Outlook E-mail

From: ▮▮▮▮▮▮

Sent: 4/1/2012 4:11:40 PM

To: ▮▮▮▮▮▮ Chris Cox; Mike Schroepfer; ▮▮▮▮▮▮ Mark Zuckerberg

Subject: Re:

I personally am pretty in favor of this approach in life generally... I would love to be far more aggressive and nimble in copying competitors at the interface / last mile level -- and far more willing to launch early and then cut or double-down on an ongoing basis.

The only caveat in my mind is being really deliberate about the layers where we are being nimble & fast vs. the lower-down frameworks that should move more slowly and deliberately. The way I think about things, consider FB a giant fly-wheel.... You want the external edge to move very quickly and iteratively -- and small dings when you get things wrong don't cost much, but the deeper you go in the stack / towards the infrastructure core (and really the human capital core even below that), you want things to move more slowly and predictably.

Practically speaking, I think this just means that we all have to be dealing in the same product abstractions, following a consistent privacy model, etc. I absolutely think that we can accomplish this balance.

Let's 'copy' (aka super-set) pinterest!

▮▮▮▮▮▮

On 3/31/12 7:36 PM, ▮▮▮▮▮▮ wrote:

>Hey Mark - just some quick thoughts on this:
>
>Copying is *definitely* much faster. When I was 'copying' FB before
>joining back in 2007 I managed to launch a social networking site in
>Spanish with feature set parity to FB with a small team of 3-5 guys in
>India. If you think of all the A/B tests and hundreds of iterations and
>optimizations that we run on a flow like NUX / Friend Browser / etc... in
>order to come up with that version of the flow that performs best, we end
>up spending a lot of engineering / design / analytics cycles that the
>guys cloning don't need to spend. There is a lot of IP on the UI that
>unfortunately is not defensible, and the guy copying can free ride on.
>
>The guys copying also don't need to spend time launching products that
>they saw didn't work that well. They just copy whatever they see works /
>can make money and iterate a bit on it (which is much faster than trial &
>error). We spend a lot of time on products and iterations on products
>that are not that used, or not anymore around- e.g. marketplace, Q&A,
>facebook lite, calendar, etc...
>
>If you gave the top down order to go ahead, copy e.g. pinterest or the
>gaming dynamics on foursquare, or feature x on product y as is (with a
>couple of minor tweaks to make it fit better on FB), I am sure very small
>team of engineers a PM and a designer would get it done super quickly.
>There would be costs on this approach in terms of how we are perceived in
>the industry (copying vs. innovating), our platform strategy (we would
>scare developers), etc... but the approach is not necessarily a failed
>business technique (Zynga built a multibillion $ company doing this...)
>
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: ▮▮markzuckerberg
>Sent: Friday, March 30, 2012 12:55 AM

>To: Chris Cox; ▮▮▮▮▮▮ Mike Schroepfer; ▮▮▮▮▮▮
>Subject:
>
>I spent some time with the Renren founders today and Robin Li from Baidu
>earlier in the week and wanted to pass along a few things:
>
>In China there is this strong culture of cloning things quickly and
>building lots of different products instead of just focusing on one thing
>at a time. This allows them to plant lots of seeds, and although it
>yields lower quality products in the short term as they're cloning and
>the markets are growing quickly, as markets mature there seems to be less
>of a gap between the clones and the originals.
>
>As an example, the Renren site now seems almost as clean and polished as
>our own, despite being more of a mess in the past. They also have more
>features than us, including:
>
>They have built their own version of Pinterest. In addition to your own
>timeline, you can have board pages that people can follow. They are
>tightly integrated into their NF. This is similar to what we've talked
>about doing in the past, and they have a version of this that seems to
>work well.
>
>They have built their own version of Tumblr. Same deal as with their
>version of Pinterest. Both seem relatively well executed to me and are
>two of their fastest growing properties.
>
>They have built their own standalone messenger app, where one key feature
>is using it like a walkie talkie -- basically like Voxer. Apparently
>Tencent QQ has also released a Voxer-like app which is really blowing up
>in China. Robin Li confirmed that a lot of people are using it, although
>he wasn't sure if that was because it's relatively harder to type in
>Chinese or if it's a universal need. Still, interesting that it's taking
>off here.
>
>Renren has also built their own games and they have 6 of the top 10
>Chinese games in the iOS app store.
>
>They have also built out a full music product where they have licensed
>all the music in China themselves.
>
>They have done some innovative things with commenting, like enabling
>people to easily fork comment threads to turn them into separate threads
>if they want. They also have emoji integrated into basically every text
>input field.
>
>They also just implemented a version of divebar with a nice touch where
>whenever you hover over a person's name, you get a little home icon which
>takes you to their timeline. We should implement this as well, although
>we'll probably want to use a different icon than home. (Linking from
>messaging to people's identities has been an issue for a while, so we
>should also fix this in the Messenger app, in the title bars of each chat
>window, etc.)
>
>Overall, seeing all this and the pace that new mobile apps seem to be
>coming out from other companies makes me think we're moving very slowly.
>If we were moving faster, then we might be able to build out more of the
>social use cases ourselves and prevent our competitors from getting
>footholds.
>
>Maybe it's just a lot easier for these guys to move quickly since they're
>just copying other people, but a lot of the stuff that we're doing around
>messages, photos, etc doesn't have a huge number of original problems
>either.
>
>I wonder what we could do to move a lot faster.
>
>Sent from 中国