

Metadata

<b>Account</b>	gus@uber.com;	SEMANTIC
<b>All Custodians</b>	Fuldner, Gus;Hazelbaker, Jill;	SEMANTIC
<b>All Paths</b>	Fuldner, Gus: \Multi Custodian Gmail\EDISCO-23472_Gmail-13.zip\EDISCO-23472_Gmail--gus@uber.com-zSSag6.mbox; Fuldner, Gus: \Multi Custodian Gmail\EDISCO-23472_Gmail-13.zip\EDISCO-23472_Gmail--gus@uber.com-zSSag6.mbox; Hazelbaker, Jill: \JCCP_EDISCO-23992\JCCP_EDISCO-23992_Export-36.zip\JCCP_EDISCO-23992_Export--jill@uber.com-YkiEpW.mbox; Hazelbaker, Jill: \JCCP_EDISCO-23992\JCCP_EDISCO-23992_Export-36.zip\JCCP_EDISCO-23992_Export--jill@uber.com-YkiEpW.mbox	SEMANTIC
<b>Application</b>	RFC822 Email Message	SEMANTIC
<b>Begin Family</b>	UBER_JCCP_MDL_003682972	SEMANTIC
<b>Confidentiality</b>	Confidential	SEMANTIC
<b>Date Created</b>	03/15/2023 1:18 pm	SEMANTIC
<b>Date Modified</b>	03/15/2023 1:18 pm	SEMANTIC
<b>Document Type</b>	Email	SEMANTIC
<b>End Family</b>	UBER_JCCP_MDL_003682975	SEMANTIC
<b>File Path</b>	\Multi Custodian Gmail\EDISCO-23472_Gmail-13.zip\EDISCO-23472_Gmail--gus@uber.com-zSSag6.mbox	SEMANTIC
<b>File Size</b>	59617	SEMANTIC
<b>Hash Value</b>	e3303dd3eeca92366ecfd01f660555	SEMANTIC
<b>Hidden Content</b>	No;	SEMANTIC
<b>ILS All Bates</b>	UBER_JCCP_MDL_003682972;UBER_JCCP_MDL_003682973;UBER_JCCP_MDL_003682974;UBER_JCCP_MDL_003682975	SEMANTIC
<b>ILS Document Date</b>	03/15/2023	SEMANTIC
<b>ILS Prod Date</b>	3/22/2025	SEMANTIC
<b>ILS Prod Vol</b>	JCCP_MDL135	SEMANTIC
<b>Other Custodians</b>	Fuldner, Gus;Hazelbaker, Jill;	SEMANTIC
<b>Primary Date</b>	03/15/2023 1:18 pm	DOC_TYP E_ALIAS
<b>Production Volume</b>	JCCP_MDL135;	SEMANTIC
<b>Redacted</b>	Yes	SEMANTIC
<b>Sort Date</b>	03/15/2023 1:18 pm	SEMANTIC

Message

---

**From:** Camiel Irving [camiel@uber.com]  
**Sent:** 3/15/2023 1:18:02 PM  
**To:** Andrew Macdonald [mac@uber.com]; Gus Fuldner [gus@uber.com]; Jill Hazelbaker [jill@uber.com]; Tony West [twest@uber.com]  
**Subject:** Fwd: [ACP] Women Rider Preferred - US Decision

FYI on WRP for the US.

We won't be able to scale the feature to any T10 cities any time soon, but even a small pilot will have significant PR value according to Jill's team.

I believe that PR value is worth the risk and financial cost, because a big announcement can catalyze attention to all of the features we're bundling to support women earners.

In order to get the absolute max value out of the announcement, I want to launch the WRP pilot AFTER we've made progress on the the balance of features in the bundle. Those features will move the needle on women earner engagement and retention, and the WRP announcement will be an acquisition lever.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Jenna Tonino <jenna.tonino@uber.com>  
**Date:** Wed, Mar 15, 2023 at 9:01 AM  
**Subject:** [ACP] Women Rider Preferred - US Decision  
**To:** Camiel Irving <camiel@uber.com>, Liza Winship <liza@uber.com>, Daniel Kolta <dkolta@uber.com>, Greg Brown <gbrown@uber.com>, Natasha Weaser <nweaser@uber.com>, Natalia Galvez <natalia.galvez@uber.com>, Adam Blinick <blinick@uber.com>, Andrew Hasbun <andrew.hasbun@uber.com>, Andrew Remis <aremis@uber.com>, Srishti Bajaj <bajaj@uber.com>, Brooke Anderson <brooke.anderson@uber.com>, Elise Maiolino <maiolino@uber.com>, Jennifer Handley <handley@uber.com>, Rebecca Payne <rebecca.payne@uber.com>, Randall Haimovici <rhaimovici@uber.com>, Scott Binnings <binnings@uber.com>, Sunny Wong <sunny.wong@uber.com>, Arda Zuber <arda@uber.com>, Emilie Boman <eboman@uber.com>, Varun Harchekar <varunh@uber.com>, Brady King <bradyk@uber.com>

*Attorney-Client Privileged*

All,

Thank you for your time, efforts, and patience over the past three months. Camiel's decision on WRP for the US, along with notes and a recap of Friday's WRP call, can be found below and linked [here](#). Please let me know if there are any questions.

