EXHIBIT 182

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

From:	Ilya Sukhar </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ILYAS8A7>
Sent:	Wednesday, October 16, 2013 11:00 AM
To:	Ilya Sukhar; Eddie O'Neil
Subject:	Message summary [mid.1372124439940:5a9a2582ae85b06924]

Edward O'Neil:
>When you have time - would be great to talk about game use cases.

Ilya Sukhar:
>why games?

Edward O'Neil:
>Oh - just thought you'd mostly been talking to games yesterday, but interested in anything you've heard.

Ilya Sukhar:
>Nothing novel - just talked a lot about Platform with devs.

Edward O'Neil:
>Ok - which change(s) do you perceive as most fuck-ing to developers? :)

Ilya Sukhar:
>third party ids because they are impossible to explain to a dev why were doing it

Edward O'Neil:
>Because they need to change their DBs? Or because it may be harder to do X-app promotion?

Ilya Sukhar:
>because they need to do anything

Ilya Sukhar:
>but yes cross app promotion is obviously huge in games

Ilya Sukhar:
>as is coherent ltv comparisons etc

Ilya Sukhar:
>they will just collect emails and dedup

Edward O'Neil:
>Makes sense - a couple of things:
>
>1/ sounds like the concern is generally wrt change.
>
>2/ outside of change, any concerns wrt non-app friends and removing friend_* permissions?
>
>3/ outside of change, would scoping UIDs to the vendor rather than an individual app help?

1

Ilya Sukhar:
>I think we should just rewind and figure out if we're solving a problem that matters. What real graph protection do we get? Not much.

Edward O'Neil:
>Yeah, this is why I was trying to backup to first-principles w/ Javi... :)

Ilya Sukhar:
>My concern is that there is no fundamental guiding motivation here and I'm still not sure who is driving it. It's not Javi from what I can tell.

Edward O'Neil:
>In my mind, the motivation is making it more difficult to build hi-fidelity profiles of users for the purpose of advertising.

Ilya Sukhar:
>well that's the first time I've heard said motivation

Edward O'Neil:
>Growth (Javi) has two technical concerns:
>
>1/ don't let apps grow w/o FB
>
>2/ make it difficult to re-assemble disparate graphs, which I believe is related to two concerns:
>
>2.1/ creating off-FB advertising profiles
>
>2.2/ graph assembly by apps that pose a strategic threat - e.g. messaging apps
>
>Sam's concern is mostly leaking data (profile data + graph connections) to partners without getting something in return - e.g. reciprocal data or an ownership stake.
>
>The point of talking to Javi this week wasn't to make a plan but to understand the advertising and growth concerns, especially wrt a single partner growing their apps.

Edward O'Neil:
>[I may have a wrong perspective(s) here, so please disagree if so.]

Ilya Sukhar:
>that all makes sense and lines up for me except 2.1 but that makes sense too

Ilya Sukhar:
>What doesn't make sense is how third party ids solve all these problems

Ilya Sukhar:
>Sam prefers we just not have an open platform

Ilya Sukhar:
>righf

Ilya Sukhar:
>right

2

Ilya Sukhar:
>I see how friend perms help with some

Edward O'Neil:
>My interpretation of Sam's preferred platform models (in order):
>
>1/ a closed platform with per-app contracts
>
>2/ an open platform where apps only get app-friends and optionally a contract that govern use of non-app friends or other info
>
>Ex: Tinder signs a contract to access non-app friends in exchange for a stake, for data, etc
>
>3/ app friends + non-app friends w/ 3rd party IDs [proposed model]. He's not thrilled with this but said it's better than where we are today and isn't the biggest strategic issue we need to solve
>
>4/ all friends w/ real IDs
>
>[all of #1 - #3 remove friend_* permissions]
>
>On friend_*: yeah, they're super powerful since 1 TOS can net an app detailed info about 400+ people.

Ilya Sukhar:
>I prefer #2 to #3. It's at least clear.

Edward O'Neil:
>Frankly, I agree with you.

Ilya Sukhar:
>Then fight for it!

