EXHIBIT 187

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

Ilya Sukhar:
>Joking aside, the Parse team can be convinced that we need to make hard tradeoffs in protecting the graph. We're not a bunch of GPL hippies by any stretch. That said, the case is just not very convincing right now. That we changed both the problem statement (whatsapp -> ads) and the solution (app friends -> third party ids) sniffs to me like we're justifying a roadmap instead of doing the right thing. Kevin is right in that it will hurt morale for our team because they'll see that the Platform is moving in a direction that Parse leadership doesn't believe in. At best, I can just go along with this and our tight knit team knows it when they see it.

Ilya Sukhar:
>I suppose that statement is scoped to third party ids. If the other stuff is still controversial with the team, I don't have recent context.

Ilya Sukhar:
>I am pretty comfortable making the case against replacement clients.

Edward O'Neil:
>Hm, maybe my statement above more accurately characterizes the argument David and I had last week than Kevin's take, if so, my apologies.
>
>
>Certainly didn't intend to insinuate that the team we're all GPL
>hippies. :)
>
>I view this as us iterating to understand the problems we have it's whatsapp + ads, not =>.
>
>That said, let's back up:
>
>Do we agree that the scope of the problem includes both competitive msg / FB clients and ads?

Vladimir Fedorov:
>Btw - I covered building ad profiles and a couple of other abuse
>scenarios in 1:1s with everyone when framing the problem. It is not a
>new thing added that came to attention now, so if it feels new it is my
>fault for explaining it poorly

Edward O'Neil:
>Thoughts on how to move this forward?
>
>I'm going to hold on talking to any eng teams about this until we're on the same page.

Douglas Purdy:
>Where did we land with games devs. Can they share the same ids?

FB-01353037

Edward O'Neil:
>Yes. It may be transitive, but ultimately, game devs will be able to map IDs of people.
>
>Eugene is uncomfortable with it from an integrity standpoint, but game partnerships is adamant that this is critical to our viability as a games business.

Douglas Purdy:
>I think it has to work the same way it works today. That ecosystem needs to just keep humming along.

Edward O'Neil:
>Frankly, I would like to find a way to limit that to games with a Canvas presence and push pure mobile games to use the ad network.

Douglas Purdy:
>I only care about canvas in this scenario. That should just work, but note that the top titles are canvas and mobile and you should only have to write your backend once.

Edward O'Neil:
>I think we're headed towards this model:
>
>1/ apps get real UID
>2/ apps only get app friends
>3/ apps can ask request access to non-app friends 4/ deprecate friend_*
>permissions 5/ deprecate NF / TL / Notif / Friend List APIs
>
>For Games: add a ranked friends API

Douglas Purdy:
>#3 is via invites?

Douglas Purdy:
>And we use a 3rd party id for that until they tos?

Edward O'Neil:
>No - via user_friends permission.

Douglas Purdy:
>Why would we do that?

Edward O'Neil:
>No - that triggers the 3rd party ID issue that's causing all the discord with the current plan.

Douglas Purdy:
>I think it is fine to use 3rd party ids for invites/invites API.

Edward O'Neil:
>Because most apps don't need non-app friends, so I would rather treat it as a permission than give it to a bunch of apps for free.

Douglas Purdy:
>Maybe I don't understand, but I think app friends + invites works fine for canvas games?

2

Edward O'Neil:
>Yes, it does - since invites includes the list of non-app friends / others that could be invited.

Edward O'Neil:
>To be clear: I want to limit access to non-app friends for non-game apps.

Douglas Purdy:
>Why not just give everyone the same thing? App friends + invites?

Edward O'Neil:
>Mobile apps can have the invites dialog, but I don't think non-game apps need API level access to that info.
>
>e.g. they don't build custom MFSs for inviting friends to an app.

Edward O'Neil:
>Non-game apps could have access to friends if:
>
>1/ they are approved for user_friends permission. Example: Tinder
>
>2/ they are approved to tag people in posts. Example: Foursquare
>
>But, I'm not considering adding invites for non-game apps today.

Douglas Purdy:
>That seems a little complex to me. Why not just app friends and invites for everyone? People tagging should only work for app friends?

Edward O'Neil:
>People tagging should work for all friends - e.g. not all my friends use Foursquare, but I should be able to tag them.
>
>Friends data becomes an API that apps need to ask to use as opposed to an OOTB feature of Login.

Edward O'Neil:
>It's like asking Apple to let your app run in the background.