

## EXHIBIT 60

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

---

**From:** Mike Vernal </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MVERNAL>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 23, 2014 10:11 PM  
**To:** Mike Vernal; George Lee; Ling Bao; Alex Himel; Jake Peterson; Douglas Purdy  
**Subject:** Message summary [id.596671953737728]

Douglas Purdy:  
>Sharing meeting tomorrow.

Douglas Purdy:  
>I am just now getting up to speed on this meeting.

Douglas Purdy:  
>george: i sent you a msg, but you could be sleeping.

Douglas Purdy:  
>mike tells me that we are working on numbers. would love to know what we are pulling together, what the current agenda is and how i can help?

Jacob Peterson:  
>Ling currently has that

Ling Bao:  
>Doug, we are pulling together slides that analyze the impact of removing implicit app stories on revenue and total platform distribution. i.e. will removing implicits kill platform?  
>  
>will have first half of slides for you in 30

Ling Bao:  
>my slides will be on revenue impact  
>Jake's pulling together estimates on total distribution impact  
>  
>Jake - when do you think that piece will be ready?

Jacob Peterson:  
>That will be unfortunately pretty late this evening. I think enough  
>time for review first thing tomorrow before you head in at 10

Jacob Peterson:  
>Just processing time and such

Alex Himel:  
>Will we have stuff that for a given set of apps (prob Instagram and Pinterest), estimates the % loss to their distribution?

Jacob Peterson:  
>Yup

Ling Bao:

>Doug - here's analysis from Jake on revenue impact of removing implicit sharing. Circulated w/ Himel and others yesterday to clean up.

>

>tl;dr

>/ Our fairly pessimistic model projects a loss of \$160M or 5.2% of

>annual canvas revenue / Mafia Wars, FarmVille, FarmVille 2, Kingdoms of Camelot are projected to lose > 10% of their TPV. Other games will lose less than 10% and many games will feel negligible impact.

>/ However, any model for a system where there's so much feedback and

>network efforts is brittle / Looking empirically, feed distribution

>declines in 2013 due to ranking changes did not correlate with

>significant revenue loss

>

>In short, there's risk of noticeable revenue downside especially in a few games that rely heavily on feed. It's impossible to model the exact amount of risk. Thus, I think the decision matrix looks something like this for games:

>

>If we think this risk is tolerable: remove implicits for games

>

>If we think it's tolerable for the ecosystem but not specific titles

>that may lose > 10% of their revenue: remove implicits for games,

>except for a few titles that stand to lose > 10% of their revenue

>

>If we think it's not tolerable: don't remove implicits for games

Ling Bao attached Implicit Sharing Canvas Impact.pptx

Ling Bao:

>Alex - following up on our chat yesterday. I tried to look at each game

>to see which use stream publish implicitly vs. explicitly. It took a

>very long time and i couldn't get many of the games to publish at all

>at least in the initial levels. I will try playing w/ the games some

>more to see which ones i can determine as implicit stream publishers

>vs. not

Alex Himel:

>heh i can honestly never get these games to publish when i truly do

>want them to

Douglas Purdy:

>ling: thanks for the context. to probe a little more. have we already set context that we are ok removing OG implicit stories?

Ling Bao:

>no - we told Nowak / Cox this needed to be escalated and discussed.

Jacob Peterson:

>ahh with george out

Jacob Peterson:

>should add vishu

Douglas Purdy:

>In that case, what do we think about saying "this is really about stream.publish, we are ready to turn off OG and the plan is in backup"?

Ling Bao:

>you're ok w/ killing ~1/3 of feed traffic? (implicit og is 1/3 and

>stream publish is 1/2)

>

>even if so, i think Cox / Nowak would push back and say they want to

>kill all implicits

>

>so what would you want to do for stream publish?

Ling Bao:

>@Alex - of the top 10 games that'd be most impacted if we removed implicits + stream publish, 6 get 90%+ traffic from implicit og \_or\_ implicit stream publish, 4 i couldn't get any publish to happen at n00b levels.

>

>i think this makes sense. a rational dev should publish implicitly as

>much as possible for distribution benefit

Alex Himel:

>That traffic number is total traffic or just feed traffic?

Ling Bao:

>Feed

Alex Himel:

>Do we know how that compares in absolute numbers to what they get from other stuff like requests?

Ling Bao:

>so if you look at slide 5, you can see the impact of lost implicit +

>stream publish feed traffic on tpv for those top games. this actually

>gets at the bottom line in terms of \$ rather than looking at the

>traffic distribution

>

>i made the comment above to address your feedback yesterday that some of these apps may be using stream publish explicitly so we didn't need to factor stream publish into their lost traffic. but apparently those that stream publish do so implicitly.

George Lee:

>Sorry...catching up on this thread now...

>

>1/ According to Jake 92% of feed installs are implicit OG. That smells right. @jake - how many of those are our is-playing stories vs. actual OG publishes by the developers?

>

>2/ Another important piece of context right now is that we're trying desperately to work with the feed team on better ranking for feed stories. Feed installs have dropped 75% since the beginning of the year. Re-engagement traffic has dropped by 50%. AND we're being told that we might get "priced out" of feed due to direct revenue value models for advertising. We are now regularly below 10M installs daily overall and while that may not show up in the revenue numbers right now, the longer term impact of lost installs could result in revenue losses that don't show up until later.

>

>3/ I think we're also missing the impact to developer sentiment (not just the quantitative losses of their stories). I get emails frequently (and sat down with some important and unhappy devs this week) about how feed distribution is

inconsistent and dying. You have to remember that our partner managers are still selling products that we ask them to sell, so when it comes to feed integration we're still telling people to use OG. The last f8 was all about implicit OG, so while we may have decided amongst ourselves that this is no longer the future without an alternative we don't have anything to tell current devs (so partners continue to tell them to use OG and they continue to integrate it). I believe we're at a tipping point here and if we don't manage this correctly, people will leave canvas at an accelerated pace just because we're thrashing them.

>

>4/ I'm actually not a fan of implicit sharing and believe we need to shut it down, but I do think we're being irresponsible to our developers if we just flip the switch and say we're sorry (I expressed this to Nowak last week). We cannot be a platform that developers believe in if we keep ripping band-aids on a whim. IMHO, we should be breaking change this OR lower the distribution over a window of time while we figure out how to offset the losses with some other distribution channel or better ranking of explicit shares.

Ling Bao:

>2/ agree George, there's risk of network effects and long term effects.

>that's why this model is ultimately brittle as noted above

>

>4/ i don't think we're discussing the timing yet. the first question

>we're trying to answer is, can we kill implicit sharing at all (w/ or

>w/o a long breaking change window) while preserving platform

George Lee:

>re: 4/

>Let's be clear. I think this conversation is not about whether we should turn off implicit sharing...we're talking about HOW we're going to turn off implicit sharing. And IMHO, we need to do it in a way that shows respect for our partners given that we sold them on OG in the last f8 and that they put lots of time into building these integrations. The reality is that the action itself is going to cause more pain than the traffic itself might cause.

Ling Bao:

>i had not assumed we would turn off implicit sharing, but defer to Doug

>on whether this is a given at this pt

George Lee:

>5/ Not sure if you guys are aware but the engagement team also wants to remove action links in the Lightstand launch. Again, this is something they were going to "just do"...another example of us being a bad partner to our devs.

>

>re: implicit

>In talking to Nowak, Cox wants to kill it and no one on the platform side really is an advocate for it. We're defending it as a mechanism to not hurt partners, not because we think it is a good product.

George Lee:

>(at least that is my interpretation)