EXHIBIT 50

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

From:	Douglas Purdy </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DOUGLAS PURDY>
Sent:	Friday, November 23, 2012 10:59 AM
To:	Dan Rose; Charles Jolley
Cc:	Ime Archibong; Mike Vernal; Justin Osofsky; Sam Lessin
Subject:	Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

+Charles who is building the deck. Ime: can you work with charles to get this in the deck?

On Nov 20, 2012, at 8:00 PM, Dan Rose <drose@fb.com> wrote:

Let's also include Flickr on the list so that we can make a decision on that

From: Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 6:32 PM
To: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>, Doug Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: RE: For review: Platform business model blog post

Agreed. Mark pinged me about Pinterest publishing recently, so T0 seems to be his focus.

I'll take a first cut at this.

From: Mike Vernal
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 6:28 PM
To: Justin Osofsky; Dan Rose; Douglas Purdy; Ime Archibong
Cc: Sam Lessin
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Subjective tier 0. Basically, the apps that Mark knows, loves, and is concerned about.

-mike

From: Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2012 18:25:29 -0800

1

To: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>, Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>, Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Great idea. Mike, were you thinking of (a) a specific criterion (e.g., MAU) that we should use to classify the top 20 devs or (b) a more subjective list based on the "tier 0" partners which Mark focuses on (e.g., Pinterest, Netflix, etc.)?

From: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 6:22 PM
To: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>, Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>, Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Cc: Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

What would be particularly interesting to me would be a list of each and every type of "social action" we'd be expecting them to publish to us. Might also be curious to know what actions on that site we would exclude (if it makes sense to call out any). This will help us establish a shared bar for what "total reciprocity" is.

-mike

From: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2012 18:20:41 -0800
To: Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>, Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Cc: Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Vernal had a good idea. Justin / Ime — let's identify our top 20 developers and put together a straw man for how we will enforce reciprocity with each of them. We need this for the meeting with Mark on Monday to help ground the discussion about what "full reciprocity" actually means from an enforcement perspective.

From: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 3:27 PM
To: Doug Purdy <dmp@fb.com>, Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>
Cc: Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Let's also add a slide on how we will manage the competitive use policy, and whether/how we will enforce differently against large developers who are over the size threshold.

From: Doug Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 10:21 AM
To: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>
Cc: Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>, Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

I think we need slightly more detail to ensure we are on the same page, but broadly, yes.

On Nov 20, 2012, at 10:16 AM, "Mike Vernal" <vernal@fb.com> wrote:

> We've spent so much time framing it and it feels like so close, that I think I would basically just adopt Mark's framing below and have a really short deck that discusses his numbered points, specifically:
>
>
> - #1 Enforcement and wording of the reciprocity policy
>
> - #3 Brief coefficient discussion (whether it makes sense to give for free for small # of friends)
>
> - #4 Mark's "News Feed" proposal below (requiring apps to give us a News Feed for the user)
>
> - #5 How we charge for excessive API usage (either per call or tiered)
>
> - #6 How we'd test premium engagement features with mobile developers
>
> - Execution plan / next steps (including when we'll come back to discuss Invitations, his #2)
>
>
> Does that seem reasonable?
>
>
> -mike

From: Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2012 07:07:05 -0800
To: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>, Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

A quick note to ensure that we're coordinated in preparing for next week's discussion:

- Blog post. Doug and I are working with Jen Taylor and Swain to update the prior draft. We'll circulate it to this team once it's ready.

- Deck? If we're preparing a deck for next week's meeting with Mark, please just let me know if I can be helpful in framing things up. Happy to work with Charles, Vlad, etc.

- Policy. There are a couple of policy issues in Mark's note: (a) implementing the reciprocity policy and (b) strengthening our enforcement approach. Specifically:

- o Reciprocity. I worked with Ali to take a first cut at this policy which incorporates Mike's concept of providing us with the option to prompt users to pull in data from FB. Draft language: "If your app requests additional information beyond a user's public profile, you must provide users with a prominent option to share the social actions they take within your app back to Facebook (such as engaging with your app's content or creating new user connections). You must easily enable this sharing functionality both within your app and by implementing our Action Syncing Protocol."

