

EXHIBIT 159

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

---

**From:** Dan Rose </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DROSE>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 15, 2012 10:34 AM  
**To:** David Ebersman; Sam Lessin; Douglas Purdy; Mike Vernal; Zach Rait  
**Subject:** Re: slides for BD

Here's an attempt to make slide 3 less confusing — is this better? Sam — you'll want to tweak my language but I tried to make this more intelligible for the board who is not as close to this stuff as we are

\*\*\*\*\*

Moving Forward...

**1. Baseline housekeeping:**

- Introduce an annual fee for developers -- reduce spam and recover nominal costs
- Charge developers for use of API's -- increase efficiency, reduce expenses and recover nominal costs
- \* Deprecate API's that are not valuable — if developers aren't willing to pay for it, we should not offer it

**2. Improve value exchange for non-games part of platform:**

**A. Distribution**

- Stop artificially "boosting" distribution for free — developers can buy sponsored stories if they want more traffic from FB
- \* Open up new paid distribution channels beyond newsfeed — e.g. notifications, bookmarks, messages, invitations, etc.
- \* Give developers the ability to target ads to non-connected users -- e.g. users who land on their sites/apps but don't connect, friends of connected users, etc.
- \* Launch ad network on mobile (and eventually desktop) -- help developers monetize their apps and give us a way to generate incremental revenue from our platform

**B. Data**

- Charge developers for use of API's — beyond nominal cost recovery, introduce a fee structure that will generate material revenue
- Introduce new "premium" paid API's that would be particularly valuable to certain industries — e.g. authenticity data for banking/commerce industry
- Develop partnerships with value-added 3rd-party services to supply data in exchange for revenue-share and/or equity — e.g. fraud services

---

**From:** David Ebersman <[ebes@fb.com](mailto:ebes@fb.com)>  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 15, 2012 8:02 AM  
**To:** Sam Lessin <[sl@fb.com](mailto:sl@fb.com)>, Dan Rose <[drose@fb.com](mailto:drose@fb.com)>, Doug Purdy <[dmp@fb.com](mailto:dmp@fb.com)>, Mike Vernal <[vernal@fb.com](mailto:vernal@fb.com)>, Zach Rait <[zach@fb.com](mailto:zach@fb.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: slides for BD

I think slides 1 and 2 read well and frame the discussion. I find slide 3 confusing to read but perhaps will be fine when you walk through it verbally? The appendix seems to have a lot of good information in it but I have not had a chance to really stare at it. Thanks.

---

**From:** Sam Lessin <[sl@fb.com](mailto:sl@fb.com)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 14, 2012 9:17 PM  
**To:** Dan Rose <[drose@fb.com](mailto:drose@fb.com)>, Douglas Purdy <[dmp@fb.com](mailto:dmp@fb.com)>, Mike Vernal <[vernal@fb.com](mailto:vernal@fb.com)>, Zach Rait <[zach@fb.com](mailto:zach@fb.com)>  
**Cc:** David Ebersman <[ebes@fb.com](mailto:ebes@fb.com)>  
**Subject:** slides for BD

All,

Still filling in blanks for the # of apps and cost of canvas games vs. rest-of-platform (since we just changed the designation) but here are basically the three slides I would like to use with the board on Thursday. Would really love any reaction / framing —

doug, dan, and I spoke today and the idea we were working off of (with great help from dan) was to frame it at a level of granularity /simplicity where the conversation with the BD would be productive.

Dan, I left Sheryl off this on the assumption that you will share with her tomorrow at your 1:1....

Sam