyone understands that this does not preclude shipping additional restrictions in the

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

META3047MDL-294-00065704
METANMAG-159-00065704

PLTF EX-03685_0001

PLTF EX
PLTF EX-03685

future.

PRIV

Legal

PRIV

PRIV

3/ re the bigger convo about "going beyond MACSA", we're still finalizing the escalation path, but I expect a mid-level meeting tomorrow/Thursday to refine the options, then a senior meeting (including this group) in the next few days to try to make a decision. If that fails, then we'd do an escalation email to Nick, Naomi, etc.

(Note that many of the key players here are involved in Israel/Gaza, so this hasn't moved as quickly as hoped -- but we are still making progress.)

From: Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 14:51

To: Monika Bickert <[REDACTED]@meta.com>; Kevin Martin <[REDACTED]@meta.com>; James Turner <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Cc: Andy O'Connell <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Subject: Re: a/c priv - adult-minor connections

PRIV legal

PRIV

From: Monika Bickert <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 at 10:15 PM

To: Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, Kevin Martin <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, James Turner <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Cc: Andy O'Connell <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Subject: Re: a/c priv - adult-minor connections

We aren't necessarily arguing for less restrictiveness. We're simply trying to find an option that is realistic for both USPP and Product (they are quite far apart) AND that the Safety team can bless. I think we may just have to kick it up to you, Nick, etc. Product can articulate their concerns with each of the additions beyond Option 1. For instance, Product will point out that we are struggling to keep up with how young people use social media these days and that is really hurting us -- one big thing is that young people like discovering and following new creators. They aren't interested in following the big name celebrities so much as they want to find the ones that they think have a niche that is cool. That's why we added a lower follower threshold for "new creator" accounts in addition to the 10k threshold. They'll have similar points on the other requirements, which I'm sure Andy and Tiggy can also articulate.

I'm fine to discuss next week when good for you, Joel, and I know Tiggy and Andy would be willing as well.

From: Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 at 5:53 PM

To: Kevin Martin <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, Monika Bickert <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, James Turner <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Cc: Andy O'Connell <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Subject: Re: a/c priv - adult-minor connections

Thanks Kevin—this is very thoughtful and an excellent explanation of the concerns.

I share the queasiness about the “mutual connection” being protective enough, but a two-year requirement seems overly restrictive of potentially reasonable use cases ([REDACTED] and [REDACTED] follow each other on IG (I think), for instance. Don’t know if that was suggested, but would certainly seem like a good use case). So maybe finding something that is more of a 2.5. I’d also like to understand what work we are doing to dial up recall on the “risky adults” classifier. Seems to me this might be the most powerful protection of all.

I do want to hear from Monika and Antigone/Neil on all this, as I am sure they will have thought about exactly the concerns you have raised, and I think we should try and get time rather to really talk it through rather than try to do more async. Next week would be easy for me, tomorrow and Thurs hard. Could do Friday if we need sooner.

From: Kevin Martin <[REDACTED]@meta.com>
Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 at 8:41 PM
To: Monika Bickert <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, James Turner <[REDACTED]@meta.com>
Cc: Andy O’Connell <[REDACTED]@meta.com>
Subject: Re: a/c priv - adult-minor connections

Monika – thanks for teeing up.

Joel - Monika and I connected and I explained I had serious reservations that Option 2 is not strong enough and may put us in a vulnerable position publicly. My team has already been working with hers and we will make sure we put latest comments in the doc. I know this is lengthy but I wanted to get you something because we may need to do this async as you are traveling.

Unfortunately I don’t think option 2 provides nearly the protection that we need or that we should be providing to youth for numerous reasons.

When considering the best policy option I think it is important to remember that we are not talking about limitations on interactions between youth and adults, but rather protections for with whom we should RECOMMEND that youth connect. When we recommend an adult to a youth or vice versa, we are much more vulnerable – as we are then responsible for anything harmful that comes from the relationship. And it is much harder to defend mistakes as we are inserting ourselves into the relationship. While I understand product is whetted to option 1, I think this issue is very likely to blow up publicly and soon. As a result, I think we are better off escalating rather than agreeing to options that will result in public criticism later. If leadership decides to go with option 1, then they will do so understanding the risks and won’t be surprised later. I have several specific concerns with option 2 that Monika outlines:

First, option 2 is significantly weaker than our own current internal policy in several ways. Today our internal policy states that we do not recommend:

- *Accounts or entities that are suspected of engaging in inappropriate interactions with children, the sexualization of children, engaging in exploitative intimate imagery and sextortion, or solicitation of CSAM, nude imagery or sexualized imagery of real or fictional children, or offline sexual encounters with children.*
- *We will not recommend the accounts of minors under the age of **16 to adults over the age of 35**, and vice-versa.*
- *We will not recommend minors to non-minors, and vice-versa, in cases where the accounts share **no mutual friends**.*

Basically our internal recommendations policy has 3 protections: (1) limits on risky adults; (2) an age limitation (no 35 to under 16 recommendations); and (3) a requirement that there be a connection through a mutual friend. While these internal protections on recommendations have never been enforced, option 2 is a significant reduction in the protections that are “in place” and will be perceived as weakening them to the extent that the change in guidelines leaks. For example, in the chart I have attached, you can see that there are a significant number of recommendations for teens in the over 35 category that are occurring today as that limitation has not been enforced. So eliminating this protection entirely results in a significant change and will be perceived that way to the extent that this change is uncovered. With the public attention in this area and with ongoing litigation, I worry that all of the details will come out and it will become apparent that we never enforced the earlier guidelines and that we ultimately weakened the protections in ways that will be hard to explain and even understand (why do we need to recommend a 40 year old to a 15 year old). Again I am not suggesting we restrict such interactions, but only that we be more cautious in our recommendations.

