

Message

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/28/2021 12:50:52 AM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Apols – with proposal now attached below. N

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people’s mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and

Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by █████) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion █████ narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.](#)

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                             |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Success                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| Where are we today relative to success | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|  | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|  | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|  | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/21/2021 12:01:26 AM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED] Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] Emily Dalton Smith [REDACTED] Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up  
**Attachments:** image.png; image.png

Hello Chris and Nick,

Since Wednesday's meeting on the well-being product strategy, following up on your feedback, we've tightened up the strategy and ask (to reduce it / prioritize) and shared the deck with + met with [REDACTED]

The core minimal ask that Pratiti and I recommend (which will likely not come from existing efforts) is:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

There are still a bunch of important details to align on around the "how" (e.g. operationally how this should be organized, and how it intersects with Youth and other horizontal efforts) — and we can follow-up in a forthcoming Leadership Sync on that — but Pratiti and I think it's important we get the ask in now, since we need the headcount in all cases.

Below we've provided a succinct framing for your back pocket and options for high and low staffing.

Thanks,  
KX, [REDACTED] and Pratiti

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [Status Quo summary below].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap

relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | -- Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned<br>-- On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)<br>-- Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (eg. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA) | -- Clear central accountability for all topics<br>-- On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR) |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI   | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>   | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.  | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.  | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gaps: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence of public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11/14/2021 2:31:07 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]; Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Mark FWIW this is my #1 "below the line" project to fund on Social Impact (i.e. before Climate.) We've also scaled this request back to ask for XFN only and 0 eng given there are none :)

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 10, 2021 at 1:53 AM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + headcount

Mark,

Circling back re: investment needed to strengthen Meta's position on well-being (see original email from Aug below).

This investment is important to ensure we have the product roadmaps necessary to stand behind our external narrative of well-being on our apps, and soon in the metaverse. This work & narrative has of course become a more critical focal point for policymakers, regulators et al in recent weeks – this is not likely to diminish going forward.

A number of us have met and agreed upon a revised investment proposal:

1. Agreement on the need to fund a central product team to organize cross-company strategy, execution, and measurement (as per our approach to other societal issues or privacy)
2. Alignment that product work must map to and support our external narrative (as part of Project Beyond)

Funding the central product team remains our biggest gap. Our original 2022 ask from Aug was 25 XFN and 20 ENG to address the roadmap detailed [here](#), which was not funded.

Scaling down, we can make necessary progress in two ways:

1. +25 XFN (and 0 ENG) to form both the central well-being product pod, and 2 topic pods within it to drive focused progress on topics like problematic use and connections. This group would create a cross-Meta well-being strategy, align disparate team roadmaps for well-being topics, and drive necessary measurement for each topic.
2. +7 XFN (and 0 ENG) would form only the central well-being pod, and would focus solely on forming a cross-Meta view of well-being strategy and existing roadmaps and gaps. This would be the bare minimum needed to meet basic policymaker inquiries.

If funded, the team will start by working with existing ENG teams operating in the space (as of Aug, ~90 ENG across Meta - ex RL - disparately working on these topics), ensuring these efforts ladder up to a coherent company strategy.

Given the increased urgency of all this since the initial escalation in August, are you supportive of funding this scaled back proposal?

Thx

N

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by █████) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion █████ narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

- 1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]
- 2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.



|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]  | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG   | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)   | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | -- Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned<br>-- On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)<br>-- Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA) | -- Clear central accountability for all topics<br>-- On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR) |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11/10/2021 6:53:36 AM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Chris Cox [REDACTED] Alex Schultz [REDACTED] Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED] Naomi Gleit [REDACTED] Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED] Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED] Susan Li [REDACTED] Joel Kaplan [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Antigone Davis [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Monika Bickert [REDACTED] David Wehner [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Mark,

Circling back re: investment needed to strengthen Meta's position on well-being (see original email from Aug below).

This investment is important to ensure we have the product roadmaps necessary to stand behind our external narrative of well-being on our apps, and soon in the metaverse. This work & narrative has of course become a more critical focal point for policymakers, regulators et al in recent weeks – this is not likely to diminish going forward.

A number of us have met and agreed upon a revised investment proposal:

1. Agreement on the need to fund a central product team to organize cross-company strategy, execution, and measurement (as per our approach to other societal issues or privacy)
2. Alignment that product work must map to and support our external narrative (as part of Project Beyond)

Funding the central product team remains our biggest gap. Our original 2022 ask from Aug was 25 XFN and 20 ENG to address the roadmap detailed [here](#), which was not funded.

Scaling down, we can make necessary progress in two ways:

1. +25 XFN (and 0 ENG) to form both the central well-being product pod, and 2 topic pods within it to drive focused progress on topics like problematic use and connections. This group would create a cross-Meta well-being strategy, align disparate team roadmaps for well-being topics, and drive necessary measurement for each topic.
2. +7 XFN (and 0 ENG) would form only the central well-being pod, and would focus solely on forming a cross-Meta view of well-being strategy and existing roadmaps and gaps. This would be the bare minimum needed to meet basic policymaker inquiries.

If funded, the team will start by working with existing ENG teams operating in the space ([as of Aug](#), ~90 ENG across Meta - ex RL - disparately working on these topics), ensuring these efforts ladder up to a coherent company strategy.

Given the increased urgency of all this since the initial escalation in August, are you supportive of funding this scaled back proposal?

Thx

N

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]

**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM

**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]

**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]

Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Antigone Davis [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by █████) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion (█████ narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, [an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.](#)

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails                                |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate «topic» on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Susan Li [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11/14/2021 9:36:47 PM  
**To:** Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Nick Clegg [REDACTED]; Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Well-being product strategy + headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

I'll defer to Mark on the decision here (and we have a Budget meeting on Monday), but unfortunately XFN heads are running even more constrained than ENG.

---

**From:** Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 14, 2021 6:31 AM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]; Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + headcount

Mark FWIW this is my #1 "below the line" project to fund on Social Impact (i.e. before Climate.) We've also scaled this request back to ask for XFN only and 0 eng given there are none :)

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 10, 2021 at 1:53 AM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + headcount

Mark,

Circling back re: investment needed to strengthen Meta's position on well-being (see original email from Aug below).

This investment is important to ensure we have the product roadmaps necessary to stand behind our external narrative of well-being on our apps, and soon in the metaverse. This work & narrative has of course become a

more critical focal point for policymakers, regulators et al in recent weeks – this is not likely to diminish going forward.

A number of us have met and agreed upon a revised investment proposal:

1. Agreement on the need to fund a central product team to organize cross-company strategy, execution, and measurement (as per our approach to other societal issues or privacy)
2. Alignment that product work must map to and support our external narrative (as part of Project Beyond)

Funding the central product team remains our biggest gap. Our original 2022 ask from Aug was 25 XFN and 20 ENG to address the roadmap detailed [here](#), which was not funded.

Scaling down, we can make necessary progress in two ways:

1. +25 XFN (and 0 ENG) to form both the central well-being product pod, and 2 topic pods within it to drive focused progress on topics like problematic use and connections. This group would create a cross-Meta well-being strategy, align disparate team roadmaps for well-being topics, and drive necessary measurement for each topic.
2. +7 XFN (and 0 ENG) would form only the central well-being pod, and would focus solely on forming a cross-Meta view of well-being strategy and existing roadmaps and gaps. This would be the bare minimum needed to meet basic policymaker inquiries.

If funded, the team will start by working with existing ENG teams operating in the space (as of Aug, ~90 ENG across Meta - ex RL - disparately working on these topics), ensuring these efforts ladder up to a coherent company strategy.

Given the increased urgency of all this since the initial escalation in August, are you supportive of funding this scaled back proposal?

Thx

N

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]

**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM

**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]

**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED] which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key "Arguments to Win").

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we're not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

#### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical



things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here](#).

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]  | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG   | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)   | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (eg. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI   | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>   | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goating).                                | Gaps: No guardrails, inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upscaling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.  | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.  | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gaps: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested:

problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/28/2021 12:50:52 AM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Dav [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Apols – with proposal now attached below. N

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and

Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by ██████ which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion (██████ narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.](#)

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                             |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Success                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| Where are we today relative to success | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|  | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|  | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|  | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [redacted]  
**Sent:** 8/28/2021 12:30:56 AM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [redacted]  
**CC:** Chris Cox [redacted]; Alex Schultz [redacted]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [redacted]; Naomi Gleit [redacted]; Kang-Xing Jin [redacted]; Sheryl Sandberg [redacted]; Susan Li [redacted]; Joel Kaplan [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; Antigone Davis [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; Monika Bickert [redacted]; David Wehner [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [redacted] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people’s mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [redacted] which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([redacted] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

Message

---

**From:** Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/21/2021 12:01:26 AM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]; Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Emily Dalton Smith [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up  
**Attachments:** image.png; image.png

Hello Chris and Nick,

Since Wednesday's meeting on the well-being product strategy, following up on your feedback, we've tightened up the strategy and ask (to reduce it / prioritize) and shared the deck with + met with [REDACTED]

The core minimal ask that Pratiti and I recommend (which will likely not come from existing efforts) is:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

There are still a bunch of important details to align on around the "how" (e.g. operationally how this should be organized, and how it intersects with Youth and other horizontal efforts) — and we can follow-up in a forthcoming Leadership Sync on that — but Pratiti and I think it's important we get the ask in now, since we need the headcount in all cases.

Below we've provided a succinct framing for your back pocket and options for high and low staffing.

Thanks,  
KX, [REDACTED] and Pratiti

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [Status Quo summary below].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap

relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]  | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG   | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)   | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (eg. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI   | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>   | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.  | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.  | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gaps: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.



