

EXHIBIT 107

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

From: Eddie O'Neil </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=EDDIE ONEIL>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 11:47 PM
To: Ilya Sukhar; Eddie O'Neil; Douglas Purdy; Vladimir Fedorov
Subject: Message summary [id.171176866411818]

Ilya Sukhar:

>How are you guys thinking about this now? I have spent more time with partner managers than ever before on this trip and the feedback on Platform Simplification is universally negative.

Edward O'Neil:

>The devil is in the details here - so, can you expand in "universally negative"?

>

>I doubt most partner managers have a good, accurate, and informed understanding of PS12n, though I'm sure talking to you helper. :)

>

>This is especially true of PMs / PEs overseas where we regularly have issues with them creating their own reality. Example: three weeks ago, one asked me why we deprecated Apple's Login Dialog.

>

>In general, I find that the partnerships org is good at defending a partner use case but less good at balancing and aligning the user, developer, and FB incentives.

>

>I'd like to do a Europe trip before EOY to talk to them (and DevOps) about PS12n / roadmap, which may help.

Ilya Sukhar:

>I should have been clearer. It's universally negative sentiment before I start the conversation. It gets better depending on the person and my ability to defend it at the time. The reason is we have not clearly communicated the reasoning behind the deprecations and the work we are doing to replace some of the use cases. In the absence of that, it looks like a confusing initiative mostly centered around Core which to then doesn't seem nearly valuable enough to trade off with their partners.

Ilya Sukhar:

>them*

Edward O'Neil:

>Got it - thanks for clarifying. Think we understand the problem, but don't think this has percolated through the org yet. Repetition is important.

>

>Attached are slides that I presented as a test run to the Mobile Platform team last week - they were well received and think the team understands why we need to make the PS12n changes (3rd party ID change aside).

Ilya Sukhar:

>Fantastic deck.

Ilya Sukhar:

>What was their reaction to 3rd party id's?

Ilya Sukhar:

>Interesting that we're pitching as "protect advertising platform" because my take was always that "protect against WhatsApp" was much more the driver.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Good: that's a much clearer line of reasoning and easier to defend. Bad: it's not a line of reasoning I have heard before.

Edward O'Neil:

>Thanks. :)

>

>RE 3rd party IDs: team was tacitly fine with them, though in-person I phrased them as "proposed" since we're not 100% locked yet.

>

>RE the reasoning: agree. This rolls together a few things that turned out to be related but distinct wrt adding weights to edges in the graph and assembling high-fidelity but offsite user profiles.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Hmm, ok.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Are you not worried that we've iterated on both the problem definition and the solution in regards to 3rd party ids?

Douglas Purdy:

>Where is the deck? Does this include the model we discussed on VC last week?

Ilya Sukhar:

>Eddie sent to me in another thread. Here.

Ilya Sukhar attached ps12n-for-eng.pdf

Edward O'Neil:

>Thanks for attaching - Virgin wifi ate the deck in this thread.

>

>Headed to MPK but back in a bit with more on 3rd party IDs.

Edward O'Neil:

>Doug: yes, it includes a high level model of the aligned / competitive model we discussed last week.

Edward O'Neil:

>On 3rd party IDs: I think we're doing the right things by iterating on both problems and solutions. Ex: I didn't understand all the games context when we started.

>

>That said, I'm worried that we have conflicting goals - graph protection with no impact on apps. And, I expect it will take more time to land a solution.

>

>API usage is also an un-peeled onion (at least by me). Next step is to understand usage by Page apps, which is a black box ATM.

>

>The 4 of us should spend time together discussing the ID model next Monday at the latest.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Conflicting goals amongst whom? Us? The company?

Edward O'Neil:

>Us - not limited to folks on this thread. :) Also discussed with Eugene a bunch last week.

Ilya Sukhar:

>What does he think?

Ilya Sukhar:

>I'm not advocating for graph protection with no disruption. That's clearly impossible. I just don't understand exactly what the "graph protection" goal is and that worries me in terms of the resulting product.

Edward O'Neil:

>He sees value in 3rd party IDs because they protect against bad behavior / data aggregation. Also agrees with the FB-as-ads-platform angle.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Yeah, I think there's no question that 3rd party ids are the right way to have built Platform starting from scratch. Does he think we should do it, all things considered?

Edward O'Neil:

>RE disruption: cool. My statement also comes with two goals Kevin, Doug, and I talked about last week - little impact to developer sat and revenue neutral.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Ah - well, that will be challenging ;)

Edward O'Neil:

>Indeed. :)

Douglas Purdy:

>Eddie: i love this presentation (i am assuming a lot of things when i read it based on context that i have). when is this talk?

Edward O'Neil:

>Thanks, glad you like it. Slides def need talking + anecdotes.

>

>Hope to give it to core platform eng on Thurs and then other teams.

Vladimir Fedorov:

>Kevin was concerned about if it is beneficial to show this deck to Parse engineers. He is thinking it over.

Edward O'Neil:

>He said something similar to me today.

>

>Would like to find a way to tease apart FB's value as a business from:

>

>1/ details about 3rd party IDs

>

>2/ the idea that there's no need to protect the graph and that apps should be able to access data just because it exists

>

>I'm going to talk to him more tomorrow, but what else can we do to get on the same page?

Douglas Purdy:

>i get #1. i don't get #2.

Edward O'Neil:

>I've had a couple of conversations that question whether the Graph needs protecting and ask why apps can't just read all the data.

Douglas Purdy:

>what is the rational?

Edward O'Neil:

>And also whether certain classes of apps [contact sync, alternate clients, etc] erode or present a threat to the business.

Douglas Purdy:

>seeking to understand.

Edward O'Neil:

>Frankly, I think it's different philosophies about developers and apps.

>

>Sorta feels like debating GPL vs. Apache licenses. :)

>

>I think a solution is to help folks understand FB's long term value as a company and the kinds of product experiences we want to build. And how that relies on protecting the Graph asset that's hard to replicate but easy to leak.

>

>Parse has operated in a world with two direct constituents - the business and developers.

>

>FB operates with three - biz, developers, and users.

>

>And, I don't think that the tensions between those 3 parties are well understood in Parse.

Edward O'Neil:

>It's a libertarian argument wrt data access that works well fine for the 2 constituents but results in friction with 3.

Douglas Purdy:

>ok. thanks for the context. i don't think we have too much time to debate this. we need to executing on this plan. i want the parse team to be happy with the plan here, but i think we have moved past reopening our philosophy on user data. how can i help here? what are we blocked on?

Vladimir Fedorov:

>We chatted and I think Kevin's argument was more about if bringing this presentation up will help or hurt parse team morale

Vladimir Fedorov:

>Lets see what his thinks tomorrow after sleeping on it

Edward O'Neil:

>Ok - GTK.

>

>Though I think above is representative of his (and David's) take.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Eh - I don't think we are libertarians. We are more like secessionists that don't trust the government ;)