

## **EXHIBIT 130**

**UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL**

---

**From:** George Lee </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GEOLEE>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 27, 2014 9:41 PM  
**To:** Douglas Purdy; Eddie O'Neil; Mike Vernal  
**Cc:** Ilya Sukhar; Eugene Zarakhovsky; Rennie Soga; Vishu Gupta  
**Subject:** Re: slides for mark

Yes...Constantin will be taking this on.

On 1/27/14, 6:16 PM, "Douglas Purdy" <dmp@fb.com> wrote:

>Constantin is PM this product now (correct George?) and thinking about  
>non-game scenarios.

>

>> On Jan 27, 2014, at 16:56, "Eddie O'Neil" <ekoneil@fb.com> wrote:

>>

>> Yes, that's my understanding.

>>

>> Eddie

>>

>>> On 1/27/14 4:54 PM, "Mike Vernal" <vernal@fb.com> wrote:

>>>

>>> The Games team needs to build an Invites product that works for  
>>>non-game apps. I am assuming that is also the plan of record.

>>>

>>> -mike

>>>

>>>> On 1/27/14, 4:49 PM, "Eddie O'Neil" <ekoneil@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> 1/ if we think we can actually build an Invites product that works  
>>>> for non-game apps, then I agree we should pre-announce.

>>>>

>>>> 2/ it's not a "hole" per se, but with removing access to non-app  
>>>>friends by default, it will be felt more acutely with Login v4.

>>>>

>>>> RE a year: I feel the same way about fixing the deep linking UX.

>>>> :)

>>>>

>>>> Eddie

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> On 1/27/14 4:42 PM, "Mike Vernal" <vernal@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>> I think we should contemplate pre-announcing Invites with Login  
>>>>v4, if we think this a material weakness of the plan.

>>>>

>>>>> Not sure - your call - but just pointing out that this isn't a

>>>>\_hole\_ in the plan, it's just out-of-sync.  
>>>>  
>>>> I also think we need to be executing better/faster on Invites.  
>>>> We've been discussing this for a year.  
>>>>  
>>>> -mike  
>>>>  
>>>>> On 1/27/14, 2:55 PM, "Eddie O'Neil" <ekoneil@fb.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Slide 3: I can change this to "Timeline Feed" if that's the right  
>>>>> term.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Slide 6: will drop the lines about Mark / Sheryl. That said,  
>>>>> think slides  
>>>>> 5/6 are important for understand the scope of impact and the  
>>>>> broad user of News Feed by key / noisy / etc.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Slide 7: for example, Lulu will grow more slowly because w/o  
>>>>> access to non-app friends they won't know have access to profile  
>>>>> info for millions of guys that never TOS'ed the app.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Slide 8: you're not missing anything, and I (we) completely agree  
>>>>> with you. An Invites product that works for non-game apps is not  
>>>>> in scope for Login v4 (+ PS12n). Do you think it should be in  
>>>>> scope?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Social Context API: Sure, will pull those out of the appendix.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> f8: Fran wants to do an event but may not want to call it f8. If  
>>>>> Login  
>>>>> v4  
>>>>> (+ PS12n) slips, the f8 date may move.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Eddie  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> On 1/27/14 12:31 PM, "Mike Vernal" <vernal@fb.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Slide 3:  
>>>>>> - Do you mean "Timeline Feed"? What's Timeline?  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Slide 6: I would drop the Mark/Sheryl ones. It's cute but will  
>>>>>> be very poorly received by Mark. In general 5+6 seem like too  
>>>>>> much detail.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Slide 7: I don't understand the "More Difficult to Grow ..." argument.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Is this custom MFS or something else?  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Missing Slide: It seems valuable to point out we're launching  
>>>>>> the social context API, since it's so critical to the changes

>>>>> we're making (right?).

>>>>> It's the way that a lot of these apps get to continue to work.

>>>>

>>>>> Slide 8:

>>>>

>>>>> - On the "Good" side, I continue to think that a reasonable  
>>>>>invitations product mitigates this risk. Am I missing  
>>>>>something? I think it's a failure of our team to not have  
>>>>>articulated that solution yet.