Ilya Sukhar:
>Javi prefers #2 to #3.

Edward O'Neil:
>We backed away from the app-friends only model because of games and want to find a way to support:
>
>For games:
>1/ custom MFS
>2/ cross-app promotion
>
>For non-games:
>3/ tagging
>
>Feel like I'm still gathering data on all 3 and can't make a sufficiently argued case to:
>
>1/ carve out games as a special case, especially since giving games #1 + #2 still triggers the growth concerns
>
>2/ make tagging approval-only. Data analyst will hopefully pull that data for me today.

Edward O'Neil:
>So, feel like we will end up fighting for it but want to have munitions before really having the argument. :)

3

>
>Note: this would break apps like Tinder w/o a process for them to sign a contract.
>
>Vlad also thinks it is too disruptive for the developer community and wants to slowly wean the ecosystem off of non-app friends.

Ilya Sukhar:
>Well perhaps the whole endeavor is flawed.

Ilya Sukhar:
>Javi is perfectly happy with an enforcement-only plan.

Ilya Sukhar:
>The details are obviously not there yet but it's an option.

Edward O'Neil:
>..really?!? With real UIDs?

Ilya Sukhar:
>For what it's worth, Sean Ryan is under the impression that games will just get an exception to *any* ps12n thing in the end so he's not too worried about it.

Edward O'Neil:
>Heh - yeah, that's very typical of how FB thinks about this and part of why our product legacy includes everything we've ever shipped...
>
>Keeping games opt-ed out of Login v3 is a great example of that.

Ilya Sukhar:
>So - then who cares about Games hangups with plan #2?

Edward O'Neil:
>I do because George, Namita, and Sean have made good arguments that it's important to the games ecosystem.

Ilya Sukhar:
>What's important?

Ilya Sukhar:
>Not to mess things up?

Ilya Sukhar:
>That's my point. They'll just push for an exception to all of it, in the end.

Edward O'Neil:
>Yeah - continuity for the sake of:
>
>1/ revenue
>2/ game developers' perception of Platform
>
>I'm not sure we're ready to shift the Games business from it's current model of using MFS / invites / X-app promotion for growth wholesale to one based on app install / re-engagement ads.
>

4

>The latter are mobile products that would leave the billion dollar Canvas business out in the cold.
>
>And they care a lot about preserving that business.
>
>Seems like this is what makes the Supercell deal interesting - that success happened on mobile.

Ilya Sukhar:
>Yeah, I understand all this.

Edward O'Neil:
>Cool - glad we're on the same page. ;)

Ilya Sukhar:
>My point is - why aren't we just splitting the two when we considering anything ps12n related.

Ilya Sukhar:
>Why are we worried that #2 doesn't work for Games if we can just carve out Games in general?

Edward O'Neil:
>Yeah, that's the $64K question.

Edward O'Neil:
>It doesn't solve for Doug's "competitive future" category since there will be another Zynga.

Ilya Sukhar:
>How does the proposal solve for it?

Edward O'Neil:
>It doesn't - because we're basically giving Games the keys to the kingdom to support MFS and X-app promotion.

Edward O'Neil:
>[in either model #2 or #3]

Ilya Sukhar:
>:)

Edward O'Neil:
>Adding more detail to #2:
>
>1/ For Games:
>= apps get app friends
>= apps get list of people to Invite
>= if approved for tagging, apps get list of non-app friends to tag
>
>2/ For non-Games:
>= apps get app friends
>= if approved for tagging, apps get list of people to tag
>
>All apps from a vendor get a stable UID but those UIDs are different across vendors.
>
>Issues:
>1/ would need a way to approve an app to access non-app friends [ex: Tinder]

5

>
>Sound right?

Ilya Sukhar:
>Unclear that we really need vendor specific ids but, yeah, sounds about right.

Edward O'Neil:
>Vendor-specific IDs go to the ads profile issue, but agree.

Ilya Sukhar:
>Gotta take off - talk to you later. I should be more available starting tomorrow because my London schedule is much less packed.

Edward O'Neil:
>Sounds good - ttyl.