EXHIBIT 140

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

Kevin Lacker:
>ok here's that doc

Kevin Lacker:
>https://docs.fb.com/writer/ropen.do?rid=osbgeb9bc0f961ba5469eb86eacc133
>981180

Kevin Lacker:
>we do need to get into more detail. this is per object in the graph api
>rather than per method

Michael Vernal:
>Ok, here's my first proposal on APIs:
>
>Ok, here's my crazy list.
>
>*****Core*****
>
>- Users:
>-- friend
>-- page
>-- place
>-- profile
>-- profile_pic
>-- user
>
>- Login:
>-- Login Dialog
>-- permissions
>
>- Posting:
>-- Share Dialog
>-- privacy*
>
>- Payments:
>-- Pay Dialog
>-- credit_card
>
>- App Management:
>-- application

>-- app_role
>-- review
>
>- Dev Utilities:
>-- batch requests
>-- errors
>-- field expansion
>-- column
>-- table
>
>*****Beta*****
>
>- User Data:
>-- album
>-- like
>-- photo
>-- photo_src
>-- photo_tag
>
>- Page Management:
>-- page_* ?
>-- profile_tab
>-- profile_view
>-- Add Page Tab Dialog
>
>- Open Graph:
>-- fitness*
>-- video*
>-- music*
>-- books *
>-- OG.*
>
>- Plugins:
>-- comment
>-- comments_info
>-- link_stat
>
>- Insights:
>-- domain
>-- domain_admin
>-- insights
>-- keyword_insights
>
>- Ads API
>
>*****Kill (/ Partner?)*****
>- achievement
>- apprequest
>- apps and game groups?
>- case*
>- Third-Party Chat
>- checkin

>- connection
>- cookies
>- developer
>- event
>- event_member
>- family
>- Feed Dialog
>- Friends Dialog
>- friend_request
>- friendlist
>- friendlist_member
>- group
>- group_member
>- link
>- location_post
>- mailbox_folder
>- message
>- news.reads (Open Graph)
>- note
>- notification
>- object_url
>- offer
>- organization*
>- page_admin
>- *profile_pic* - all the crazy tables
>- realtime updates
>- Requests Dialog
>- question*
>- score
>- Send Dialog
>- standard_friend_info
>- standard_user_info
>- status
>- stream
>- stream_filter
>- stream_tag
>- subscription
>- thread
>- translation?
>- unified_message*
>- unified_thread*
>- video
>- video_tag
>- url_like

Michael Vernal:
>For Core + Beta, note, we'd also want to prune the fields on the table.

Michael Vernal:
>For whatever we keep in stable core and in beta, we need to staff the engineering team to handle the following SLA:
>- Unbreak Now: 100% fixed in 24h
>- High-Pri: 100% fixed in 7d

>- Mid-Pri: 100% fixed in 14d
>
>I mean 100% on those (unless the technical complexity literally makes that impossible). So when I was asking to estimate the size of the team, this is what I'm asking for. I think we can calculate this based on looking at the incoming rate, the fix rate, etc. and try to come up with a reasonable plan.

Douglas Purdy:
>Agreed. Zhen is pulling those numbers and will have them by Tuesday.

Michael Vernal:
>Now, this is a a pretty major breaking change. One way of addressing this might just be to declare a v2 (or a v3?). Just say "Hey everyone, this is v3 of the API. We're committing to 3 years for core APIs, and 3 months for experimental APIs." We could say that in ~3-6 months the non-core parts of the old API will no longer be supported / have bug fixes, but we could keep that code alive for a few years to ease the transition (with big warnings in the docs not to use).

Douglas Purdy:
>The REST and FBML plan. I think that is reasonable.

Douglas Purdy:
>The ecosystem was ok with how we handled those.

Douglas Purdy:
>How about plugins? Out of scope?