>>>>

>>>>> General:

>>>>> - Are we talking about potentially downplaying f8 as part of this?

>>>>

>>>>> -mike

>>>>

>>>>>> On 1/27/14, 12:18 PM, "Eddie O'Neil" <ekoneil@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>> Updated slides - sorry for the dupe'ed content in 8-10; meant  
>>>>>> to delete #8.

>>>>>

>>>>>> Eddie

>>>>>

>>>>>>> On 1/27/14 12:02 PM, "Mike Vernal" <vernal@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> I think we can say we're going to work to get this experience  
>>>>>>> available on all platforms.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> I think that'll minimize the initial pr risk.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> On Jan 27, 2014, at 11:45 AM, "Ilya Sukhar" <is@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> My concern is around the perception that we can't hold our  
>>>>>>> story together.

>>>>>>> We're going all-in on the user trust message as our reasoning

>>>>>>> for doing the v4 breakup and it'd be sad if the TechCrunch

>>>>>>> article clearly pointed out that there was an easy and obvious

>>>>>>> workaround on iOS. I agree that it's a power user feature.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On 1/27/14 10:13 AM, "Mike Vernal" <vernal@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On balance, I'm much less concerned about the iOS native  
>>>>>>>> dialog than everyone else.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> I think letting people opt-out of specific permissions is a  
>>>>>>>> great power user feature < and I'm glad we're doing it < but

>>>>>>>> I don't think it's a material inflection in how trustworthy

>>>>>>>> the experience is. I think the real inflection is in

>>>>>>>> reviewing apps and making the sharing experience a lot more

>>>>>>>> trustworthy.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> I think we can/should talk to Apple about updating the login

>>>>>>>> dialog to support X-out. I actually think they'll be

>>>>>>>supportive, since it's a better user experience. But I  
>>>>>>>don't fear some world where lots of people use that on iOS  
>>>>>>>for the next ~18 months.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> I might be missing something, but that's kind of my \$0.02.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> -mike

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> On 1/27/14, 9:08 AM, "Ilya Sukhar" <is@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> I think we should get opinionated about the Apple situation

>>>>>>> before coming to Mark. Is #4 something we want to do? I

>>>>>>> don't understand all the implications but it certainly

>>>>>>> sounds better than a blanket exception.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> On 1/27/14 9:03 AM, "Eddie O'Neil" <ekoneil@fb.com> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> On Apple:

>>>>>>>> 1/ Apple was either a 5 or 7 year deal, and we're 19 months

>>>>>>>>in.

>>>>>>>> 2/ We can talk to them, but (as stated) we have zero

>>>>>>>>leverage and these changes cut against their model for

>>>>>>>>permissions on iOS.

>>>>>>>> 3/ Agree this is a major Trust issue.

>>>>>>>> 4/ Simply using iOS Login for user\_public\_profile is

>>>>>>>>certainly an option.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> On Canvas revenue impact: have asked for data but don't

>>>>>>>>have #s yet.

>>>>>>>> Note: the changes for TPV games are implementation details

>>>>>>>>- e.g.

>>>>>>>> assuming

>>>>>>>> we offer API alternatives for custom MFS / X-app promotion

>>>>>>>>and that the eng work to adopt those is zero, there

>>>>>>>>should be minimal Canvas impact.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On Tinder: should be fine because they don't use friends

>>>>>>>> permissions or NAF.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On signal to get from Mark: yeah, I'll make some of those

>>>>>>>> questions more clear.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Eddie

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On 1/27/14 9:01 AM, "Eugene Zarakhovsky" <eugenez@fb.com>

>>>>>>>> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Alternatively, would it be within the Apple contract terms

