

EXHIBIT 75

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

From: Ime Archibong </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=IME ARCHIBONG>
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2013 7:15 PM
To: Kelly Jang; Sam Lessin; Konstantinos Papamiltiadis
Subject: Re: Quick sync on Identity?

Thanks, Kelly. Can you pls also add Konstantinos (cc'd)?

Cheers
Ime

From: Kelly Jang <kjang@fb.com>
Date: Monday, September 9, 2013 5:55 PM
To: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>, Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Subject: RE: Quick sync on Identity?

I setup time for next Monday – let me know if I should add anyone else to this meeting besides you two – thanks!

facebook

Kelly Jang | Administrative Assistant | Identity Team
Sam Lessin, Elizabeth Windram Laraki & Michael Richter
Direct/Mobile: 415-717-0620 | [✉:kjang@fb.com](mailto:kjang@fb.com)
1 Hacker Way | Menlo Park, CA | 94025

From: Sam Lessin
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2013 1:34 PM
To: Ime Archibong; Kelly Jang
Cc: Konstantinos Papamiltiadis
Subject: Re: Quick sync on Identity?

Cool... Let's do it when we are next both free! Looking forward!

From: Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Date: Monday, September 9, 2013 4:13 PM
To: Kelly Jang <kjang@fb.com>
Cc: "Error getting data. Data most likely not set. Error getting data. Data most likely not set." <sl@fb.com>, Konstantinos Papamiltiadis <kpapamiltiadis@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Quick sync on Identity?

Perfect timing. I think we should connect this week or early next week. I'd like at least 30mins, but could do an hour. I'm only in MPK on Wednesday this week, but Mon or Tuesday next week would be great.

Sam - We could use this meeting to discuss your roadmap and give you a recommendation on Refresh.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 9, 2013, at 4:11 PM, "Kelly Jang" <kjang@fb.com> wrote:

Hi Sam/Ime – let me know if you want me to setup time for this week – how long do you need? Thx!

facebook

Kelly Jang | Administrative Assistant | Identity Team
Sam Lessin, Elizabeth Windram Laraki & Michael Richter
Direct/Mobile: 415-717-0620 | [✉:kjang@fb.com](mailto:kjang@fb.com)
1 Hacker Way | Menlo Park, CA | 94025

From: Sam Lessin
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2013 6:57 AM
To: Ime Archibong
Cc: Konstantinos Papamiltiadis; Kelly Jang
Subject: Re: Quick sync on Identity?

Yes — let's talk when I am back... my gut is pretty strongly that we should shut down access to friends on lifestyle apps... because we are ultimately competitive with all of them and they leak data... but let's talk more

S

From: Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, August 27, 2013 6:54 AM
To: "Error getting data. Data most likely not set. Error getting data. Data most likely not set."
<sl@fb.com>
Cc: Konstantinos Papamiltiadis <kpapamiltiadis@fb.com>, Kelly Jang <kjang@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Quick sync on Identity?

We can probably wait until you get back, so that we can get the full version. Don't want to rush you. Until then, we'll just caveat our thinking/recommendations to be contingent on syncing with you and the team.

From: Sam Lessin <sl@fb.com>
Date: Tuesday, August 27, 2013 6:50 AM
To: Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Cc: Konstantinos Papamiltiadis <kpapamiltiadis@fb.com>, Kelly Jang <kjang@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Quick sync on Identity?

Hey Ime -- I am about to go out of town for 10 days or so... but would love to chat about this. Can this wait that long / until I am back or should we hop on the phone?

sam

From: Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>
Date: Monday, August 26, 2013 10:44 PM
To: "Error getting data. Data most likely not set. Error getting data. Data most likely not set."
<sl@fb.com>
Cc: Konstantinos Papamiltiadis <kpapamiltiadis@fb.com>
Subject: Quick sync on Identity?

Hey Sam – We're beginning to make decisions about how to navigate the different categories of partners during the Platform 3.0 changes being announced in Q4. We won't be able to make sound decisions on how

to treat Identity/Lifestyle platform apps without the latest understanding your team's roadmap/vision. Can I grab 15mins with you this week or is someone on your team we should connect with?

From: Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>

Date: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:45 AM

To: Konstantinos Papamiltiadis <kpapamiltiadis@fb.com>

Cc: Jackie Chang <jackie@fb.com>, Chris Daniels <chrisd@fb.com>, Simon Cross <si@fb.com>

Subject: Re: T0/Special Cases for P3 consideration

Thanks for driving this work, KP/Jackie/Simon. This is nuanced stuff to think through, so I'm glad there are a couple of us thinking about it.

A couple thoughts:

1) My sense is that we'll need to talk to multiple stakeholders before making decisions in the Strategic bucket. We should collectively form opinions on as many as possible, but I think there will be other folks that will push in opposite positions, e.g. ppl might not be so keen to let Path have the permission.

2) Lifestyle. To make decisions on what we strategically should/shouldn't support, do you feel like we have a strong grip on the Identity teams' product focus and direction? You might have been able to bridge that gap in the last couple of weeks, but if you haven't we should find time with Sam or Matt soon. I think clear understanding from them is critical to make the right decisions here.

Thanks again for driving this, folks!

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 21, 2013, at 5:09 PM, "Konstantinos Papamiltiadis" <kpapamiltiadis@fb.com> wrote:

+ Simon

Thanks a lot, Jackie. This is great – I have included the additional info for the strategic partners in the attached spreadsheet as well (for completeness).