Best,  
Jenna  
--

**Camiel's Decision**

**Hold on proceeding with WRP in the US at this time.** Revisit the discussion and the plan to pilot once we have made progress with the broader Women Earners plan and have a more robust roadmap of sustainable features for women earners that we can launch ahead of or alongside WRP (as opposed to leading with WRP at the beginning of our women earner’s effort). Fully recognize and appreciate the PR impact WRP could have, however the supply needed to clear the legal risk is substantial; we haven’t seen similar increases other than at new city launches. While WRP shows signal on adoption and improving safety, at this point don’t have confidence that the exposure risk will be outweighed by the PR moment or that WRP will add women to the platform in a manner that is sticky / has staying power. We should first lay the groundwork to improve the platform for women earners via lower risk, more sustainable means, then consider following with WRP as an additional feature for the cohort.

**AI:** Jenna to set up time to present the US Women Earners plan to Camiel before EO March.

Team	Summary & Meeting Notes
Legal	<h1>REDACTED - PRIVILEGED</h1>
Comms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See it as a big PR opportunity</li> <li>• WRP’s reception in the court of opinion is a matter of opinion, not a foregone conclusion</li> <li>• Business upside may be unproven but you can’t get US data until you experiment with</li> <li>• Would roll out with a robust Comms and Policy engagement, and creative storytelling - potentially make it intentionally provocative</li> <li>• When you look at WRP vs BOR, these happening at two very different “moments’ in time and are not an apples to apples comparison</li> <li>• Would not push non-binary or trans gender issues in the headlines; more of the fine print</li> <li>• Expect that allies would be neutral but not negative; even if there was an explosive reaction we’re not certain that would happen and we would want to push the envelope, should be trying something a little different</li> <li>• With opponents like the ACLU and attorney general, indicating displeasure is not necessarily opposition; criticism doesn’t take away from the overall broader reputational benefit</li> <li>• While we’re going to make a splash, in the grand scheme we’re not that important.</li> <li>• WRP will have safety undertones even though we will not be leading with safety. For critics to come out against a feature that has an obvious safety undertone, they would be taking a political risk that could galvanize women against them.</li> </ul> <p><i>Camiel’s question: What sort of media pushback should we expect? Ex. Looking at a Fox News article addressing medical school admissions criteria using race to create inclusive classes; can</i></p>

	<p><i>agree that medical school is also not that important - nevertheless the argument exists and has a place in a broader anti-inclusion conversation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foresee some media outlets like Fox taking issue, but may see moderates come out on the other side</li> <li>• Would not be seen as “woke for the sake of being woke” just to take a stance - instead, it’s in service of women</li> </ul>
Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tenuous path to expansion. Advocating for legislative changes is a multi-year effort, and in some states may be a possibility (dependent on resources and business prioritization).</li> <li>• No state is without risk, although policy has identified lower risk targets based on stakeholder engagements.</li> <li>• To move beyond a pilot we would need metrics to show that we are actually making change for women earners.</li> <li>• We are confident we can land a small pilot, with a positive women’s empowerment narrative, among key stakeholders/ NGOs, where the promoters outweigh detractors.</li> <li>• Bringing along civil liberties organizations is going to be challenging as they are fundamentally concerned about a slippery slope.</li> <li>• Whether it is WRP or broader work on women earners, it is important to note that attracting and retaining women earners is not a problem that is unique to Uber, women’s participation in the transportation sector is low relative to other sectors. Although Uber is well positioned to be a leader in this space, there are a number of external barriers to contend with. Change will take time, and capturing that change numerically will also take time.</li> </ul>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Haven’t done any clean synthetic controls given that was never the goal in any of the regions we have launched., We have not seen these levels of supply increase that we would need in the US to clear the legal costs, though note that the regions we have launched in have not had strong marketing or external marketing pushes to attract new drivers.</li> <li>• Would be valuable to see a long term Policy push, modeled after exceptions in AUS and CAN.</li> </ul>
US Earner Ops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could strive to hit women supply growth targets through both newly added drivers and increase in supply hours</li> <li>• Seeing qualitative reports of depressed earnings from ANZ, where only 2-3% of drivers are women and when they have WRP on are servicing 50% (assumed) of the population; expect that if we launch this in the US would see similar or worse earnings</li> <li>• While both current and new earners could turn off WRP if they feel it’s not suitable for them, new earners may not have the earnings context to understand what’s affecting their earnings; this may affect their stickiness on the platform.</li> <li>• Furthermore, it would be difficult to lead with empowerment messaging if we are taxing women in exchange for their safety.</li> </ul>

--  
Jenna Tonino  
Manager | Women Earners



--  
Camiel Irving *she/hers*  
RGM, US & Canada Mobility

[camiel@uber.com](mailto:camiel@uber.com) | 202.300.6927