Message

---

**From:** Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 9/2/2021 6:14:47 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]; Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

FWIW [REDACTED] the well-being work is already centralized in research, comms and policy. I think the proposal is to centralize it in terms of product + engineering as well (a central product team with surface product teams, same as Integrity and Social Impact verticals) – which feels like more coordinated and streamlined to me.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Thursday, September 2, 2021 at 12:00 PM  
**To:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Ok sounds good.

I reached out and talked to Pratiti yesterday - we agreed our goals are aligned so even if we don't get incremental dedicated well-being funding, we can lean some on youth team to make some progress here. And if we do get some extra, we will figure out best use and make faster progress.

[REDACTED]

On Aug 31, 2021, at 7:21 PM, Chris Cox [REDACTED] wrote:

Adding Naomi to see this too.

I would view it as very low-likelihood that Mark chooses to fund more here given how over-constrained we are, so I think we're going to end up with the outcome you're suggesting anyway, [REDACTED] If for some reason we have more funding towards well-being and I'm wrong, then we should have the deeper conversation on how to organize.

---

**From:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 31, 2021 at 8:02 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED], Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Thanks for the flag, will look into it.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Sunday, August 29, 2021 at 11:09 PM  
**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED], Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Hi Adam, Chris,

I met with Pratiti and wellbeing task force.

I agree wholeheartedly with their conclusion on wellbeing overall needs more work and investment, as evidenced by several recent flareups on gaps. I am supportive of product/eng funding that they are advocating to help fill the gaps.

I advocated to them though to NOT start yet another central xfn to oversee these wellbeing efforts. We have IG wellbeing xfn. we have Youth wellbeing xfn. and now we are advocating building another horizontal oversight committee. There is lot of layers being built up on teams doing the work, plus having too much central oversight demotivates local product and research teams. I also feel horizontal efforts are hard at FB and operationally would only make sense to do for big things eg creators, youth vs smaller efforts like wellbeing.

Just some private food for thought as you decide on this.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 27, 2021 5:50 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Apols – with proposal now attached below. N

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion [REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key "Arguments to Win").

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we're not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### Well-being product strategy headcount request:

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here](#).

<image001.png>

<image002.png>

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 9/2/2021 4:00:02 PM  
**To:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Ok sounds good.

I reached out and talked to Pratiti yesterday - we agreed our goals are aligned so even if we don't get incremental dedicated well-being funding, we can lean some on youth team to make some progress here. And if we do get some extra, we will figure out best use and make faster progress.

[REDACTED]

On Aug 31, 2021, at 7:21 PM, Chris Cox [REDACTED] wrote:

Adding Naomi to see this too.

I would view it as very low-likelihood that Mark chooses to fund more here given how over-constrained we are, so I think we're going to end up with the outcome you're suggesting anyway, [REDACTED]. If for some reason we have more funding towards well-being and I'm wrong, then we should have the deeper conversation on how to organize.

---

**From:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 31, 2021 at 8:02 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED], Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Thanks for the flag, will look into it.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Sunday, August 29, 2021 at 11:09 PM  
**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED], Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Hi Adam, Chris,

I met with Pratiti and wellbeing task force.

I agree wholeheartedly with their conclusion on wellbeing overall needs more work and investment, as evidenced by several recent flareups on gaps. I am supportive of product/eng funding that they are advocating to help fill the gaps.

I advocated to them though to NOT start yet another central xfn to oversee these wellbeing efforts. We have IG wellbeing xfn. we have Youth wellbeing xfn. and now we are advocating building another horizontal oversight committee. There is lot of layers being built up on teams doing the work, plus having too much central oversight demotivates local product and research teams. I also feel horizontal efforts are hard at FB and operationally would only make sense to do for big things eg creators, youth vs smaller efforts like wellbeing.

Just some private food for thought as you decide on this.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 27, 2021 5:50 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Apols – with proposal now attached below. N

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by ██████ which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ██████ narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key "Arguments to Win").

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we're not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here](#).

<image001.png>

<image002.png>

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.



|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | --Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned<br>--On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)<br>--Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA) | --Clear central accountability for all topics<br>--On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR) |

# Status Quo

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent <sup>2</sup> and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections). | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

Message

---

**From:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
(FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=AC59CDE168C34676B09679178C985E05]  
**Sent:** 8/31/2021 6:02:38 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]; Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Thanks for the flag, will look into it.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] i [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Sunday, August 29, 2021 at 11:09 PM  
**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED], Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Hi Adam, Chris,

I met with Pratiti and wellbeing task force.

I agree wholeheartedly with their conclusion on wellbeing overall needs more work and investment, as evidenced by several recent flareups on gaps. I am supportive of product/eng funding that they are advocating to help fill the gaps.

I advocated to them though to NOT start yet another central xfn to oversee these wellbeing efforts. We have IG wellbeing xfn. we have Youth wellbeing xfn. and now we are advocating building another horizontal oversight committee. There is lot of layers being built up on teams doing the work, plus having too much central oversight demotivates local product and research teams. I also feel horizontal efforts are hard at FB and operationally would only make sense to do for big things eg creators, youth vs smaller efforts like wellbeing.

Just some private food for thought as you decide on this.

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 27, 2021 5:50 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Apols – with proposal now attached below. N

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people’s mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we

are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion (██████ narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here](#).

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                             |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Success                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| Where are we today relative to success | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|  | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|  | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|  | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/30/2021 6:09:33 AM  
**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Hi Adam, Chris,

I met with Pratiti and wellbeing task force.

I agree wholeheartedly with their conclusion on wellbeing overall needs more work and investment, as evidenced by several recent flareups on gaps. I am supportive of product/eng funding that they are advocating to help fill the gaps.

I advocated to them though to NOT start yet another central xfn to oversee these wellbeing efforts. We have IG wellbeing xfn. we have Youth wellbeing xfn. and now we are advocating building another horizontal oversight committee. There is lot of layers being built up on teams doing the work, plus having too much central oversight demotivates local product and research teams. I also feel horizontal efforts are hard at FB and operationally would only make sense to do for big things eg creators, youth vs smaller efforts like wellbeing.

Just some private food for thought as you decide on this.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 27, 2021 5:50 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Apols – with proposal now attached below. N

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key "Arguments to Win").

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we're not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical



things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here](#).

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]  | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG   | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)   | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | -- Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned<br>-- On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)<br>-- Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA) | -- Clear central accountability for all topics<br>-- On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR) |

| Status Quo                                    |   | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |   | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                         | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).       | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.  | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win) | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested:

problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 9/1/2021 2:21:01 AM

**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Adding Naomi to see this too.

I would view it as very low-likelihood that Mark chooses to fund more here given how over-constrained we are, so I think we're going to end up with the outcome you're suggesting anyway, [REDACTED]. If for some reason we have more funding towards well-being and I'm wrong, then we should have the deeper conversation on how to organize.

---

**From:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]

**Date:** Tuesday, August 31, 2021 at 8:02 AM

**To:** [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Chris Cox [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Thanks for the flag, will look into it.

---

**From:** Pavni Diwanji [REDACTED]

**Date:** Sunday, August 29, 2021 at 11:09 PM

**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] Chris Cox [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Fw: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Hi Adam, Chris,

I met with Pratiti and wellbeing task force.

I agree wholeheartedly with their conclusion on wellbeing overall needs more work and investment, as evidenced by several recent flareups on gaps. I am supportive of product/eng funding that they are advocating to help fill the gaps.

I advocated to them though to NOT start yet another central xfn to oversee these wellbeing efforts. We have IG wellbeing xfn. we have Youth wellbeing xfn. and now we are advocating building another horizontal oversight committee. There is lot of layers being built up on teams doing the work, plus having too much central oversight demotivates local product and research teams. I also feel horizontal efforts are hard at FB and operationally would only make sense to do for big things eg creators, youth vs smaller efforts like wellbeing.

Just some private food for thought as you decide on this.

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Friday, August 27, 2021 5:50 PM

To: Mark Zuckerberg [redacted]  
Cc: Chris Cox [redacted]; Alex Schultz [redacted]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [redacted]; Naomi Gleit [redacted]; Kang-Xing Jin [redacted]; Sheryl Sandberg [redacted]; Susan Li [redacted]; Joel Kaplan [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; Antigone Davis [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; Monika Bickert [redacted]; David Wehner [redacted]; [redacted]

Subject: Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Apols – with proposal now attached below. N

---

From: Nick Clegg [redacted]  
Date: Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
To: Mark Zuckerberg [redacted]  
Cc: Chris Cox [redacted], Alex Schultz [redacted], Pratiti Raychoudhury [redacted], Naomi Gleit [redacted], Kang-Xing Jin [redacted], Sheryl Sandberg [redacted], Susan Li [redacted], Joel Kaplan [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], Antigone Davis [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], Monika Bickert [redacted], David Wehner [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]

Subject: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [redacted] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people’s mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by ██████ which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion (█████’s narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here](#).

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                             |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Success                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| Where are we today relative to success | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|  | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|  | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|  | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/26/2021 11:03:37 PM  
**To:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**CC:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Chris – as agreed yesterday. This ok for me to send to MZ?

N

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Both Chris and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Product developments like IG Youth which have kept the conversation top of mind for policymakers.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED] which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key "Arguments to Win").

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we're not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why the proposed investment outlined below is important.

Nick

---

**From:** Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 20, 2021 at 5:01 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED], Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Adam Mosseri [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Emily Dalton Smith [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up

Hello Chris and Nick,

Since Wednesday's meeting on the well-being product strategy, following up on your feedback, we've tightened up the strategy and ask (to reduce it / prioritize) and shared the deck with + met with Pavni.