- o Enforcement. Historically, we've treated policy enforcement as a secondary function of platform. One of my top priorities is to significantly up level this function, and this will begin by hiring a manager with far different capabilities than previous folks. We're close to extending an offer to an internal candidate who fits this profile (e.g., HLS grad, a decade as a federal prosecutor, user privacy and law enforcement experience). I'm also working with Colin to develop a more proactive and strategic approach to enforcement in competitive and other key contexts. We met yesterday and he'll send an a/c privileged summary as a next step (I'll provide more thoughts in the context of his note).

From: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 6:41 AM
To: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>, Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Justin will work with Doug on this

From: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>
Date: Monday, November 19, 2012 10:52 PM
To: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>, Doug Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Yeah - I've been bucketing all these changes into something I'm calling "Platform 3.0." Specifically:

- Paid Developer Model

- Removing a bunch of APIs (e.g., all the friend ones)

- New invitations model on iOS, Android, etc.

- Removing non-TOSed Friends

- API charging above a certain usage threshold

- Data reciprocity policy

- Action importer spec

- (Potentially) one premium service, just to set the tone for premium services

4

I think we need to roll all these changes out together as a big package with heavy messaging. This will likely be similar to the Twitter changes they just launched in terms of impact on the ecosystem.

Re: GDP - I actually think we want to get those changes out earlier, since it's a big user win.

Charles + Vlad are going to own this from a PM + Eng perspective. Starting on a blog post I think would be a really useful way of clarifying what we're doing here. I think below is a pretty reasonable starting point. Maybe someone (Doug?) could update it based on Zuck's most recent note, circulate around, and then we can circulate w/ Zuck via email to see if we are correctly memorializing what he's proposing (maybe shoot for next Tuesday, after the Monday meeting where I expect us to agree on Zuck's proposal).

-mike

From: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2012 13:38:20 -0800
To: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Sorry, bad communication. I did this as an exercise to see what it would look like if we moved forward with our strawman proposal from the last meeting.

After you guys have a chance to review and weigh-in, we can decide whether it would be useful to send this to the group that met last week as a way to try to move the discussion forward.

We can also just use it as a way to start preparing for whenever a decision gets made. This exercise also made me realize that we might want to include other decisions — like GDP 3.0 and $49/yr — in the broader announcement so that we package all of the platform changes together at once for developers.

From: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>
Date: Friday, November 16, 2012 11:05 AM
To: Doug Purdy <dmp@fb.com>, Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

Yes, I'm confused too. Can we not show this to Zuck yet (I'm booked and want to read this).

FB-01368117

More broadly, I agree w/ Doug - I think we need to better coordinate how we're reviewing this stuff w/ Zuck. I want to review + iterate on this before showing it to Mark.

From: Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2012 11:03:47 -0800
To: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>, Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>
Subject: Re: For review: Platform business model blog post

I am confused. Why is the goal of this exercise with Zuck?

On Nov 16, 2012, at 11:00 AM, "David Swain" <dswain@fb.com> wrote:

> Sam, Mike, Doug -
>
> We've drafted a hypothetical blog post to help conceptualize how some of the decisions we're considering could be positioned to developers.
>
> Dan would like to show something to Zuck later today. Can each of you take a look through the following (also attached) and provide feedback?
>
> David
>
> **Next Steps for Facebook Platform**
>
> Over the past five years, our platform has evolved from an ecosystem of apps and games that run on Facebook.com. It emerged as a way for websites to personalize their experience and drive traffic, and increasingly is becoming a key way for mobile apps to be discovered and grow.
>
> Regardless of whether you've built a web or mobile app, developers typically plug into Facebook for one or all of these things.
>
> 1. Identity and registration: people can quickly get started in your app or game through Facebook login and our native authorization dialogs.
> 2. Growth: you can tap into channels like news feed, timeline, App Center, Bookmarks and Requests to reach and re-engage your users on Facebook, whether they're on the web, iOS or Android.
> 3. Promotion: you can use products like Facebook Pages and ads to accelerate and maintain growth.
>
> Over the next few months, we're making several structural improvements to take into account theincreasing diversity of apps building with Facebook and the feedback we've received from the people who use your apps. Each change is designed to make it easy to take advantage of the core value our platform provides, improve theexperience people have with apps, and build an environment that allows us to continue to invest deeply in the platform.

