EXHIBIT 34

From: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2012 11:04 PM
To: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Cc: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Subject: Re: like/share:counter issue?

Let's frame this up in a message to ▮▮▮ in a small thread; I'll touch base w/ ▮▮▮ on this.

▮▮▮▮

From: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2012 21:28:19 -0700
To: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Cc: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Subject: Re: like/share:counter issue?

That's the correct reading of the data. I was also surprised that the contribution was this large.

▮▮▮▮

On Oct 10, 2012, at 9:09 PM, ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ wrote:

> Reading this data – are we seeing from these samples are seeing btwn 18-29% likes through private messages? That seems huge?
>
> Think it makes sense to ask ▮▮▮ about it. I mentioned this to chris cox, and he was surprised that it acted in this way.
> Will these news sites see their Likes go down by 20% if we stop dong this going forward?

From: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2012 19:55:25 -0700
To: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Cc: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
Subject: Re: like/share:counter issue?

Summary:

1/ % of like button count attributed to private messages is higher than we had hoped. My recommendation would be to keep the count as is, but we should start a thread with ▮▮▮ about it to get his opinion. I'm also curious what other people on this thread who are closer to the public sentiment think. Stats below.

2/ Diff in review to prevent the same user being able to increment the like count by more than one with private message sends. In other words, just like I can personally only bump the count once by clicking the like button, I will

1

only be able to bump once with private messages.

DATA:

Looked at four domains, all of which are news sites because I figured those were what we cared about the most - nytimes.com, washingtonpost.com, huffingtonpost.com, techcrunch.com.

For each, I pulled the top shared urls on a given day (10/8). Sample sizes:
* nytimes.com => 87
* washingtonpost.com => 82
* huffingtonpost.com => 56
* techcrunch.com => 82

%, for each, of like count attributed to private messages:
* nytimes.com => 24.39%
* washingtonpost.com => 18.38%
* huffingtonpost.com => 20.91%
* techcrunch.com => 29.42%

████

On Oct 10, 2012, at 1:58 PM, ███████████████████████
 wrote:

> No worries. We were delayed on circling back with you. Thanks███
>
> On 10/10/12 1:57 PM, ████████████████████wrote:
>
>> Hey, I'll send something out later today. Sorry for the delay - was
>> waiting for a couple changes to go out to production to limit over
>> counting from the send dialog. More info soon.
>>
>> -███
>>
>> On Oct 10, 2012, at 1:40 PM, ████████████████████
>> wrote:
>>
>>> Hi███- Sheryl asked for an update on this.
>>>
>>> Were you able to look into how often people share links through
>>> messages,
>>> and if it makes sense for us to pull that type of sharing from the
>>> share/like counter?
>>>
>>> Thanks!
>>████
>>>
>>>
>>> On 10/4/12 2:49 PM, ███████████████████████wrote:
>>>
>>>> +███and███████so we are all on the same page for follow up
>>>>
>>>> ███is looking into data re: how often people share links through
>>>> messages. From there we will determine if any product changes should
>>>> happen to align with user expectations.

2

>>>>
>>>> PR will keep an eye on press coverage and continue to follow up to
>>>> ensure
>>>> press understands the distinction between Page likes/ plugin likes.
>>>>
>>>> Fyi -- an update was just posted to the TechCrunch article with a good
>>>> statement from Josh Constine:
>>>>
>>>> "Josh Constine sees it differently. 'This isn¹t a human reading your
>>>> messages, it¹s a machine scanning them. Facebook would need to do that
>>>> anyway to prevent spam. As for the result, there¹s no Like, my face
>>>> doesn¹t appear next to the button, and nothing shows up on my profile.
>>>> It¹s just an anonymous +1 on a counter, letting it more accurately
>>>> reflect
>>>> that people are interested in a website. I think we need to ease back
>>>> from
>>>> philsophical outrage about perceived privacy violations and ask if this
>>>> actually hurts us. I don¹t think this does.'"
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Thanks all,
>>>> ████████
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 10/4/12 1:34 PM, ███████████████████████████ wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> I just booked Touch Base in Building 17 if everyone wants to meet in
>>>>> 10
>>>>> minutes at 1:45
>>>>>
>>>>> Fred
>>>>>
>>>>> On 10/4/12 1:21 PM, ████████████████████████ wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> What's the issue?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I'm free right now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On Oct 4, 2012, at 1:21 PM, ██████████████████████████ wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> will be quick
>>>>>> But would love to connect
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>