The core minimal ask that Pratiti and I recommend (which will likely not come from existing efforts) is:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

There are still a bunch of important details to align on around the "how" (e.g. operationally how this should be organized, and how it intersects with Youth and other horizontal efforts) — and we can follow-up in a forthcoming Leadership Sync on that — but Pratiti and I think it's important we get the ask in now, since we need the headcount in all cases.

Below we've provided a succinct framing for your back pocket and options for high and low staffing.

Thanks,  
KX, [REDACTED] and Pratiti

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]



If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent, and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).             | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/24/2021 11:47:23 PM  
**To:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Chris – this seems responsive to what we asked KX in the well being leadership sync last week. Do you still think I should send this – or a version of it – to MZ? I’m not clear exactly how urgent this is.

Separately I know that [REDACTED] – added here – had a good conversation with [REDACTED] who feels that we shouldn’t be creating additional XFN leadership syncs when much of the work is already streamed through her team, but I’m not sure if that has a bearing on the HC ask included here. [REDACTED]?

N

---

**From:** Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 20, 2021 at 5:01 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED], Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Adam Mosseri [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Emily Dalton Smith [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up

Hello Chris and Nick,

Since Wednesday’s meeting on the well-being product strategy, following up on your feedback, we’ve tightened up the strategy and ask (to reduce it / prioritize) and shared the deck with + met with [REDACTED]

The core minimal ask that Pratiti and I recommend (which will likely not come from existing efforts) is:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

There are still a bunch of important details to align on around the “how” (e.g. operationally how this should be organized, and how it intersects with Youth and other horizontal efforts) — and we can follow-up in a forthcoming Leadership Sync on that — but Pratiti and I think it’s important we get the ask in now, since we need the headcount in all cases.

Below we’ve provided a succinct framing for your back pocket and options for high and low staffing.

Thanks,  
KX [REDACTED] and Pratiti

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here](#).

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                             |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Success                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| Where are we today relative to success | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|  | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|  | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|  | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/26/2021 11:09:48 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

OK

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Thursday, August 26, 2021 at 4:03 PM  
**To:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up

Chris – as agreed yesterday. This ok for me to send to MZ?

N

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Both Chris and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Product developments like IG Youth which have kept the conversation top of mind for policymakers.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion [REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key "Arguments to Win").

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we're not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why the proposed investment outlined below is important.

Nick

---

**From:** Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 20, 2021 at 5:01 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED] Chris Cox <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Adam Mosseri [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> Emily Dalton Smith [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up

Hello Chris and Nick,

Since Wednesday's meeting on the well-being product strategy, following up on your feedback, we've tightened up the strategy and ask (to reduce it / prioritize) and shared the deck with + met with [REDACTED]

The core minimal ask that Pratiti and I recommend (which will likely not come from existing efforts) is:  
**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]  
**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

There are still a bunch of important details to align on around the "how" (e.g. operationally how this should be organized, and how it intersects with Youth and other horizontal efforts) — and we can follow-up in a forthcoming Leadership Sync on that — but Pratiti and I think it's important we get the ask in now, since we need the headcount in all cases.

Below we've provided a succinct framing for your back pocket and options for high and low staffing.

Thanks,  
KX, [REDACTED] and Pratiti

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [Status Quo summary below].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-

being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area, no central ownership | --Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned<br>--On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)<br>--Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA) | --Clear central accountability for all topics<br>--On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR) |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** David Ginsberg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 4/9/2019 3:50:46 AM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Susan Li [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Fidji Simo [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Tom Alison [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Background on Well-Being Contingency HC Ask  
**Attachments:** WB Ask.pdf

*PDF attached or text below:*

Mark,

As part of the contingency headcount process we are requesting additional headcount to fund the “Well-being 10x” initiative. This headcount will cover both work in the Blue App (17 heads) and Instagram (7 heads). The background, details, and potential trade-offs are below.

*[Note: Well-being and subjective well-being refers to people’s evaluation of their own lives -- in thoughts and feelings. On IG, their integrity team is also called the Well-Being team. For the purposes of this memo, we are specifically talking about subjective well-being and related areas (e.g. social comparison, loneliness, problematic use) as distinct from integrity.]*

**Background/Business Context:** Over the past few weeks, in response to requests from Chris, Sheryl, Nick and others, the team has developed a plan for how we might go bigger with our work on Well Being. We made good progress on this front in 2018 with our launch of MSI and the “Your time on Facebook/IG” feature. However, we continue to face external scrutiny on Facebook and Instagram’s impact on well being, especially around areas of problematic use/addiction and teens.

Current research (internal and external) tells us that despite all the positive effects that FB provides (e.g. meaningful interactions, belonging, social support), there is increasing scientific evidence (particularly in the US, see [here](#) and [here](#)) that the average net effect of FB on people's well-being is slightly negative. The science here is still very early, primarily US based, and relying on self-reporting. There are a lot of limitations and we have a lot to learn, especially around causation vs. correlation.

While we don't know why the net impact is slightly negative, we do know:

- Active interactions with close friends are associated with improvements in well-being, whereas more passive behaviors like scrolling/browsing and watching videos are not. → *These insights, in part, led to our feed ranking change for meaningful social interactions (MSI) last year.*
- Feeling in control of one's experiences in life, including with technology, is associated with more positive psychological effects. → *“Your Time on Facebook/ Instagram” is an example of a feature related to increasing agency and control, and (for those who used it) it led to increased feelings of control and satisfaction with FB time spent.*

We also have deep understanding around **three** negative drivers that occur frequently on FB and impact people's well-being:

1. Problematic use (prevalence: 55% mild, 3.1% severe)
2. Social comparison (prevalence: 40% mild, 5% severe)
3. Loneliness (prevalence: 36% mild, 7% severe)



We believe there is a strong need to increase our investment in these areas to make a meaningful shift over the next year and beyond. We believe we should prioritize the work as follows:

1. Move quickly in the areas we have confidence in our understanding:
  1. **Problematic use:** Given its prevalence and our confidence around product interventions (prominent time controls and goals, night mode, etc), we will tackle this area first.
  2. **Social comparison & Loneliness:** We will build a playbook (product ideas and execution plan) for each of these before moving into execution.
2. Better understand work:
  1. Focus more in depth research on understanding why there is a net negative impact and for whom, establishing a measurement approach at the product level and among the competitive landscape, and a comprehensive and prioritized list of additional areas to focus on.

***We have a two-phase vision for this work: in phase 1, we want FB/IG to be “best-in-class” among social media apps, and in phase 2, we want FB/IG to be net positive to well-being (2020 and beyond).***

**Ask:**

Our ask is for **17 HC (6 ENG)** on Blue, and **7 HC (1 ENG)** for IG broken down as follows:

- On Blue, we will accomplish the following with these resources:
  - Build tools/products to address problematic use and establish the longer term strategy in this space, so we become best-in-class among social media apps by ~mid 2020 (**+11 HC = 3 Eng, 2 UXR, 1 design, 1 PM, 2 DS, 1 DE, 0.5 CS, 0.5 PMM**).
  - Deepen our knowledge and confidence on key areas so we can unblock future work on these topics (e.g., net negative effect, social comparison, loneliness, etc.) and establish operational measurement, specifically establishing the playbooks for social comparison and loneliness by EOY 2019 (**+6 HC = 2.5 Eng, 3 UXR, 0.5 DE**).
- On IG, we will accomplish the following with these resources:
  - Understand one well-being key area (e.g., problematic use) on IG and establish well-being measurement by EOY 2019 with a potential for it to slip into H1 2020, pending hiring (**+7 HC = 1 Eng, 2 UXR, 2 DS, 1 DE, 1 PM**).

**Landscape of Current Heads:**

- Funding has been limited so far. On FB, we have a research core and a single PM. Specifically, there are about 11 heads: 6 research, 2 CDS, 1 PM, 1 half time of each design, eng, content, data.
- On IG, we have .2 researcher and no DE/DS/CDS/Design/PMs focused on well-being.
- Due to differences in the FB and IG platforms, their usage, and community member demographics - especially given the larger population of teens on IG - we believe we need to invest in resources to understand well-being on both these platforms (i.e., the learnings aren't always generalizable from platform to platform).
- Without additional investment, we are on a trajectory to deliver exploratory findings and continue our research at a slower pace (and NO product changes).

**If had to self-fund, what would trade off and what would be the impact of that shift?**

- On Blue, if we had to self-fund, the tradeoffs would be difficult. We could scrape just the eng/design/product (no UXR) to make progress on the product efforts, which would trade this off against Goodwill work, depending on some other decisions we are looking at with that team. We do not recommend this because Goodwill is critical in helping us fix our brand which is also very high priority.

- Since half of the ask is research related, if we had to self fund we could also consider “taxing” the rest of the research teams to each give up a head and move to the well-being team. That would be a difficult option as there are lot of other taxes like that being levied right now (profile+, integrity moves, etc). Additionally that would leave the other 7 roles still unfilled.
- On the IG side, given the integrity deficit already going on, this would remain unstaffed for now.

# Well-Being Contingency Fund Ask

Mark,

As part of the contingency headcount process we are requesting additional headcount to fund the “Well-being 10x” initiative. This headcount will cover both work in the Blue App (17 heads) and Instagram (7 heads). The background, details, and potential trade-offs are below.

