EXHIBIT 34

_				
-				
From:				
Sent:	Wednesday, October 10, 2012 11:04 PM			
To:				
Cc:				
Subject	•	Re: like/share:counter issue?		
Let's frai	me this up in a message to	in a small thread; I'll touch base w/		
From:				
	/ed, 10 Oct 2012 21:28:19	-0700		
To:				
Cc:				
Subject	: Re: like/share:counter iss			
Subject	. Net inter share to unter iss			
That's th	ne correct reading of the dat	ta. I was also surprised that the contribution was this large.		
On Oct 1	10, 2012, at 9:09 PM,	wrote:		
	Reading this data – are we messages? That seems hug	ng this data – are we seeing from these samples are seeing btwn 18-29% likes through private ages? That seems huge?		
	Think it makes sense to ask this way.	about it. I mentioned this to chris cox, and he was surprised that it acted in		
	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:co	unter issue?		
	Summary:			
	Summer y.			

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

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
- * <u>huffingtonpost.com</u> => 56
- * techcrunch.com => 82

%, for each, of like count attributed to private messages:

- * <u>nytimes.com</u> => 24.39%
- * washingtonpost.com => 18.38%
- * <u>huffingtonpost.com</u> => 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**fteen** - 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,

>>>

>>>> + **Constant for 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.

wrote:

>>>> >>>> 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 >>>>> >>>> >>> >> >

3