

EXHIBIT 202

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

From: Adam Mosseri </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MOSSERI>
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 8:53 AM
To: TR Vishwanath
Cc: Mike Vernal; Eddie O'Neil; Carl Sjogreen; Vladimir Fedorov
Subject: Re: Permissions on iOS

Importance: Low

I was under the impression that they we were going to be using native UI for 1, 2 and 3 and that they were going to figure out how to incorporate a 'See More' link into a UIAlert, is that still the case?

Adam

On Feb 16, 2012, at 8:44 AM, TR Vishwanath wrote:

Sorry scratch that last part.. It doesn't make any sense once I read it :)

From: Vishwanath <trvish@fb.com>
Date: Thu, 16 Feb 2012 08:43:08 -0800
To: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>, Eddie O'Neil <ekoneil@fb.com>, Carl Sjogreen <carlsjogreen@fb.com>, Vladimir Fedorov <vladf@fb.com>, Adam Mosseri <adam@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Permissions on iOS

IMO, in light of the path fiasco, allowing the default values for the perms in this bundle to be tweak able when the user enters credentials in the device may be something to consider, especially since we don't get a chance to correct this once the device has shipped.

Regardless of that decision would it make sense to have a setting that turns off SSO for apps while still having the device connected to FB so that the user can post photos/statuses etc from the device?

Thanks
Vish

From: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>
Date: Wed, 15 Feb 2012 17:02:31 -0800
To: Vishwanath <trvish@fb.com>, Eddie O'Neil <ekoneil@fb.com>, Carl Sjogreen <carlsjogreen@fb.com>, Vladimir Fedorov <vladf@fb.com>, Adam Mosseri <adam@fb.com>
Subject: Re: Permissions on iOS

I think we decided that the app would still specify GDP permissions, and the See More link would state what the app was actually asking for. What I mean is that if you only ask for these permissions you're still eligible for fast/native GDP.

I don't think users can tweak this.

-mike

From: TR Vishwanath <trvish@fb.com>

Date: Wed, 15 Feb 2012 16:47:17 -0800

To: Microsoft Office User <vernal@fb.com>, Eddie O'Neil <ekoneil@fb.com>, Carl Sjogreen <carlsjogreen@fb.com>, Vladimir Fedorov <vladf@fb.com>, Adam Mosseri <adam@fb.com>

Subject: Re: Permissions on iOS

Mike do you think of this as an all-or-nothing bundle or do you think users should be able to tweak the defaults at initial sign-on time (for example, toggle off user_checkins)

From: Mike Vernal <vernal@fb.com>

Date: Wed, 15 Feb 2012 16:37:06 -0800

To: Eddie O'Neil <ekoneil@fb.com>, Carl Sjogreen <carlsjogreen@fb.com>, Vladimir Fedorov <vladf@fb.com>, Adam Mosseri <adam@fb.com>

Cc: Vishwanath <trvish@fb.com>

Subject: Re: Permissions on iOS

I can't figure out how to use Zoho docs.

My comments:

Initial Sign-On – Apple will design this experience. I assume it will be good. We need to give them legalese here. Not worried beyond getting them the right legalese we need for GDP.

Reading Profile

- We should ask someone maybe from content strategy to suggest a short sentence here. I think something like "Allow Foodspotting to access my Facebook account" feels right here.
- I think we're going to ask them for a "See More" link, right? We should include that here and say it will link to a Facebook page explaining the permissions in detail. We can't make the "Don't Allow" button a See More link.
- Otherwise, I think these permissions seem reasonable. The ones that are "close to the line" for me are:
 - user_photos
 - user_videos
 - user_checkins
 - user_events
 - user_groups
- (I think they're ok, but they are the most aggressive.)
- Why wouldn't we include user_online_presence in this? It's not that scary.
- I think we should allow some friends_* permissions here. It seems strange to have a social platform and not allow some friends_ permissions. Personally, I think we should make this include:
 - friends_about_me
 - friends_activities
 - friends_birthday
 - friends_education_history
 - friends_hometown
 - friends_interests
 - friends_likes
 - friends_location
 - friends_relationships
 - friends_website
 - friends_work_history
- (My litmus test here is that we should allow the basic profile/identity data that you'd expect to see in a Facebook contact card. We should certainly include any data that will just show up in the Address Book. We shouldn't create disincentives to use our API over the Address Book.)

Publishing

- Again, we should work w/ branding or content strategy to figure our right wording here. I think it's something like "Allow Foodspotting to publish to Facebook" or something.
- If we do a "combined" permission, I might say "Allow Foodspotting to access and publish to my Facebook account."
- This should only grant publish_actions. We're making it so publish_actions allow non-wall-to-wall posts.

-mike

From: Eddie O'Neil <ekoneil@fb.com>

Date: Wed, 15 Feb 2012 14:59:08 -0800

To: Microsoft Office User <vernal@fb.com>, Carl Sjogreen <carlsjogreen@fb.com>, Vladimir Fedorov <vladf@fb.com>, Adam Mosseri <adam@fb.com>

Cc: TR Vishwanath <trvish@fb.com>

Subject: Permissions on iOS

All — there are four permission / GDP scenarios on iOS:

- 1/ initial sign-on from the device
- 2/ 3rd party app reading from a user's profile
- 3/ 3rd party app writing to a user's profile
- 4/ 3rd party app requesting additional permissions

There's a doc here: <https://docs.fb.com/opendoc.do?docId=16078000000013001&service=zw> that covers these.

I'm sure this will come up in the review tomorrow, so please have a look over the doc and send along feedback. Apple is anxious to hear this proposal, so I'd like to the review / privacy / legal cycle started.

Thanks,
Eddie