*[Note: Well-being and subjective well-being refers to people’s evaluation of their own lives – in thoughts and feelings. On IG, their integrity team is also called the well-being team. For the purposes of this memo, we are specifically talking about subjective well-being and it’s associated areas (e.g. social comparison, loneliness, problematic use) as distinct from integrity.]*

**Background/Business Context:** Over the past few weeks, in response to requests from Chris, Sheryl, Nick and others, the team has developed a plan for how we might go bigger with our work on Well Being. We made good progress on this front in 2018 with our launch of MSI and the “Your time on Facebook/IG” feature. However, we continue to face external scrutiny on Facebook and Instagram’s impact on well being, especially around areas of problematic use/addiction and teens.

Current research (internal and external) tells us that despite all the positive effects that FB provides (e.g. meaningful interactions, belonging, social support), there is increasing scientific evidence (particularly in the US, see [here](#) and [here](#)) that the average net effect of FB on people’s well-being is slightly negative. The science here is still very early, primarily US based, and relying on self-reporting. There are a lot of limitations and we have a lot to learn, especially around causation vs. correlation.

While we don’t know why the net impact is slightly negative, we do know:

- Active interactions with close friends are associated with improvements in well-being, whereas more passive behaviors like scrolling/browsing and watching videos are not. – *These insights, in part, led to our feed ranking change for meaningful social interactions (MSI) last year.*
- Feeling in control of one’s experiences in life, including with technology, is associated with more positive psychological effects. – *“Your Time on Facebook/ Instagram” is an example of a feature related to increasing agency and control, and (for those who used it) it led to increased feelings of control and satisfaction with FB time spent.*

We also have deep understanding around **three** negative drivers that occur frequently on FB and impact people’s well-being:

- a. Problematic use (prevalence: 55% mild, 3.1% severe)
- b. Social comparison (prevalence: 40% mild, 5% severe)
- c. Loneliness (prevalence: 36% mild, 7% severe)

We believe there is a strong need to increase our investment in these areas to make a meaningful shift over the next year and beyond. We believe we should prioritize the work as follows:

1. Move quickly in the areas we have confidence in our understanding:
  - a. **Problematic use:** Given its prevalence and our confidence around product interventions (prominent time controls and goals, night mode, etc), we will tackle this area first.
  - b. **Social comparison & Loneliness:** We will build a playbook (product ideas and execution plan) for each of these before moving into execution.
2. Better understand work:

- a. Focus more in depth research on understanding why there is a net negative impact and for whom, establishing a measurement approach at the product level and among the competitive landscape, and a comprehensive and prioritized list of additional areas to focus on.

*We have a two-phase vision for this work: in phase 1, we want FB/IG to be "best-in-class" among social media apps, and in phase 2, we want FB/IG to be net positive to well-being (2020 and beyond).*

**Ask:**

Our ask is for 17 HC (6 ENG) on Blue, and 7 HC (1 ENG) for IG broken down as follows:

- On Blue, we will accomplish the following with these resources:
  - Build tools/products to address problematic use and establish the longer term strategy in this space, so we become best-in-class among social media apps by ~mid 2020 (+11 HC = 3 Eng, 2 UXR, 1 design, 1 PM, 2 DS, 1 DE, 0.5 CS, 0.5 PMM).
  - Deepen our knowledge and confidence on key areas so we can unblock future work on these topics (e.g., net negative effect, social comparison, loneliness, etc.) and establish operational measurement, specifically establishing the playbooks for social comparison and loneliness by EOY 2019 (+6 HC = 2.5 Eng, 3 UXR, 0.5 DE).
- On IG, we will accomplish the following with these resources:
  - Understand one well-being key area (e.g., problematic use) on IG and establish well-being measurement by EOY 2019 with a potential for it to slip into H1 2020, pending hiring (+7 HC = 1 Eng, 2 UXR, 2 DS, 1 DE, 1 PM).

**Landscape of Current Heads:**

- Funding has been limited so far. On FB, we have a research core and a single PM. Specifically, there are about 11 heads: 6 research, 2 CDS, 1 PM, 1 half time of each design, eng, content, data.
- On IG, we have .2 researcher and no DE/DS/CDS/Design/PMs focused on well-being.
- Due to differences in the FB and IG platforms, their usage, and community member demographics - especially given the larger population of teens on IG - we believe we need to invest in resources to understand well-being on both these platforms (i.e., the learnings aren't always generalizable from platform to platform).
- Without additional investment, we are on a trajectory to deliver exploratory findings and continue our research at a slower pace (and NO product changes).

**If had to self-fund, what would trade off and what would be the impact of that shift?**

- On Blue, if we had to self-fund, the tradeoffs would be difficult. We could scrape just the eng/design/product (no UXR) to make progress on the product efforts, which would trade this off against Goodwill work, depending on some other decisions we are looking at with that team. We do not recommend this because Goodwill is critical in helping us fix our brand which is also very high priority.
- Since half of the ask is research related, if we had to self fund we could also consider "taxing" the rest of the research teams to each give up a head and move to the well-being team. That would be a difficult option as there are lot of other taxes like that being levied right now (profile+, integrity moves, etc). Additionally that would leave the other 7 roles still unfilled.
- On the IG side, given the integrity deficit already going on, this would remain unstaffed for now.

Message

---

**From:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 4/16/2019 4:16:48 PM  
**To:** Susan Li [REDACTED]; David Ginsberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Tom Alison [REDACTED]; Fidji Simo [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Background on Well-Being Contingency HC Ask

Susan, thanks for the update. Unfortunately I don't see us funding this from Instagram any time soon, we recently ran a divestment exercise and are still too tight in a number of places.

Adam

---

**From:** Susan Li [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 16, 2019 at 8:55 AM  
**To:** David Ginsberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Tom Alison [REDACTED]; Fidji Simo [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Background on Well-Being Contingency HC Ask

Following up on the review yesterday – this was not funded, in part given the number of open heads (esp. on Blue) at the moment. Having said that, both Mark and Sheryl wanted to emphasize they think this is work worth doing (and consequently reprioritizing other things). I know this isn't a terribly satisfying answer, but we are constrained to 178 ENG heads for the remainder of the year and it's only April, so funding decisions are now far and few between.

---

**From:** David Ginsberg  
**Sent:** Monday, April 8, 2019 8:51 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Susan Li [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Fidji Simo [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Tom Alison [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Background on Well-Being Contingency HC Ask

*PDF attached or text below:*

Mark,

As part of the contingency headcount process we are requesting additional headcount to fund the "Well-being 10x" initiative. This headcount will cover both work in the Blue App (17 heads) and Instagram (7 heads). The background, details, and potential trade-offs are below.

*[Note: Well-being and subjective well-being refers to people's evaluation of their own lives -- in thoughts and feelings. On IG, their integrity team is also called the Well-Being team. For the purposes of this memo, we are specifically talking about subjective well-being and related areas (e.g. social comparison, loneliness, problematic use) as distinct from integrity.]*

**Background/Business Context:** Over the past few weeks, in response to requests from Chris, Sheryl, Nick and others, the team has developed a plan for how we might go bigger with our work on Well Being. We made good progress on this front in 2018 with our launch of MSI and the "Your time on Facebook/IG" feature. However, we continue to face external scrutiny on Facebook and Instagram's impact on well being, especially around areas of problematic use/addiction and teens.

Current research (internal and external) tells us that despite all the positive effects that FB provides (e.g. meaningful interactions, belonging, social support), there is increasing scientific evidence (particularly in the US, see [here](#) and [here](#)) that the average net effect of FB on people's well-being is slightly negative. The science here is still very early, primarily US based, and relying on self-reporting. There are a lot of limitations and we have a lot to learn, especially around causation vs. correlation.

While we don't know why the net impact is slightly negative, we do know:

- Active interactions with close friends are associated with improvements in well-being, whereas more passive behaviors like scrolling/browsing and watching videos are not. → *These insights, in part, led to our feed ranking change for meaningful social interactions (MSI) last year.*
- Feeling in control of one's experiences in life, including with technology, is associated with more positive psychological effects. → *"Your Time on Facebook/ Instagram" is an example of a feature related to increasing agency and control, and (for those who used it) it led to increased feelings of control and satisfaction with FB time spent.*

We also have deep understanding around **three** negative drivers that occur frequently on FB and impact people's well-being:

1. Problematic use (prevalence: 55% mild, 3.1% severe)
2. Social comparison (prevalence: 40% mild, 5% severe)
3. Loneliness (prevalence: 36% mild, 7% severe)

We believe there is a strong need to increase our investment in these areas to make a meaningful shift over the next year and beyond. We believe we should prioritize the work as follows:

1. Move quickly in the areas we have confidence in our understanding:
  1. **Problematic use:** Given its prevalence and our confidence around product interventions (prominent time controls and goals, night mode, etc), we will tackle this area first.
  2. **Social comparison & Loneliness:** We will build a playbook (product ideas and execution plan) for each of these before moving into execution.
2. Better understand work:
  1. Focus more in depth research on understanding why there is a net negative impact and for whom, establishing a measurement approach at the product level and among the competitive landscape, and a comprehensive and prioritized list of additional areas to focus on.