6

These changes impact web and mobile apps integrated with Facebook; they do not apply to games that run inside Facebook.com (canvas) where there are different user expectations. Similarly, they don't apply to mobile games that share the same app ID as a canvas game. (paragraph needs to be tuned)

User experience
Helping people quickly get started with apps is one of the core values of our platform, but it's also the area where there's been some confusion and, at times, frustration from users. The following three changes are designed to simplify the experience people have and build long-term trust.

- ? **Improving the authorization process:** We are splitting the authorization dialog into two distinct screens. By separating these dialogs, it will be easier for people to understand exactly what permissions they are giving your app. The first dialog will allow you to request permission to access the basic and extended information you need tostreamline the registration process and enable personalized experiences. The second dialog allows you to request permission to post to Facebook on behalf of someone. People can choose to enable this permission if they want to share information with their friends about their activity in an app, such as the music that they listened to on Spotify or the places that they checked-in on Foursquare.
- ? **Reducing what data is shared.** We are selectively removing data fields to make it easier for people to understand the information they are sharing with your app. Specifically, lesser used or more sensitive information such as inbox messages; friends' basic info, contact info and extended info; and the Stream API will no longer be available. People will continue to be able to share the most commonly used information to build a social app, such as first and last name, birthday, profile picture, gender, location, user ID and extended info (likes, interests, etc.). (point to documentation for more)
- ? **Helping people find their friends.** People can continue share their Facebook friend connections with your app, but only for those friends who are already using the app. This way, people can tell your app that they are friends with someone using your app, but not share their entire friend list. This better meets peoples' expectations on how their information is shared. For example, people shouldn't have to share their friends' likes and interests with an app because you would already have that information from when their friend chose to connect to your app.

Shared value exchange
Facebook Platform is designed to enable rich social apps, not to be used as a data export tool. Moving forward, if you give people a way to bring their Facebook data with them to improve the experience in your app, you also need to give them a way to share their app activity on Facebook. This preserves the overall health of the app ecosystem for users,developers and Facebook.

Practically, this means that if you ask someone to share his or her Facebook information with your app to provide a more personalized and social experience, you need to give that person the ability to share the activity from your app back to Facebook. For example, Spotify uses Facebook information to customize their experience, and they allow people to share their listening activity back to Facebook.

We've updated our policies to reflect this, and you can learn more here (link).

Premium and paid services
As many of the top iOS, Android and web apps have invested more in social, one of the most common areas of feedback is related to access to stronger support, as well as the ability to use more advanced features of the platform such as Instant Personalization and our recommendation and ranking capabilities. Today we're making this possible with three paid programs:

   ? Friend connections: We will begin charging for each connection that is revealed between two users of your app. This will allow us to invest in making this functionality as advanced and valuable as possible. (*Or lead with*: The value of a Facebook-connected user is, on average, X percent more than a non-Facebook user (reference yet to be conducted research or study). Facebook-connected users typically share more and spendmore time and money in apps. To allow us to invest in making this functionality as advanced and valuable as possible, we will being charging a small fee for each connection that is revealed between two users of your app.)
   ? Instant personalization: This program has been used by sites such as TripAdvisor, Rotten Tomatoes, Bing and Yelp to create deeply social experiences. We will continue to role this out on a whitelisted basis to approved partners. Learn more and apply here (link).
   ? Coefficient: We are creating new APIs to more efficiently surface a person's closest friends in your app. For instance, it could show which friends a person could look to for music recommendations, or friends who share other common interests. Learn more and apply here [link].

(Need to explain or link to how we'll charge/fees/specifics, as well as timing for the rollout)

We'll continue to look for ways to develop more advanced premium services that help you build better social apps and reach more users. By moving to a paid model for this advanced functionality, it sets us up to re-invest in the types of technologies and APIs many of you have asked for.

Professionalizing developer support
We consistently hear the desire from our developer community to fix bugs and provide higher quality technical support. Based on your feedback, we're launching a developer support program that will better match what you've come to expect from other platforms. Developers who integrate with Facebook will be

required to pay a flat $49 annual fee per app. In exchange, you will receive 2 technical support incidents from our developer support team. Social plugins and Facebook login (or registration plugin / pending decision) remain free and are separate from this program.

As part of the program, we will also enhance our app review process. Learn more here: (link).

<2012_11_16 PlatformChangesDS.docx>