A little update from my end, and how I think we should tie this to what Jackie has put together. Simon managed to pull a list of 40k+ apps that request and make use of the friends_permissions. You can see all of those apps in the attached. The most interesting data points having reviewed the top 250 apps are the following (I took the liberty to make a recommendation as well btw – the numbers in the brackets are the percentage of the apps reviewed under this category):

1/ Games (25%): All games request access to friends lists and on top of this friends_games_activity. The main reason is user acquisition through social referral. Typical example is Candy Crush, invite your friends to get an extra 5 lives. Removing access to the full friends list for those app will seriously affect this vertical and how they see FB as a platform for growth via organic and paid for channels. My recommendation is: KEEP ACCESS

2/ In-house App/ Mobile (12.5%): No brainer this one, we need to maintain access for all our apps as well as the "approved mobile ones". Recommendation: KEEP ACCESS

3/ Strategic (12.5%): From MSFT, to Yahoo!, to Pinterest, Path, Klout and the likes. Some of them should obvious not have access such as Myspace, Twitter, Youtube, etc. In particular

for Strategic partners we should use the framework developed by Jackie.

RECOMMENDATION: User Jackie's framework

4/ Comms (6%): Unlike the other audit, a lot more Comms apps appear in this list. If we restrict access to user's friends that already use the app we would seriously affect the growth of their business. However, I think we need to take a hard stance on this one and don't offer any exceptions given they are not contributing with edges and/or NEKO spend. Recommendation is: REMOVE ACCESS

5/ Lifestyle (18%): Surprising a lot apps listed here, mostly focused on Dating, and to a lesser extend on social influence (this was the dominant category for newsfeed inside Lifestyle). The use of Friends list is totally justified here, if I may say. I would love to know if Girl A is a friend of a friend before I approach her and ask her to meet – I suspect this use case is even more important for female users of those apps that want to have a degree on confidence on the quality of their data. My recommendation is: KEEP ACCESS. This may surprise you, but I am working on a deck to assess the opportunity for this vertical and I think besides NEKO, we can really tap into this vertical and improve the Identity data we hold for our users, while increase our revenues. My plan was to finish this before the end of the week (when I am off on holidays), but most probably I will conclude it when I am back.

6/ Photosharing (7%): Also a surprising number of apps fall under this category. Friends list is core to sharing photos and video with people that don't necessarily use the app. Us removing full access to the friends list would require significant changes from those devs. Recommendation is: REMOVE ACCESS

7/ Astrology (4%): Considerable number of apps on this vertical. They need access to friends bdays to come up with predictions. They products will be broken without this, however, I am not sure if it's a vertical that makes sense for us. Recommendation is: REMOVE ACCESS

8/ Media/Music/Books/Fitness (7%): Invite friends, mention tagging are the main use case here. However I don't think we should allow them access to this and we should treat partners and devs in this vertical fairly with no exceptions. Recommendation is: REMOVE ACCESS

9/ Unknown and Replicas (8%): Most of the unknown are in fact developed by the same PMD, investigating. In any case, those apps should not be able to access the full friends lists anyway. Recommendation is: REMOVE ACCESS

As a general note, I think we need to carry on with this exercise to figure if there are more apps falling under different verticals that we have not identified yet, before we can make a decision for all the apps in this vertical. For both the Newsfeed and the Friends permission audit, we can use Jackie's framework to assess KEEP/REMOVE for those partner falling under the Strategic tabs and then make up a decision based on the criteria outlined by Jackie below.

Let me know what you think,

kp

From: Ime Archibong <ime@fb.com>

Date: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:31 AM

To: Jackie Chang <jackie@fb.com>

Cc: Chris Daniels <chrisd@fb.com>, Konstantinos Papamiltiadis <kpapamiltiadis@fb.com>

Subject: Re: T0/Special Cases for P3 consideration

Thanks, Jackie. Glad you two linked up on this work. Looks like you have the right buckets flagged. One nitpick suggestion would be to consolidate the last two categories in the risk assessment tab under some term that represents "significant partner thrash." We know that there is going to be some partner thrash coming out of these changes, but we're just looking to minimize it and navigate it thoughtfully.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 21, 2013, at 2:30 AM, "Jackie Chang" <jackie@fb.com> wrote:

Ime & Chris,

Working with KP to further synthesize P3 impact by breaking out T0 partners with non-standard agreements and specific categories of impact that we should address. KP is working on the pulling the same analysis of the friend data, but we're also working in parallel to parse out key partnerships/scenarios that we should be solving for:

<https://docs.fb.com/sheet/ropen.do?rid=osbge9fce0156e72340bc9b80ea4fa6bdc2f8>

T0 Tab:

- Partners with non-standard agreement and their backward compatibility clause.
- Existing integrations impacted
- Future integrations in planning

Risk Assessment Tab:

- PR risk: Potential partners/cases that may cause negative press
- Strategic Value: Key integrations that use read stream or friend data and drive value to fb. Should decide if we allow certain use cases that are of strategic value to fb.
- Competitive/Not Useful to FB: Key integrations that are competitive or drive little value to fb. Good that we're removing, but may need some additional considerations on wind-down time.
- Major Business Disruption/Kill: Noticeable integrations who's whole business is built on stream or friend data. Should be part of PR flag.
- In the Pipeline: Partner integration in the works where they've been working with someone at fb. This may be difficult to message as our sales team went to some of these partners a pitched and opportunity that they worked with them closely on.

This should be complete by EOW; however, Constantin will be using this on Thurs for a discussion with Vernal on how to tackle edge cases. Let us know of any feedback.

Thanks!
Jackie

<All apps with friends permissions.xlsx>