***We have a two-phase vision for this work: in phase 1, we want FB/IG to be "best-in-class" among social media apps, and in phase 2, we want FB/IG to be net positive to well-being (2020 and beyond).***

#### Ask:

Our ask is for **17 HC (6 ENG)** on Blue, and **7 HC (1 ENG)** for IG broken down as follows:

- On Blue, we will accomplish the following with these resources:
  - Build tools/products to address problematic use and establish the longer term strategy in this space, so we become best-in-class among social media apps by ~mid 2020 (**+11 HC = 3 Eng, 2 UXR, 1 design, 1 PM, 2 DS, 1 DE, 0.5 CS, 0.5 PMM**).
  - Deepen our knowledge and confidence on key areas so we can unblock future work on these topics (e.g., net negative effect, social comparison, loneliness, etc.) and establish operational measurement, specifically establishing the playbooks for social comparison and loneliness by EOY 2019 (**+6 HC = 2.5 Eng, 3 UXR, 0.5 DE**).
- On IG, we will accomplish the following with these resources:

- Understand one well-being key area (e.g., problematic use) on IG and establish well-being measurement by EOY 2019 with a potential for it to slip into H1 2020, pending hiring (+7 HC = 1 Eng, 2 UXR, 2 DS, 1 DE, 1 PM).

#### **Landscape of Current Heads:**

- Funding has been limited so far. On FB, we have a research core and a single PM. Specifically, there are about 11 heads: 6 research, 2 CDS, 1 PM, 1 half time of each design, eng, content, data.
- On IG, we have .2 researcher and no DE/DS/CDS/Design/PMs focused on well-being.
- Due to differences in the FB and IG platforms, their usage, and community member demographics - especially given the larger population of teens on IG - we believe we need to invest in resources to understand well-being on both these platforms (i.e., the learnings aren't always generalizable from platform to platform).
- Without additional investment, we are on a trajectory to deliver exploratory findings and continue our research at a slower pace (and NO product changes).

#### **If had to self-fund, what would trade off and what would be the impact of that shift?**

- On Blue, if we had to self-fund, the tradeoffs would be difficult. We could scrape just the eng/design/product (no UXR) to make progress on the product efforts, which would trade this off against Goodwill work, depending on some other decisions we are looking at with that team. We do not recommend this because Goodwill is critical in helping us fix our brand which is also very high priority.
- Since half of the ask is research related, if we had to self fund we could also consider "taxing" the rest of the research teams to each give up a head and move to the well-being team. That would be a difficult option as there are lot of other taxes like that being levied right now (profile+, integrity moves, etc). Additionally that would leave the other 7 roles still unfilled.
- On the IG side, given the integrity deficit already going on, this would remain unstaffed for now.

Message

---

**From:** Susan Li [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 4/16/2019 3:55:43 PM  
**To:** David Ginsberg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Tom Alison [REDACTED]; Fidji Simo [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Background on Well-Being Contingency HC Ask

Following up on the review yesterday – this was not funded, in part given the number of open heads (esp. on Blue) at the moment. Having said that, both Mark and Sheryl wanted to emphasize they think this is work worth doing (and consequently reprioritizing other things). I know this isn't a terribly satisfying answer, but we are constrained to 178 ENG heads for the remainder of the year and it's only April, so funding decisions are now far and few between.

---

**From:** David Ginsberg  
**Sent:** Monday, April 8, 2019 8:51 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Susan Li [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Fidji Simo [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]; Tom Alison [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Background on Well-Being Contingency HC Ask

*PDF attached or text below:*

Mark,

As part of the contingency headcount process we are requesting additional headcount to fund the "Well-being 10x" initiative. This headcount will cover both work in the Blue App (17 heads) and Instagram (7 heads). The background, details, and potential trade-offs are below.

*[Note: Well-being and subjective well-being refers to people's evaluation of their own lives -- in thoughts and feelings. On IG, their integrity team is also called the Well-Being team. For the purposes of this memo, we are specifically talking about subjective well-being and related areas (e.g. social comparison, loneliness, problematic use) as distinct from integrity.]*

**Background/Business Context:** Over the past few weeks, in response to requests from Chris, Sheryl, Nick and others, the team has developed a plan for how we might go bigger with our work on Well Being. We made good progress on this front in 2018 with our launch of MSI and the "Your time on Facebook/IG" feature. However, we continue to face external scrutiny on Facebook and Instagram's impact on well being, especially around areas of problematic use/addiction and teens.

Current research (internal and external) tells us that despite all the positive effects that FB provides (e.g. meaningful interactions, belonging, social support), there is increasing scientific evidence (particularly in the US, see [here](#) and [here](#)) that the average net effect of FB on people's well-being is slightly negative. The science here is still very early, primarily US based, and relying on self-reporting. There are a lot of limitations and we have a lot to learn, especially around causation vs. correlation.

While we don't know why the net impact is slightly negative, we do know:

- Active interactions with close friends are associated with improvements in well-being, whereas more passive behaviors like scrolling/browsing and watching videos are not. → *These insights, in part, led to our feed ranking change for meaningful social interactions (MSI) last year.*



- Feeling in control of one's experiences in life, including with technology, is associated with more positive psychological effects. → *“Your Time on Facebook/ Instagram” is an example of a feature related to increasing agency and control, and (for those who used it) it led to increased feelings of control and satisfaction with FB time spent.*

We also have deep understanding around **three** negative drivers that occur frequently on FB and impact people's well-being:

1. Problematic use (prevalence: 55% mild, 3.1% severe)
2. Social comparison (prevalence: 40% mild, 5% severe)
3. Loneliness (prevalence: 36% mild, 7% severe)

We believe there is a strong need to increase our investment in these areas to make a meaningful shift over the next year and beyond. We believe we should prioritize the work as follows:

1. Move quickly in the areas we have confidence in our understanding:
  1. **Problematic use:** Given its prevalence and our confidence around product interventions (prominent time controls and goals, night mode, etc), we will tackle this area first.
  2. **Social comparison & Loneliness:** We will build a playbook (product ideas and execution plan) for each of these before moving into execution.
2. Better understand work:
  1. Focus more in depth research on understanding why there is a net negative impact and for whom, establishing a measurement approach at the product level and among the competitive landscape, and a comprehensive and prioritized list of additional areas to focus on.

***We have a two-phase vision for this work: in phase 1, we want FB/IG to be “best-in-class” among social media apps, and in phase 2, we want FB/IG to be net positive to well-being (2020 and beyond).***

#### Ask:

Our ask is for **17 HC (6 ENG)** on Blue, and **7 HC (1 ENG)** for IG broken down as follows:

- On Blue, we will accomplish the following with these resources:
  - Build tools/products to address problematic use and establish the longer term strategy in this space, so we become best-in-class among social media apps by ~mid 2020 (**+11 HC = 3 Eng, 2 UXR, 1 design, 1 PM, 2 DS, 1 DE, 0.5 CS, 0.5 PMM**).
  - Deepen our knowledge and confidence on key areas so we can unblock future work on these topics (e.g., net negative effect, social comparison, loneliness, etc.) and establish operational measurement, specifically establishing the playbooks for social comparison and loneliness by EOY 2019 (**+6 HC = 2.5 Eng, 3 UXR, 0.5 DE**).
- On IG, we will accomplish the following with these resources:
  - Understand one well-being key area (e.g., problematic use) on IG and establish well-being measurement by EOY 2019 with a potential for it to slip into H1 2020, pending hiring (**+7 HC = 1 Eng, 2 UXR, 2 DS, 1 DE, 1 PM**).

#### Landscape of Current Heads:

- Funding has been limited so far. On FB, we have a research core and a single PM. Specifically, there are about 11 heads: 6 research, 2 CDS, 1 PM, 1 half time of each design, eng, content, data.
- On IG, we have .2 researcher and no DE/DS/CDS/Design/PMs focused on well-being.

- Due to differences in the FB and IG platforms, their usage, and community member demographics - especially given the larger population of teens on IG - we believe we need to invest in resources to understand well-being on both these platforms (i.e., the learnings aren't always generalizable from platform to platform).
- Without additional investment, we are on a trajectory to deliver exploratory findings and continue our research at a slower pace (and NO product changes).

**If had to self-fund, what would trade off and what would be the impact of that shift?**

- On Blue, if we had to self-fund, the tradeoffs would be difficult. We could scrape just the eng/design/product (no UXR) to make progress on the product efforts, which would trade this off against Goodwill work, depending on some other decisions we are looking at with that team. We do not recommend this because Goodwill is critical in helping us fix our brand which is also very high priority.
- Since half of the ask is research related, if we had to self fund we could also consider “taxing” the rest of the research teams to each give up a head and move to the well-being team. That would be a difficult option as there are lot of other taxes like that being levied right now (profile+, integrity moves, etc). Additionally that would leave the other 7 roles still unfilled.
- On the IG side, given the integrity deficit already going on, this would remain unstaffed for now.

Message

---

**From:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11/12/2021 2:35:25 AM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Well-being product strategy + headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

I am supportive of this and will follow up. As you know, we have overall budgeting issues across the board so no promises on what will happen.

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 9, 2021 10:54 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner <[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + headcount

Mark,

Circling back re: investment needed to strengthen Meta's position on well-being (see original email from Aug below).

This investment is important to ensure we have the product roadmaps necessary to stand behind our external narrative of well-being on our apps, and soon in the metaverse. This work & narrative has of course become a more critical focal point for policymakers, regulators et al in recent weeks – this is not likely to diminish going forward.

A number of us have met and agreed upon a revised investment proposal:

1. Agreement on the need to fund a central product team to organize cross-company strategy, execution, and measurement (as per our approach to other societal issues or privacy)
2. Alignment that product work must map to and support our external narrative (as part of Project Beyond)

Funding the central product team remains our biggest gap. Our original 2022 ask from Aug was 25 XFN and 20 ENG to address the roadmap detailed [here](#), which was not funded.

Scaling down, we can make necessary progress in two ways:

1. +25 XFN (and 0 ENG) to form both the central well-being product pod, and 2 topic pods within it to drive focused progress on topics like problematic use and connections. This group would create a cross-Meta well-being strategy, align disparate team roadmaps for well-being topics, and drive necessary measurement for each topic.
2. +7 XFN (and 0 ENG) would form only the central well-being pod, and would focus solely on forming a cross-Meta view of well-being strategy and existing roadmaps and gaps. This would be the bare minimum needed to meet basic policymaker inquiries.

