## EXHIBIT 176 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:** Tuesday, March 26, 2013 10:59 PM

**To:** Ime Archibong; Monika Bickert; Justin Osofsky

**Cc:** Sam Lessin; Mike Vernal

**Subject:** Re: Next steps w/Refresh.io & Reciprocity

How many engs/product?

From: Ime Archibong < ime@fb.com > Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 10:52 PM

To: Douglas Purdy <a href="mailto:dmp@fb.com">dmp@fb.com</a>, Monika Bickert <a href="mailto:dmp@fb.com">monika@fb.com</a>, Justin Osofsky <a href="mailto:dmp@fb.com">josofsky@fb.com</a>>

Cc: Sam Lessin <<u>sl@fb.com</u>>, Mike Vernal <<u>vernal@fb.com</u>>

Subject: RE: Next steps w/Refresh.io & Reciprocity

Yes, we'd let them have publish for #2...but every publish use case we discussed felt really forced and awkward. If I was using the app, I wouldn't publish anything.

Their team seems really talented. The app is beautifully designed. The learning algorithms and heuristics they've built (at least what they shared with me) seem well thought out and sophisticated. I bet they could do a bunch more with access to our internal data and engineers.

From: Douglas Purdy

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 26, 2013 10:48 PM

To: Ime Archibong; Monika Bickert; Justin Osofsky

**Cc:** Sam Lessin; Mike Vernal

Subject: Re: Next steps w/Refresh.io & Reciprocity

I assume that we would let have publish for #2?

Do you have a read on how good their team is? Note that I don't like the optics if us going with #2, if we ask that about acquihire right now.

From: Ime Archibong < ime@fb.com > Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 10:44 PM

To: Monika Bickert <monika@fb.com>, Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>

Cc: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>, Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>

Subject: Next steps w/Refresh.io & Reciprocity

Monika, Justin -

I met with the Refresh team again to brainstorm reciprocity in their app. To be very frank, together we struggled (and I still struggle) to identify any value they could provide to FB that would ever be sufficient to equate a reciprocal value exchange. They are taking a ton of data from us. In fact, the closest we got was if they published the professional graph (aka LinkedIn graph) to us, but clearly LinkedIn would shut them off immediately.

Optimistically, I think we have a two real options for Refresh.io:

1. Acqui-hire this team and have them work on this at FB. Reminder that the Identity team is building a similar UEX. **@Sam** - Any interest here?

1

2. Restrict their access to our APIs and data, but let them use login.

If we're not interested in #1, I'd like to move forward and signal #2 to them soon. Ideally, before they continue investing too much in FB. I want to avoid a situation where we let them launch, they get traction, and we're forced to grandfather them in when Platform 3.0 lands.

**@Everyone** -- Is my thinking off on this? Are there any other options here?

2