EXHIBIT 167

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, February 20, 2013 2:34 PM
To:	Mike Vernal
Subject:	Re: your call tonight

I don't think this is something we should do over email. Let's discuss 1x1 and then figure out where we go from there. I'm out the next couple of weeks so I'm going to ask Belma to find time for us this week

On Feb 20, 2013, at 1:58 PM, "Mike Vernal" <vernal@fb.com> wrote:

> -Others
>
> I agree we should do this.
>
> I think a complementary issue is that I think we've been trying to carve to stark a distinction between "Open Graph" and "Games" in a way that suggests that each is a vertical that is kind of the peer of the other. I think this is the wrong framing, because it makes issues that span the entire platform feel unowned, and it also muddles our ability to talk to developers with a single, unified voice (Doug is scheduling a bunch of mobile developer events, and I think the Games team was a little miffed that they were planning to talk to Games developers at this event).
>
> I think part of this is stemming from trying to draw a really strong line where Sean could only work George + Vishu on games stuff (and, frankly, kind of ignore feedback from Doug, me, etc.).
>
> I think in addition to more clearly articulate the end state we're going to get to and how we're going to get there with platform 3.0, we should also re-clarify that there is a single team that deals with developers (platform, lead by Doug on the PM side and Vlad on the Eng side) and that Games and Open Graph are both types of apps that sit on top of that. I think that would have also been a much cleaner story with the bookmarks/notification changes, because I think it created this really weird gap between Doug + George that ultimately caused ball's to be dropped.
>
> If you just agree, let's just clarify this via email (I can draft something). If you don't, let's chat about it at next 1:1?
>
> -mike
>
> From: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
> Date: Wednesday, February 20, 2013 1:03 PM
> To: Douglas Purdy <dmp@fb.com>, Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>
> Cc: David Swain <dswain@fb.com>
> Subject: Re: your call tonight
>
> (Just us)
>
> I'm worried that we are executing platform 3.0 via piecemeal changes (notifications, bookmarks, API deprecation, etc). I think we should clarify our strategy so that people understand how all of these changes

1

fit together. My suggestion is that we communicate this internally first via a platform all-hands, then communicate externally to developers. The sooner we do this, the less thrash we will cause for partners.

From: Doug Purdy <dmp@fb.com>
Date: Wednesday, February 20, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>, Marie Hagman <marieh@fb.com>
Cc: Chris Ackermann <chrisa@fb.com>, Chris Daniels <chrisd@fb.com>, Andy Mitchell <arm@fb.com>, Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Piyush Mangalick <pman@fb.com>, Ambar Pansari <ambar@fb.com>
Subject: Re: your call tonight

We are putting together a plan to deprecate now.

Will be this semester.

We'll update you when we have the dates locked.

Marie is driving (new API PM).

On Feb 20, 2013, at 9:55 AM, "Dan Rose" <drose@fb.com> wrote:

> (+ Doug, Vernal)
>
> We're revisiting this API and use case. In the meantime, we continue to run into situations like this that technically comply with our current approach but will potentially conflict with our future approach.
>
> Mike/Doug — I know we decided to postpone "platform 3.0" until 2H, but it feels like we need to move more quickly. Agree?
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Chris Ackermann <chrisa@fb.com>
> **Date:** Wednesday, February 20, 2013 9:02 AM
> **To:** Chris Daniels <chrisd@fb.com>, Andy Mitchell <arm@fb.com>, Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
> **Cc:** Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Piyush Mangalick <pman@fb.com>, Ambar Pansari <ambar@fb.com>
> **Subject:** Re: your call tonight
>
> +Piyush and Ambar who are also helping to dig in
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Chris Ackermann <chrisa@fb.com>
> **Date:** Wed, 20 Feb 2013 11:45:33 -0500
> **To:** Chris Daniels <chrisd@fb.com>, Andy Mitchell <arm@fb.com>, Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
> **Cc:** Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>
> **Subject:** Re: your call tonight
>
>> We do offer it to all developers as an extended permission (read_stream) and it typically shows on the second screen of GDP (see here). I don't have the background here, but we had agreed to special case Yahoo! at some point to auto-grant this permission to all users that auth with FB (which is why it shows on the first screen of GDP in my screenshot below). I'm not sure who might know the history on this?

2

Chris

Thanks Chris.

Apologies for the potentially ignorant question, but I thought we didn't give partners access to a user's news feed. What are they actually accessing when they get the permission for "Access to posts in your News Feed"? This would be precisely what Apple wants (and then they'd filter it), but I thought we only had given the API to a few select partners (Windows Phone for their app, Flipboard, maybe a couple others).