If funded, the team will start by working with existing ENG teams operating in the space (as of Aug, ~90 ENG across Meta - ex RL - disparately working on these topics), ensuring these efforts ladder up to a coherent company strategy.

Given the increased urgency of all this since the initial escalation in August, are you supportive of funding this scaled back proposal?

Thx

N

**From:** Nick Clegg <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Chris Cox <[REDACTED]>, Alex Schultz <[REDACTED]>, Pratiti Raychoudhury <[REDACTED]>  
Naomi Gleit <[REDACTED]>, Kang-Xing Jin <[REDACTED]>, Sheryl Sandberg <[REDACTED]>, Susan Li  
<[REDACTED]>, Joel Kaplan <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, Antigone Davis  
<[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, Monika Bickert <[REDACTED]>, David Wehner  
<[REDACTED]>, Pavni Diwanji <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.

- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

#### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.](#)

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>– On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>– Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>– On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, BSH, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 8/26/2021 9:16:32 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**CC:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Nick – here is a draft wrapper for KX’s email. This is all culled from Antigone’s recent note and includes some useful links should Mark be interested.

[REDACTED]

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Both Chris and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted to you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people’s mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Product developments like IG Youth which have kept the conversation top of mind for the next year or more depending on product timelines.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will likely exacerbate these concerns and raise new ones about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

There are some positives internal developments I wanted to highlight. We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing one of the key Arguments to Win).

Nonetheless, we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why the proposed investment outlined below is so important.

Nick

---

**From:** Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 20, 2021 at 5:01 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED] Chris Cox [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Alex Schultz [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED] [REDACTED], Emily Dalton Smith [REDACTED] Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount follow-up

Hello Chris and Nick,

Since Wednesday's meeting on the well-being product strategy, following up on your feedback, we've tightened up the strategy and ask (to reduce it / prioritize) and shared the deck with + met with [REDACTED].

The core minimal ask that Pratiti and I recommend (which will likely not come from existing efforts) is:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

There are still a bunch of important details to align on around the "how" (e.g. operationally how this should be organized, and how it intersects with Youth and other horizontal efforts) — and we can follow-up in a forthcoming Leadership Sync on that — but Pratiti and I think it's important we get the ask in now, since we need the headcount in all cases.

Below we've provided a succinct framing for your back pocket and options for high and low staffing.

Thanks,  
KX, [REDACTED] and Pratiti

**Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]



If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See Options Table below]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned</li> <li>On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)</li> <li>Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear central accountability for all topics</li> <li>On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR)</li> </ul> |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent, and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).             | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11/13/2021 12:32:58 AM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Well-being product strategy + headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Ok – let me know if you hear more

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 11, 2021 11:19 PM  
**To:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + headcount

Mark tells me that [REDACTED] has raised her concerns about how this will combine with her Youth team – Adam Mosseri is trying to reconcile so it may take a little time. N

---

**From:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Thursday, November 11, 2021 at 6:35 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Well-being product strategy + headcount

I am supportive of this and will follow up. As you know, we have overall budgeting issues across the board so no promises on what will happen.

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 9, 2021 10:54 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + headcount

Mark,

Circling back re: investment needed to strengthen Meta’s position on well-being (see original email from Aug below).

This investment is important to ensure we have the product roadmaps necessary to stand behind our external narrative of well-being on our apps, and soon in the metaverse. This work & narrative has of course become a more critical focal point for policymakers, regulators et al in recent weeks – this is not likely to diminish going forward.

A number of us have met and agreed upon a revised investment proposal:

1. Agreement on the need to fund a central product team to organize cross-company strategy, execution, and measurement (as per our approach to other societal issues or privacy)
2. Alignment that product work must map to and support our external narrative (as part of Project Beyond)

Funding the central product team remains our biggest gap. Our original 2022 ask from Aug was 25 XFN and 20 ENG to address the roadmap detailed [here](#), which was not funded.

Scaling down, we can make necessary progress in two ways:

1. +25 XFN (and 0 ENG) to form both the central well-being product pod, and 2 topic pods within it to drive focused progress on topics like problematic use and connections. This group would create a cross-Meta well-being strategy, align disparate team roadmaps for well-being topics, and drive necessary measurement for each topic.
2. +7 XFN (and 0 ENG) would form only the central well-being pod, and would focus solely on forming a cross-Meta view of well-being strategy and existing roadmaps and gaps. This would be the bare minimum needed to meet basic policymaker inquiries.

If funded, the team will start by working with existing ENG teams operating in the space ([as of Aug](#), ~90 ENG across Meta - ex RL - disparately working on these topics), ensuring these efforts ladder up to a coherent company strategy.

Given the increased urgency of all this since the initial escalation in August, are you supportive of funding this scaled back proposal?

Thx

N

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED], Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li [REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people's mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back "suburban moms" has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We're already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key "Arguments to Win").

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we're not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

**1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]

**2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap

relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [See *Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an [overall one-pager for well-being product strategy](#) is here.

|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]   | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG  | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)  | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | --Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned<br>--On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)<br>--Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA) | --Clear central accountability for all topics<br>--On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR) |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment  | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>  | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely spelling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.  | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.   | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11/12/2021 7:19:00 AM  
**To:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Well-being product strategy + headcount  
**Attachments:** image001.png; image002.png

Mark tells me that [REDACTED] has raised her concerns about how this will combine with her Youth team – Adam Mosseri is trying to reconcile so it may take a little time. N

---

**From:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Thursday, November 11, 2021 at 6:35 PM  
**To:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Well-being product strategy + headcount

I am supportive of this and will follow up. As you know, we have overall budgeting issues across the board so no promises on what will happen.

---

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 9, 2021 10:54 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED]; Alex Schultz [REDACTED]; Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]; Naomi Gleit [REDACTED]; Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED]; Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED]; Susan Li [REDACTED]; Joel Kaplan [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antigone Davis [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Monika Bickert [REDACTED]; David Wehner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + headcount

Mark,

Circling back re: investment needed to strengthen Meta's position on well-being (see original email from Aug below).

This investment is important to ensure we have the product roadmaps necessary to stand behind our external narrative of well-being on our apps, and soon in the metaverse. This work & narrative has of course become a more critical focal point for policymakers, regulators et al in recent weeks – this is not likely to diminish going forward.

A number of us have met and agreed upon a revised investment proposal:

1. Agreement on the need to fund a central product team to organize cross-company strategy, execution, and measurement (as per our approach to other societal issues or privacy)
2. Alignment that product work must map to and support our external narrative (as part of Project Beyond)

Funding the central product team remains our biggest gap. Our original 2022 ask from Aug was 25 XFN and 20 ENG to address the roadmap detailed [here](#), which was not funded.

Scaling down, we can make necessary progress in two ways:

1. +25 XFN (and 0 ENG) to form both the central well-being product pod, and 2 topic pods within it to drive focused progress on topics like problematic use and connections. This group would create a cross-Meta well-being strategy, align disparate team roadmaps for well-being topics, and drive necessary measurement for each topic.
2. +7 XFN (and 0 ENG) would form only the central well-being pod, and would focus solely on forming a cross-Meta view of well-being strategy and existing roadmaps and gaps. This would be the bare minimum needed to meet basic policymaker inquiries.

If funded, the team will start by working with existing ENG teams operating in the space (as of Aug, ~90 ENG across Meta - ex RL - disparately working on these topics), ensuring these efforts ladder up to a coherent company strategy.

Given the increased urgency of all this since the initial escalation in August, are you supportive of funding this scaled back proposal?

Thx

N

**From:** Nick Clegg [REDACTED]

**Date:** Friday, August 27, 2021 at 5:30 PM

**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]

**Cc:** Chris Cox [REDACTED], Alex Schultz [REDACTED], Pratiti Raychoudhury [REDACTED]

Naomi Gleit [REDACTED], Kang-Xing Jin [REDACTED], Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED], Susan Li

[REDACTED], Joel Kaplan [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Antigone Davis

[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Monika Bickert [REDACTED], David Wehner

[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Well-being product strategy + tech headcount

Mark

KX, Pratiti and [REDACTED] have put together the proposal below for additional investment to strengthen our position on wellbeing across the company. Chris, Alex and I strongly endorse this approach, and I wanted you to see their thinking ahead of the discussions on headcount allocation.

From a Policy perspective, this work has become increasingly urgent over recent months. Politicians in the US, UK, EU and Australia are publicly and privately expressing concerns about the impact of our products on young people’s mental health. In the US, this was specifically raised with me by the Surgeon General, and is the subject of potential legal action from State AGs. We have received numerous policymaker inquiries and hearing requests.

This policy focus - at all levels of government and in multiple jurisdictions - is now being reflected in a greater push for legislation (eg, body image bills, youth design bills, etc.). It has multiple root causes, including but not limited to:

- Increased concerns about the impact of online tools during Covid-19 -- exacerbated by increased suicide ideation amongst teens during the pandemic as well as an uptick in actual suicides and other negative mental health outcomes.
- Press and policymaker focus on new product developments like IG Youth.
- Political considerations (eg, efforts to win back “suburban moms” has resulted in Congressional Republicans making youth/kids as a centerpiece of their tech agenda).

We’re already seeing that our pivot to the metaverse will raise new questions from policymakers about the impact that our FRL products will have on young people. In a recent US policy elites survey, participants (both Democrats and Republicans) expressed concerns about the potential impacts of AR/VR on young users, particularly with regard to time spent on the devices and the potential for harmful actors to target children.