Michael Vernal:
>Thoughts on this as a starting point? Again, principles:
>
>- Get down to a core, stable set of APIS for our main use cases (Login
>+ Sharing)
>- Support them for 3+ years without breaking changes
>- Have a mechanism for things we want to try out, but aren't yet ready
>to commit to for 3+ years
>- Have adequate eng staffing to ensure A+ support on these (All bugs
>fixed within 14d, A+ documentation, full test coversage, etc.)

Douglas Purdy:
>Literally music to my ears.

Ling Bao:
>plugins is listed as beta right now. should some plugins (like button for example), be stable core?

Douglas Purdy:
>I think pages should go under "private". We can confirm that again with John C.

Douglas Purdy:
>That is the API

Michael Vernal:
>Didn't think about Plugins. Here's my intuition:
>
>Core:
>- Login Button

>
>Beta:
>- Send Button
>- Embedded Posts
>- Follow Button
>- Comments Plugin
>- Activity Feed
>- Recommendations Plugin
>- Like Box
>- Facepile
>
>Kill?:
>- Registration Plugin

Douglas Purdy:
>We should enumerate the plugins too

Douglas Purdy:
>Ok.

Douglas Purdy:
>:/)

Douglas Purdy:
>Like button should be core?

Ling Bao:
>agree

Michael Vernal:
>Yes, I think so. I think "Login" is core.

Michael Vernal:
>I also think "Share" is core.

Douglas Purdy:
>Ling: can you pull the developer and user usage numbers for the plugins? Apps, impressions and action?

Douglas Purdy:
>Agreed. Everything else is noise.

Michael Vernal:
>Also - I'm not sure if we should keep the photo/album/etc. stuff. It might be simpler to do a clean break and just kill that, too.

Michael Vernal:
>More broadly, I think any team should be able to pull things back that we're killing, but they need to sign-up to support them.

Michael Vernal:
>E.g., if Pages team doesn't want to kill Page APIs, then they can own them. But they have to sign-up for our SLA.

Michael Vernal:
>Similarly, if Events wants to keep Events API, or Games their APIs, they can, but they haven to sign-up for their API.

Douglas Purdy:
>Yeah. I was thinking the same thing. Photo viewing, shouldn't the photos team decide that?

Douglas Purdy:
>Photo post is always supported

Michael Vernal:
>Yes

Douglas Purdy:
>But read, maybe not

Michael Vernal:
>I think that's right. They should also own supporting the bugs.

Michael Vernal:
>If a team isn't hitting their SLAs, and won't invest to fix it, we'll just deprecate the API as part of the next quarterly window.

Douglas Purdy:
>We used to have a principle about users taking data their data to other apps, but I think that is just the FB replacement game again and Javi, whoever is going to come after that scenario too .

Douglas Purdy:
>We should so this once

Douglas Purdy:
>Should do

Michael Vernal:
>Yeah, I don't think we need that sceneario per se.

Michael Vernal:
>At the very least, let's start aggressive and back off from there.

Michael Vernal:
>Can we use this as a starting point for a proposal? Happy to answer any + all questions. WE have to figure this out ASAP (to Constantin's point), but I feel like we could start fleshing out the next level of detail here and will generate a million questions to answer.

Douglas Purdy:
>I think we should have a really structure conversation with these product teams about this approach. Pages, Groups, Photos, Messenger, etc. we support the key login and share scenarios, but everything else is up to the feature team to decide, we recommend no public core or beta APIs, but if they want them, they have to support the SLA.

Edward O'Neil:
>This is great - very glad we're starting here.
>
>Mike: thanks for the context.

FB-00417667

Michael Vernal:
>And just to set one more piece of context - our mission is to help developers build, grow and monetize mobile apps. The way we help them build apps is via Parse and by helping users login, find their friends, and share back to Facebook.
>
>Our non-goals are:
>- Let people build Facebook replacement apps - no more.
>- Let people abstractly take their data with them - not supported any more.
>
>So if you need help deciding whether an API is in-or-out, use the mission to help answer that question.