If we wanted to go with a middle ground option it seems that merely enforcing the current internal guidelines would be the easiest and most defensible option. That would require no change and no weakening of our protections and easiest to explain publicly.

Second, Monika describes option 2 as only allowing recommendations if the recommended account is a public figure with over 10k followers, but I don’t think that is complete. What she describes is actually a prong of our option 3. Option 2 allows public figures with 10k followers “*OR is a newly created (L90D) Professional Account with >1K followers**”. As I understand it the articulated concern by product is that they want to be able to recommend celebrities to teens to follow (e.g Taylor Swift to teens). The addition of the professional account with only 1k followers seems to go well beyond existing celebrities.

Third, it is not clear that Option 2 alone will be able to withstand the inevitable public scrutiny. The limitation on 1 mutual connection is pretty broad and it is unclear how much protection that provides. Especially since we are still going back and forth on exactly what level of behavior will be deemed risky, a mutual contact requirement alone seems to offer too little protection. To be clear it is helpful but without more I worry it is too thin a reed to bear that much weight. It is too easy to meet. For example, every child who is connected to their team’s coach would then be eligible to be recommended to every adult that the coach is connected to. Every work colleague. Every high school classmate. I worry that puts too much pressure both substantively and publicly on our MSCA test. The MSCA protection is too amorphous and in flux to be able to determine whether it will offer a sufficient protection for us to defend recommending children to adults and vice versa. The experience with both Francis Haugen and the earlier WSJ story should remind us that it is not what protections we put in place that protect us but rather what protections we can explain and seem reasonable publicly that will be important. I worry that the first time our MSCA system misses risky behavior and we recommend a child to a 45 year old because they went to high school with the teen’s track coach, we will be very vulnerable.

Fourth, the external environment is very focused on the issue of teens generally and our recommendation systems in particular and this may result in further hearings and investigations. Both Congress and the states are very critical of social media and us in particular for the impact on youth. The previous WSJ story was particularly damaging to our

reputation here. We understand that Horowitz is working on a follow up story now with a particular focus on our systems for recommending both content and connections to teens. Mark has already been asked to testify in early November. To the extent that the latest WSJ story focuses on this issue or even worse that this change leaks and is compared to our current policy that has not been enforced – we will be subject to criticism and escalating investigations/hearings.

Finally, option 3 provides significantly more protection for youth and for us and still provides flexibility for the use cases that product has outlined. Option 3 was crafted to address the use cases that are most easily understood and explainable for recommending adults to youth and vice versa. Option 3 puts in place protections built off the current internal guidelines: (1) limits on risky adults; (2) an age limitation (only recommending people within a 2 year window for teens under 16; and within a 4 year window for teens under 18); and (3) a connection through a mutual friend or contacts; OR a celebrity with 10k followers. The addition of some age limitation is critical. Product has argued that they need some flexibility to be allowed to recommend Teens to others in their High School or to recent graduates whom the teens knew but are now in college. We addressed similar issues in private messaging by adopting windows of age ranges that would reflect these common use cases. We would still be able to recommend other teens in the same high school to students under 16. And we would still be able to recommend teens to recent graduates in college whom they might have known. This approach is not only consistent with how we tried to address similar issues around messaging but is easily explainable publicly. And the celebrity exception is narrowly targeted but provides an outlet for that issue as well. Finally as the attached chart demonstrates it addresses a significant number of the recommendations that we currently provide but eliminates those that are hardest to defend.

For all of these reasons, I think we should push for option 3 or an enforcement of the current internal guidelines for recommendations, even though product will argue for significantly less and may want to escalate.

From: Monika Bickert <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 at 1:49 PM

To: Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, Kevin Martin <[REDACTED]@meta.com>, James Turner <jaturner@meta.com>

Cc: Andy O'Connell <[REDACTED]@meta.com>

Subject: a/c priv - adult-minor connections

Hi James, Joel, Kevin,

I wanted to get your thoughts on the options in [this doc](#) about how to restrict recommendations of minors and adults to one another. My sense right now is that Product is wedded to Option 1 (status quo: cut out "risky adults" from recommendations to and from minors) and US Public Policy is wedded to Option 3 (significantly expand restrictions).

Candidly, I am hoping we can reach a middle ground and land on Option 2, which only allows recommendations between adults/minors if they are strongly connected (e.g. mutual friends or same contact info) or if the recommended account is a public figure with over 10k followers. Andy is not confident that we could get Product to move off of Option 1, but we feel comfortable pushing Option 2 with them. Antigone and team are ok with Option 2.

Looking forward to your feedback.

Thanks,
Monika