The good news is we are starting to make real progress internally: We now have a strong program of research underway (led by Pratiti); we have established a Youth XFN (led by [REDACTED]) which is driving some valuable product changes; and we are organizing our comms and marketing efforts in a more streamlined fashion ([REDACTED] narrative disruption team has youth wellbeing as a top priority, and as you know wellbeing is one of our key “Arguments to Win”).

Nonetheless, we need to do more and we are being held back by a lack of investment on the product side which means that we’re not able to make changes and innovations at the pace required to be responsive to policymaker concerns. Our wellbeing work is both under-staffed and fragmented across teams, which is why we view the proposed investment outlined below as important – conscious though we all are of the numerous other competing headcount demands.

Nick

### **Well-being product strategy headcount request:**

We are not on track to succeed for our core well-being topics (problematic use, bullying & harassment, connections, and SSI),\* and are at increased regulatory risk and external criticism. These affect everyone, especially Youth and Creators; if not addressed, these will follow us into the Metaverse [*Status Quo summary below*].

KX and team developed a product strategy that will get us on track for success over the next ~2 years.

We hope much of the funding can come out of App, Youth, Creators, and Integrity teams, but a few critical things will likely not:

- 1) Establishing a central cross-Family team:** One of the core gaps right now is each team approaches well-being differently (if at all), and no one owns end-to-end success in each area across all audiences; staffing this is a pre-requisite for company long-term success, and will let us achieve more out of the family of app investments. [25 XFN Headcount]
- 2) Accelerating work around Problematic Use on FB/IG:** This is the topic where we have the largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations as well as minimal current staffing. [20 ENG for FB/IG]

If we want to make meaningful progress, we recommend at a minimum staffing these up for 2022 [*See Options Table below*]. This ask does not cover funding product work specific to AR/VR; however, if we fund the central team, it can work with AR/VR to align on the strategy and approach here as well. For more details, an overall one-pager for well-being product strategy is here.



|                   | Status Quo  | Option 1 [Minimum Recommended]  | Option 2 [Ideal]   |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Description       | No changes from Status Quo  | 1) Centralize tracking across all topics, and strategy and measurement for Problematic Use and Connections<br>2) Staff up Problematic Use product work across FB and IG   | 1) Centralize tracking, strategy, and measurement across all topics<br>2) Staff up all identified product gaps across topics in FB, IG, MSGR, WA and Integrity   |
| Incremental Asks  |   | 0 25 XFN (Central) + 20 ENG (Product)   | 40 XFN (Central) + 84 ENG (Product)  |
| What this gets us | Not on path to fully address any topic area; no central ownership | -- Central accountability for the 2 topics that are currently wholly un-owned<br>-- On path to address Problematic Use challenges (topic where we have largest gap relative to competitors and external expectations, and minimal current staffing)<br>-- Not on path to address all 4 topic areas, but may be able to accomplish more, dependent on ability Centrally to influence teams across FoA to prioritize work on these topics (e.g. Youth, Creators, Integrity, AR/VR, FB/IG/MSGR/WA) | -- Clear central accountability for all topics<br>-- On path to address challenges across all 4 topic areas across FB, IG, MSGR, WA without needing to align prioritization with other teams (excluding AR/VR) |

| Status Quo                                    |  | Problematic use   | Bullying & Harassment   | SSI  | Connections  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Success</b>                                |  | <i>People feel their time on the platform is worthwhile and empowered to manage their experiences.</i>  | <i>People feel safer and supported when interacting on our platforms.</i>   | <i>People don't associate the company with suicide and self-injury struggles.</i>  | <i>People use our products to meaningfully interact with their connections.</i>  |
| <b>Where are we today relative to success</b> | <b>Amplification</b><br>Proactively prevent and reduce the amplification of problematic aspects of each topic on platform (e.g., ranking, goaling).                                | Gaps: No guardrails; inconsistency or not available across platforms; not consistently optimized for youth across the company.                            | Gaps: Better detection of mass harassment/brigading (e.g. Euro 2020 incident); inconsistency across platforms; classifiers not optimized for youth.   | Gaps: Regulation; missing borderline/adjacent problematic content; not optimized for youth.  | Gaps: Missing high-responsibility investments; inconsistency across platforms; contradictory product investments without clear guardrails.                               |
|   | <b>Support &amp; resources</b><br>Provide people with the right tools at the right time to prevent and/or navigate <topic> on platform (e.g., controls, reflections).              | Gaps: Existing tools neither widely used nor promoted; missing high-responsibility investments; not consistently customized for youth across the company. | Gaps: Improved targeting and timely upselling of existing tools; inconsistency across platforms; not consistently customized for youth across the company. Unclear on user satisfaction with support offered. | Gaps: Some countries don't have localized content; not customized consistently for youth across the company.   | Gaps: We don't know which products and use cases are the most impactful; could do some more work on quality refinements (e.g., Graph cleanup).                           |
|   | <b>Measurement</b><br>Centralized way to measure the topic and track progress against our success state.   | Gaps: No centralized measure; don't know impact of current products.  | Gaps: Don't know impact of current products or have measurement for the supportiveness of our current products.   | Gaps: Don't have a way to define or measure progress toward long-term success.   | Gaps: No centralized measure across apps. There is little empirical evidence on the impact of our products, and which products and use cases are most impactful.         |
|   | <b>Narrative</b><br>Centralized narrative where we are transparent about all of our work, and have public advocates for it.<br><br><i>(Needs to be driven by Arguments to Win)</i> | Gaps: No centralized narrative or strong public advocates (opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse).  | Gaps: No centralized narrative; could have more public advocates for the whole family of apps.  | Gap: Addressing perceived "adjacent" problems (e.g. Problematic Use, B&H, Eating Disorders) even if most evidence does not suggest they are actual drivers of SSI. | Gaps: No centralized narrative; other well-being topics detract; no strong empirical evidence or public advocates (strong opportunity to be proactive for the metaverse) |

\* After considering 1,000+ well-being topics, we selected the top topics that key experts and policy stakeholders advocate are important for us to focus on, and where we are currently underinvested: problematic use, bullying + harassment, connections, SSI. These topics are also highly aligned with what teens want Facebook and Instagram to prioritize.

Message

---

**From:** Arturo Bejar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10/7/2021 9:37:05 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Gap in our understanding of harm and bad experiences

Hi [REDACTED], here is the note, in the message below I fixed the numbers (as the ones I had before were prior to the corrections), the different numbers do not affect the overall point. I refer to TRIPS more than BEEF by name because this was targeted to Zuck and he would have been more familiar with that name.

Thanks,  
Arturo

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]  
**Subject: Re: Gap in our understanding of harm and bad experiences**  
**Date:** October 6, 2021 at 11:59:53 AM PDT  
**To:** Arturo Bejar [REDACTED] Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED] Chris Cox [REDACTED], Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]

Arturo, let's catch up next week. I've been swamped with the Youth work and a few other fires, but happy to go through this in more detail with you. I've also been talking to [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] who have been echoing the point of the large gap between perceived issues and technically violating issues. More teams are moving to this model – the creator well-being work is a good example – but I agree we have more to do.

Adam

---

**From:** Arturo Bejar [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 5, 2021 at 9:38 PM  
**To:** Mark Zuckerberg [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Sheryl Sandberg [REDACTED] Chris Cox [REDACTED] Adam Mosseri [REDACTED] Mark Zuckerberg <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Gap in our understanding of harm and bad experiences

Dear Mark,

I saw the note you shared today after the testimony, and I wanted to bring to your attention what I believe is a critical gap in how we as a company approach harm, and how the people we serve experience it. I've raised this to Chris, Sheryl, and Adam in the last couple of weeks.

I want to start by saying that my personal experience, and what I believe, is that you and m-team care deeply about everyone we serve, and my goal in sending this is to be of service to that. It's been 2 years since I've been back part-time.

51% of Instagram users say 'yes' to having had a bad or harmful experience in the last 7 days. Out of those 1% of report and of those 2% have the content taken down (i.e. 0.02%). The numbers are probably similar on Facebook.

Two weeks ago my daughter [REDACTED] 16, and an experimenting creator on Instagram, made a post about cars, and someone commented 'Get back to the kitchen.' It was deeply upsetting to her. At the same time the comment is far from being policy violating, and our tools of blocking or deleting mean that this person will go to other profiles and continue to spread misogyny. I don't think policy/reporting or having more content review are the solutions.

There is detailed data about what people experience in TRIPS, a statistically significant survey. We ran a more detailed survey, I've attached the full age breakdown below, but here are some key numbers (these questions are in the last 7 days):

11% of 13-15 year olds said they were the target of bullying.

21% of 13-15 year olds said they experienced negative comparison.

13% of 13-15 year old responded said they received unwanted advances.

Why does someone think it is ok to post 'get back to the kitchen' or harass someone? I believe it is because it doesn't violate policy, and other than deleting or blocking, there is no feature that helps people know that kind of behavior is not ok. Another example, is unsolicited penis pictures. [REDACTED] has received those from boys too since the age of 14, and her tool is to block them. I asked her why boys keep doing that? She said if the only thing that happens is they get blocked, why wouldn't they?

Why the gap between Prevalence and TRIPS? Today we don't don't know what % of content people experience as misinformation, harassment, or racism is policy violating. We have done great work in driving down prevalence, and there will always be more to do, but what if policy based solutions only cover a single digit percentage of what is harming people?

