EXHIBIT 53

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

Samuel Lessin:
>Just came across this startup (https://rang.com/) incidentally that my cousin's long-time boyfriend started / pivoted his old company into...
>
>It is super unclear to me why this is good for us / why we should be allowing this.
>
>What terms are they violating? and how are we going to signal in the future that this is not ok (and, incidentally, can someone reach out to them and tell them to stop it)?

Douglas Purdy:
>The concept itself is not violating any existing policy that I see. In the new model, they wouldn't be able to get all the friendshave to share back all social actions the user

Douglas Purdy:
>took, etc.

Douglas Purdy:
>We could say they were a competitive social network, however or if they got big enough, invoke the size clause.

Douglas Purdy:
>Personally, I think the new model helps a great deal here, but the app could still exist, but with better value exchange for us -- today we get nothing and lose a lot.

Samuel Lessin:
>Just so I understand - what do we get in the new model of value in your mind?

Michael Vernal:
>Wouldn't lack of friends' birthdays effectively kill this app?

Michael Vernal:
>And if they could some how build a social graph and encourage gifting, they would have to publish the gift actions back to us.

Douglas Purdy:
>Exactly

Michael Vernal:
>Lastly, per Doug, I think the "competitive" policy should crib from Apple's policies. We should say you can't duplicate core functionality of Facebook without a deal. I think a gifting app is clearly duplicating core functionality.

Douglas Purdy:

>It is not a policy violation

Douglas Purdy:
>Messenger is screwed up for me....

Douglas Purdy:
>Anyway, I agree with mike.

Lee Linden:
>My recommendation would be to focus on the birthdays and life events functionality (vs. gifting) -- and prevent 3rd party apps for scrapping that data and presenting it elsewhere. That seems like core FB, part of user identity, and a key portion of our value prop to users.

Michael Vernal:
>Justin - can we compare our competitive network policy to apple's duplicate functionality policy and see if we can have a similar one?

Douglas Purdy:
>We should change the competitive network language.

Justin Osofsky:
>@Mike: Sure. I'll take a look this weekend.

Samuel Lessin:
>Ok - I hear that if we are going to have a policy about dupe functionality ...   Just short of that i can't see reciprocity of who gave whom gifts being compelling

Douglas Purdy:
>I like that better than saying competitive network in the current policy. It provides a clear acid test.

Michael Vernal:
>Isn't it moot? This app can't get off the ground without friend birthdays.

Michael Vernal:
>I have zero anxiety about this app in the platform 3.0 world.

Lee Linden:
>Another example from Amazon which launched just recently:
>https://www.amazon.com/gp/gift-central/organizer/organizerref=hol_2012browse_ffgifter

Douglas Purdy:
>Me either. They could buy ads to bootstrap, but the NUX would be terrible if your friends weren't already there.

Samuel Lessin:
>Ah - duh - good point -- I forgot we were taking away all friend info, including bdays

Douglas Purdy:
>They can still get app friends, but they have a clear bootstrapping problem. I think the app pivots again

Michael Vernal:
>Amazon is a different story because they have scale. We just need to negotiate an overall fb / amazon relationship that would cover this.

2

Samuel Lessin:
>@doug -- app friends is fine, because that is the user's list....

Lee Linden:
>I'd be interesting if they can use a globally reserved "gift" verb and we create the story.
>
>Then we can create an aggregate of all gifts sent to a user and offer a "give gift" button which ties into our Gifts product (or partners who are sharing with us)