>>>>>>>>if we reduced the actual granted permissions when

>>>>>>>>>granted via the native iOS Login dialog? This would also  
>>>>>>>>give developers incentive to move to v4.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> On 1/26/14, 9:11 PM, "Douglas Purdy" <dmp@fb.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> If that is the case, when does the timer run out on the  
>>>>>>>>>apple deal?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> On Jan 26, 2014, at 9:07 PM, "Ilya Sukhar" <is@fb.com>  
>>>>>>>>>wrote:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> We talked about this in the review last week and I was  
>>>>>>>>>pushing for getting Apple on board with this but the  
>>>>>>>>>sentiment in the room seemed to be that we have no  
>>>>>>>>>leverage and should not count on any movement from Apple  
>>>>>>>>>on this front at all.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> On 1/26/14 9:05 PM, "Douglas Purdy" <dmp@fb.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> How long do we need to support the current ios native  
>>>>>>>>>login?  
>>>>>>>>> Can  
>>>>>>>>> we  
>>>>>>>>> talk  
>>>>>>>>> to apple to see if we can iterate on the native model?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> On Jan 26, 2014, at 8:36 PM, "Ilya Sukhar" <is@fb.com>  
>>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Developers are going to use iOS Login to avoid the  
>>>>>>>>>x-out scenario that  
>>>>>>>>> v4  
>>>>>>>>> is all about. It erodes our user trust message.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> On 1/26/14 8:31 PM, "Douglas Purdy" <dmp@fb.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> 1. Can we make sure that George is there tomorrow?  
>>>>>>>>> 2. I thought Tinder was ok as long was we offer the  
>>>>>>>>>invite API/Dialog?  
>>>>>>>>> 3. What is the issue with iOS login? That we have to  
>>>>>>>>>support that model for a couple more years?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> On Jan 26, 2014, at 8:14 PM, "Ilya Sukhar"  
>>>>>>>>>> <is@fb.com>  
>>>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Yeah, I think these are the things I'd like to get  
>>>>>>>>>from  
>>>>>>>>> Mark:  
>>>>>>>>> 1/ Is he comfortable with the broad devaluation of  
>>>>>>>>>Login?  
>>>>>>>>> 2/ Is he comfortable killing the prospects of a lot

>>>>>>>>>>>>of startups (some of which are good like Venmo  
>>>>>>>>>>>and Tinder and I think we should emphasize that  
>>>>>>>>>>>more)?  
>>>>>>>>>>> 3/ Can we guarantee Login to any app?  
>>>>>>>>>>> 4/ Are we willing to roll this out with a huge  
>>>>>>>>>>>exception for Canvas?  
>>>>>>>>>>> 5/ Are we willing to roll this out with a huge  
>>>>>>>>>>>exception for iOS Login?  
>>>>>>>>>>> 6/ Does he foresee any issues with the scope of the  
>>>>>>>>>>>current  
>>>>>>>>>>> 2  
>>>>>>>>>>> year  
>>>>>>>>>>> SLA  
>>>>>>>>>>> commitment?  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Other stuff:  
>>>>>>>>>>> Slide 7: s/on-trivial/non-trivial Slides 8-10 seem a  
>>>>>>>>>>> bit confusing and redundant to me. I would also  
>>>>>>>>>>> prefer we emphasize a few more good apps.  
>>>>>>>>>>> Could we add more context on how much revenue impact  
>>>>>>>>>>> we expect on Canvas with these changes?  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> On 1/26/14 5:26 PM, "Eddie O'Neil" <ekoneil@fb.com>  
>>>>>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Yeah, I was wondering that too - gives us the  
>>>>>>>>>>> chance to talk about whether we would ever take  
>>>>>>>>>>> basic Login away from competitive apps.  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Will add that.  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Eddie  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> On Jan 26, 2014, at 3:35 PM, "Douglas Purdy"  
>>>>>>>>>>> <dmp@fb.com>  
>>>>>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> I wonder if we should show mark the partner model  
>>>>>>>>>>> (competitor, aligned,  
>>>>>>>>>>> etc.) with the grid of what they get in terms of  
>>>>>>>>>>> product access, up front?  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> On Jan 26, 2014, at 1:56 PM, "Eddie O'Neil"  
>>>>>>>>>>> <ekoneil@fb.com>  
>>>>>>>>>>> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Attached is a first cut at slides for Mark.  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Feedback welcome.  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Eddie  
>>>>>>>>>>> <login-v4-review-with-mark.key>

>>