Policy is necessary when the content is unambiguously inappropriate, yet it has many limitations. It trails behavior, the interventions are heavy and risk over-enforcement and getting the border line right is extraordinarily difficult. Policy enforcement is analogous to the police, it is necessary to prevent crime, but it is not what makes a space feel safe.

What makes a workplace, or a school, or a dinner table feel safe is social norms.

If someone goes around telling women to 'get back to the kitchen', and the only thing that happens is their content is deleted or they get blocked, don't we run the risk of normalizing bad behavior? How are people to learn to be members of a safe and supportive community without visible interventions that help set the social norms for the environment? I believe social norms also protect speech.

At dinner tonight [REDACTED] said: my car videos are getting 100,000 views, it's natural that I'm going to get a lot of hate with that. Is it? Why is it acceptable for someone to harass someone on their surface? The most powerful solution for the integrity and safety space is to affect the supply of bad experiences via the actors creating them.

I might be wrong about my assessment, and welcome feedback about any effort or data that I'm missing. I believe that it is important to get the following efforts well-funded and prioritized:

- What is the content that is causing bad experiences for our users? How intense is the experience?
- What % of that content is policy violating? (i.e. how much of TRIPS is driven by content other than what drives Prevalence?)

- What are visible product solutions that make the community better over time? e.g. actor feedback, comment covers, pinned comments, etc.

The solutions we create I believe should have the following properties:

- The person who has the negative experience should feel heard, you don't 'perceive' racism or harassment, you experience it, and you are the source of truth for that. The feedback flow should not be just about filing a report, but about understanding the experience the person is having so we can give them the right solution.
- We should empower creators, communities, and Instagram, in setting the social norms for the spaces they are a part of.
- Where appropriate we should give feedback to actors, in the belief that they are acting with good intention and might have caused unintentional harm. There can be a range of interventions that start with 'nudges' that assume positive intention. This will allow us to separate the people who would behave differently given feedback, from the ones who are intentionally causing harm. We can then approach people who are intentionally malicious with the integrity tools.

If you would like I can give more details or specifics on this. I am appealing to you because I believe that working this way will require a culture shift. I know that everyone in m-team team deeply cares about the people we serve, and the communities we are trying to nurture, and I believe that this work will be of service to that.

Arturo

Message

**From:** Arturo Bejar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10/14/2021 11:56:05 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Pre-read for our conversation tomorrow

Hi [REDACTED],

Sharing with you the pre-read of my conversation with Adam tomorrow, I will keep you posted.

Arturo

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Arturo Bejar [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Pre-read for our conversation tomorrow  
**Date:** October 14, 2021 at 4:40:38 PM PDT  
**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]

Hi Adam,

In order to make the best use of our time tomorrow I put together a short pre-read that I've vetted with the team in well-being.

**Data points (last 7 days/more than 7 days)**

Have you ever received unwanted sexual advances on Instagram?

- 13-15 year olds: 13%/27%

Have you ever seen anyone discriminating against people on Instagram because their gender, religion, race, sexual orientation, or another part of their identity?

- 13-15 year olds: 26%/31%

Has anyone done any of these things to you on Instagram? Insulted or disrespected you, contacted you in an inappropriate way, damaged your reputation, threatened you, excluded you or left you out.

- 13-15 year olds: 11%/25%

Have you ever felt worse about yourself because of other peoples' posts on Instagram?

- 13-15 year olds: 21%/23%

Questions:

- What should be the goal/number of 13-15 year olds on each of the BEEF categories?

- Are users able to express these experiences to us in the product? (e.g. for unwanted sexual advances, or negative comparison you can't)
- What would we build if >90% of the content which drives these experiences is not policy violating or borderline?

If you'd like to look at the data directly, here is the data by age:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10rR5hbK4v1W-2QmUUMSLGiUFfljgm9ngf-3gZqVJQEU/edit#gid=951724808>

I also find it helpful to put the data in the context of the questions (which convey better than our labels what people are experiencing):

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gQGpXK7UkC\\_Z7\\_C41Z8SLqb4Puom4yv4KfX0Zs6-wdg/edit#gid=2045546404](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gQGpXK7UkC_Z7_C41Z8SLqb4Puom4yv4KfX0Zs6-wdg/edit#gid=2045546404)

## Recommendations

1. For Instagram to set goals based on TRIPS/BEEF, use people's experience as the north star for the work:
  1. What would you build if the goal was to get to 1% unwanted sexual advances? Or 3% witnessed hate? Or 2% target of bullying?
  2. Change the use of the word 'perceived' to 'experienced' - people don't perceive being harassed.
2. Provide features that help us understand the issues and content that people are experiencing so that we may develop interventions/features that help them and improve the community over time.
  1. Secondary actions to block/delete where we get user experience data. This has been difficult to date because the team has been running into XFN limitations on understand efforts.
  2. Make the reporting flow, or add experiences at the beginning to make people feel heard and supported with what they are experiencing, as well as generate insights on the issues they are having.
3. Invest in features that help us learn how to develop and maintain social norms, and actor feedback.

**Can we shift the conversation into one of hope and leadership?**

- Everyone in the industry has the same problems right now.
- Prevalence-based measures, while necessary, don't create a safe and supportive community, you're always behind the latest harmful thing.
- We have few visible features that help create a safe and supportive environment for everyone.
- There is a great product opportunity in figuring out the features that make a community feel safe and supportive.
- It is possible and important to work these issues in partnership with other industry leaders and academics. We have much learn about each of these issues. I believe is possible to help create public conversation on these topics for good.

A point which might be good for you to know (which I did not put in the document reviewed by the team) is that many employees I've spoken who are doing this work (and are of different levels) are distraught about how the last few weeks have unfolded. These are people who love FB/IG, and are heart/mission driven to the work.

Thanks,  
Arturo

Message

**From:** Arturo Bejar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10/14/2021 11:46:06 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Pre-read for our conversation tomorrow

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] - sent Adam the pre-read, I added a paragraph at the bottom about how I believe this is also a retention question. The bigger the gap gets with how the world sees these issues, I believe it will become harder to retain great people. My hope is for a bigger mission than reducing certain harm by some amount, but how could this team lead the industry on this space.

I also added the negative comparison data point, the question asked is powerful, and the numbers are meaningful.

Let me know any questions or feedback, will report back after my chat tomorrow, if you'd like to talk before that I'm at [REDACTED].

Thanks,  
Arturo

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Arturo Bejar [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Pre-read for our conversation tomorrow  
**Date:** October 14, 2021 at 4:40:38 PM PDT  
**To:** Adam Mosseri [REDACTED]

Hi Adam,

In order to make the best use of our time tomorrow I put together a short pre-read that I've vetted with the team in well-being.

**Data points (last 7 days/more than 7 days)**

Have you ever received unwanted sexual advances on Instagram?

- 13-15 year olds: 13%/27%

Have you ever seen anyone discriminating against people on Instagram because their gender, religion, race, sexual orientation, or another part of their identity?

- 13-15 year olds: 26%/31%



Has anyone done any of these things to you on Instagram? Insulted or disrespected you, contacted you in an inappropriate way, damaged your reputation, threatened you, excluded you or left you out.

- 13-15 year olds: 11%/25%

Have you ever felt worse about yourself because of other peoples' posts on Instagram?

- 13-15 year olds: 21%/23%

Questions:

- What should be the goal/number of 13-15 year olds on each of the BEEF categories?
- Are users able to express these experiences to us in the product? (e.g. for unwanted sexual advances, or negative comparison you can't)
- What would we build if >90% of the content which drives these experiences is not policy violating or borderline?

If you'd like to look at the data directly, here is the data by age:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10rR5hbK4v1W-2QmUUMSLGiUFfljgm9ngf-3gZqVJQEU/edit#gid=951724808>

I also find it helpful to put the data in the context of the questions (which convey better than our labels what people are experiencing):

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gQGpXK7UkC\\_Z7\\_C41Z8SLqb4Puom4yv4KfX0Zs6-wdg/edit#gid=2045546404](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gQGpXK7UkC_Z7_C41Z8SLqb4Puom4yv4KfX0Zs6-wdg/edit#gid=2045546404)

## Recommendations

1. For Instagram to set goals based on TRIPS/BEEF, use people's experience as the north star for the work:
  1. What would you build if the goal was to get to 1% unwanted sexual advances? Or 3% witnessed hate? Or 2% target of bullying?
  2. Change the use of the word 'perceived' to 'experienced' - people don't perceive being harassed.
2. Provide features that help us understand the issues and content that people are experiencing so that we may develop interventions/features that help them and improve the community over time.
  1. Secondary actions to block/delete where we get user experience data. This has been difficult to date because the team has been running into XFN limitations on understand efforts.
  2. Make the reporting flow, or add experiences at the beginning to make people feel heard and supported with what they are experiencing, as well as generate insights on the issues they are having.
3. Invest in features that help us learn how to develop and maintain social norms, and actor feedback.

Can we shift the conversation into one of hope and leadership?

- Everyone in the industry has the same problems right now.

- Prevalence-based measures, while necessary, don't create a safe and supportive community, you're always behind the latest harmful thing.
- We have few visible features that help create a safe and supportive environment for everyone.
- There is a great product opportunity in figuring out the features that make a community feel safe and supportive.
- It is possible and important to work these issues in partnership with other industry leaders and academics. We have much learn about each of these issues. I believe is possible to help create public conversation on these topics for good.

A point which might be good for you to know (which I did not put in the document reviewed by the team) is that many employees I've spoken who are doing this work (and are of different levels) are distraught about how the last few weeks have unfolded. These are people who love FB/IG, and are heart/mission driven to the work.

Thanks,  
Arturo