Douglas Purdy:
>I am happy to help with those conversations, but I think that this is a good opportunity for Eddie and Ilya to talk to these teams. Other thought on how to drive that part ?

Michael Vernal:
>Let's start with our own proposal.

Michael Vernal:
>Once we have that, we can start talking to other teams. I wouldn't do that yet.

Michael Vernal:
>It will be randomizing.

Ling Bao:
>Plugin data + proposal for some. All the stuff in Beta has < 500k users
>daily / is small fry
>
>??? = what's our bar for BETA? Public content cares a lot about Embed +
>Hashtag plugin. Like Box gets 2M clickers daily (still 5x - 7x less
>than Like button), Comments has 500K commenters daily
>
>CORE
>Like
>Share Dialog
>Login Button
>
>BETA
>Send
>Follow
>Recommendations Bar
>
>KILL
>Registration Form
>
>???
>Embed
>Hashtag
>Like Box - 3B daily impressions, 2M daily clickers; 1.4M daily sites
>Activity Feed - 236M daily impressions; 37K daily sites Recommendations
>Box - 230M daily impressions; 19K daily sites Facepile - 160M daily
>impressions; 23K daily sites Comments - 44M daily impressions, 500k

>daily posters; 60K daily sites

Michael Vernal:
>I like plugins, and none of them feel off-strategy per se. So I think my proposal is a reasonable starting point, but we need to understand the level of eng staffing needed to support the required SLAs.

Douglas Purdy:
>Agreed. I want these to be hyper structured. My experience is that teams will snap to whatever we recommended. I just want to make sure we are going to have those conversations after we have a reasonably baked proposal.

Douglas Purdy:
>And I am happy to help. I think we want to cut almost everything not in the Login and Share buckets.

Ling Bao:
>seems like good starting point. do we work w/ Zhen to figure out eng staffing for SLAs, etc.?

Douglas Purdy:
>Constantin: could you frame this up in the doc (there is tons of good context here). I think this is the developer value part of P3 -- stability and a shot at restored trust.

Douglas Purdy:
>Zhen is pulling the bug numbers. Let's see what they are and iterate
>here on the staffing. I want everyone to see everyone's homework. :-)

Ling Bao:
>for non-goal: - Let people abstractly take their data with them - not supported any more.
>
>what's our policy on login data? there's a meme that fb will take away login if your app competes. is there a minimal level of function / data we can promise to always provide in p3 to be a utility here?
>
>like stable id or stable id + public profile? (but no friends / graph)

Douglas Purdy:
>The meme is wrong

Douglas Purdy:
>We have never took away login

Douglas Purdy:
>Just friends.get

Douglas Purdy:
>And never sharing

Douglas Purdy:
>We always give sharing

Douglas Purdy:
>And I think we should potential concern another bucket here: restricted.

Douglas Purdy:
>Consider

8

Douglas Purdy:
>For we chat, etc.

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>Framing: Yes, on it. Will start putting this together tomorrow AM.

Kevin Lacker:
>is sharing via Social.framework in "core"

Douglas Purdy:
>Yes, unless we want to revisit the Apple deal.

Ling Bao:
>agree
>
>on data - so devs always keep stable id + public profile? even restricted apps like wechat?

Douglas Purdy:
>Javi doesn't like them with profile pics

Douglas Purdy:
>So I think we may want to tackle now

Douglas Purdy:
>We don't even let them but ads

Douglas Purdy:
>Buy

Douglas Purdy:
>Mike? I think you have to make a call here.

Ling Bao:
>one proposal: stable id + name + email (if user granted that). i think
>that's really reasonable for an identity platform / utility

Ling Bao:
>also, our dev policy has ii.12 policy right now that says:
>
>We may require you to delete data you receive from the Facebook API if you violate our terms.
>
>i think if we're saying identity platform is core, we should clarify
>that to whatever decision we land on here

Kevin Lacker:
>what category does the localization api fall into. beta?

