

EXHIBIT 34

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

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

[REDACTED]

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

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

[REDACTED]

On Oct 10, 2012, at 9:09 PM, [REDACTED] 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 [REDACTED] 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 doing this going forward?

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2012 19:55:25 -0700
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
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 [REDACTED] 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
- * 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.