Thanks,

Chris

From what I'm able to see, it only looks like they're only using friends' likes of pages/entities on FB to filter what stories get shown to a user. They do ask for a lot of data in our GDP, including access to the user's News Feed, so theoretically they could cull that for signals although I'm not sure how useful it would actually be given the chance of Y! stories showing up there enough to make a difference. I'll confirm that they aren't able to pull full set of articles your friends have shared/liked ASAP.

I've included a few screen shots below for more context.

One of their news stories where surface friends' likes:

<Screen Shot 2013-02-20 at 11.05.05 AM.png>

Their GDP (note all of the profile data they're asking for):

<Screen Shot 2013-02-20 at 11.09.21 AM.png>
They're using FB friends' birthday data to power a birthday unit on the new homepage:

 <Screen Shot 2013-02-20 at 11.06.26 AM.png>

3

+Chris

I'm in a meeting now, but Chris can answer in detail. He's working closest with the Y Product team.

From: Chris Daniels <chrisd@fb.com>
Date: Wednesday, February 20, 2013 10:00 AM
To: Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
Cc: Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, andy mitchell <arm@fb.com>
Subject: Re: your call tonight

Andy - can yahoo actually pull what articles your friends shared and liked to rank what news you see? This is what the wsj article says, but I'm not sure it's true.

If yes, then Apple may pick up on it and ask for the same feed of shared articles which is what we have been telling them we won't give them. If no, we are fine as they are just ranking by your likes and clicks on yahoo articles.

Chris

On Feb 20, 2013, at 6:47 AM, "Dan Rose" <drose@fb.com> wrote:

> Is apple going to complain that this looks similar to what they wanted to do in safari?
>
> On Feb 20, 2013, at 6:44 AM, "Justin Osofsky" <josofsky@fb.com> wrote:
>
>> Thanks. It looks like this morning's coverage of the redesign is straightforward and the changes weren't particularly significant. Y!'s core message was around personalizing the homepage experience to increase engagement. TechCrunch stated "the changes here aren't too radical, and the redesign probably won't have a big effect on how most people look at Yahoo". The WSJ (business press) was a bit more into the FB angle with the headline "Yahoo leans on FB in revamp of homepage."
>>
>> Chris is having lunch with Kearns on Thursday. We should reinforce the message that their communications approach caused an unnecessary scramble.
>>
>> **From:** Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
>> **Date:** Wednesday, February 20, 2013 6:39 AM
>> **To:** Justin Osofsky <josofsky@fb.com>, Chris Daniels <chrisd@fb.com>, Andy Mitchell <arm@fb.com>
>> **Subject:** Fwd: your call tonight

4

FYI

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Marissa Mayer
> <marissamayer@yahoo-inc.com>
> **Date:** February 19, 2013, 11:49:28 PM
> PST
> **To:** Dan Rose <drose@fb.com>
> **Cc:** Sheryl Sandberg <sheryl@fb.com>,
> Elliot Schrage <elliot@fb.com>
> **Subject: Re: your call tonight**
>
> Hey Guys -
>
> Sorry was flying and just landed now.
>
> My understanding is that our teams
> have been talking so I think we are
> hopefully in alignment. In terms of FB
> data, it's the same social signals Yahoo
> has been using to customize the
> homepage, the homepage is just
> reformatted.
>
> Will coordinate more directly on future
> launches. Happy to talk and help
> however we can if you get questions
> tomorrow. I'm in New York and
> available early. 650-776-7022
>
> Marissa
>
> On Feb 20, 2013, at 1:03 AM, "Dan
> Rose" <drose@fb.com> wrote:
>
>> Hi Marissa,
>>
>> Sounds like an exciting
>> launch tomorrow.
>>
>> We were a bit
>> surprised to learn
>> from your team today
>> about the FB
>> integration. With all of
>> our other large
>> partners, we
>> collaborate early on
>> big integrations to
>> make sure we stay
>> aligned. Let's try to

5

stay more synched in the future.

I'm always available if you want to talk - 650-521-4592.

Good luck tomorrow.

-Dan

On Feb 19, 2013, at 9:02 PM, "Sheryl Sandberg" <sheryl@fb.com> wrote:

> Marissa —
> Sorry I missed your call tonight. As I said in your voice mail — exhausted so going to sleep. I know we would like to help with your launch tomorrow

but don't know enough about tit. Dan copied here in case you want to email or talk. I will be up super early if you want to talk.

-Sheryl

sheryl sandberg | chief operating officer | Facebook

1601 willow road | menlo park, ca | 94025

sheryl@fb.com

<Screen Shot 2013-02-20 at 11.05.05 AM.png>
<Screen Shot 2013-02-20 at 11.09.21 AM.png>
<Screen Shot 2013-02-20 at 11.06.26 AM.png>