Kevin Lacker:
>we should also make it clear what the association between access tokens
>and sessions and permissions is. your app is not stable if it needs to
>change the when-to-reissue-access-tokens logic. for example, are mobile

9

>tokens definitely valid for 60 days, when can permissions for an access
>token change, and so on

Kevin Lacker:
>in what situation can you pass an access token between devices

Kevin Lacker:
>the same goes for policies, like policies around when you can ask for
>what permissions, or what sort of content your app is allowed to
>prefill

Ling Bao:
>i think core rules should apply to tokens: i.e. whatever works now,
>doesn't break for 3 yrs
>
>we don't allow any pre-fill today except documented non-message
>parameters or if you have the user-message og action capability. i
>think that doesn't change

Kevin Lacker:
>it seems like we do allow pre-fill in practice because there are a
>bunch of high profile apps using it. if we revoke that, it will
>certainly be perceived as a breaking change. but i guess this is a
>specific detail we can hammer out later

Kevin Lacker:
>also, can we offer a similar SLA for things that are incorrect in our
>docs. like, if the api is doing something that we claim is correct, but
>our docs describe different behavior, can we consider that to be as bad
>as the api having a bug? (it should be easier to fix)

Zhen Fang:
>doc bugs should be treated like product bugs, same sla.

Edward O'Neil:
>^^^^ agree.

Kevin Lacker:
>it seems like to get to zero-doc-bugs at the start we may have to make
>a pass through docs and mark some docs as "kill" as well

Zhen Fang:
>I'm going to run bug counts / accepts for core/beta apis (will use mike's list above to start). It's going to be an
approximation of the reality, as we don't tag all incoming bugs/internal tasks in a granular enough way to really capture
all.

Zhen Fang:
>yes - should kill outdated docs in the process. we've done major rewrites before, the problem is not making them
accurate for now (this is doable), but maintaining the sanity over time. with a smaller core + less changes, it should be
possible w/ the right checks in place.

Kevin Lacker:

>i might be misinterpreting mike's per-table breakdown, but it seems
>like some way to upload photos and videos should be in core

Zhen Fang:
>the way i read it,uploading yes in core. reading it, not in core.

Kevin Lacker:
>that's what i would expect. that's the "photo" and "video" tables right?

Kevin Lacker:
>also i think photo_src

Michael Vernal:
>@Kevin - yes, uploading/sharing is in "core." Reading photos and videos is not.

Michael Vernal:
>There are lots of details to be figured out here - can you read somethign you posted? Probably yes. Let's start trying to figure out all these details and go from there. This might end up being a 10-page or 15-page or 20-page spec, but I think the way to make progress is to just write everything down so everyone can read/understand the plan.

Tirunelveli Vishwanath:
>This generally looks good. One concern I have is the core is the stuff we care the most about (login, share) and are most motivated to change/improve till we get to the right place. How do we deal with features like anon login, the per-action privacy stuff or even quirky behaviors like sticky privacy that we are not doing now but may want to do later (where later < 3 years)?

Michael Vernal:
>I think we put ourselves in a box, where we can't change those things except on a very large time window.

Michael Vernal:
>Also, I wonder if we should rename this entire effort to "Platform Simplification."

Michael Vernal:
>From Platform 3.0.

Ling Bao:
>+1 what about throwing Stability in there? seems like that's the
>+biggest sell for devs

Michael Vernal:
>How would you throw "Stability" into "Platform Simplification?" :)

Ling Bao:
>Platform Simplification and Stability?
>
>then again, i also coined "piggyback dialog" so i think i'm all out of
>street cred in the naming department :)

Michael Vernal:
>I find no irony in doubling the # of words in something that has the
>word "Simplification" in it. :P
>

>I'm stealing the Ads Simplification meme.

Ling Bao:
>(y)

EXHIBIT 141

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL