

EXHIBIT 113

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

From: Vladimir Fedorov </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=VLADF>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 8:56 PM
To: Ilya Sukhar; Eddie O'Neil; Douglas Purdy; Vladimir Fedorov
Subject: Message summary [id.171176866411818]

Edward O'Neil:

>Think we need to do an eng-only all hands to talk about Platform Simplification.
>
>I'm hearing from eng in both sites that they've heard of but know nothing about PS12n.
>
>Want to get out in front of this and have a ~1h meeting to talk about what we're doing, why, and how it will impact them.
>
>Should include a bunch of data about API usage, the focus on mobile, examples of good apps, etc.
>
>Suggest that we do this in the next week or so.
>
>Thoughts?

Edward O'Neil:

>[I'm working on slides now]
>
>:)

Douglas Purdy:

>i am ok with it if you think that it will help ship what we need to ship. i don't know if i would frame this is an eng all-hands, but rather, "hey, if you want more details on this PS12N thing, I and the tech leads are going to give a presentation on such such day."

Edward O'Neil:

>I think this is important - folks on this thread (+ Vish, Harsh, etc) understand why we're doing this, but for everyone else, this is a black box.
>
>Don't much care what it's called as so long as the audience is all of (but limited to) platform eng, incl parse.
>
>I want a forum where eng is willing to ask questions (+ vent) without them being overwhelmed by questions from the partnerships team.

Ilya Sukhar:

>I recommend we talk to Javi about the third party id proposal. I don't think we are doing the right thing there based on my discussion with Javi just now.

Edward O'Neil:

>I have follow-up with him to discuss on Friday.
>
>tl;dr on talking with him?

Douglas Purdy:

>can we make sure we are calibrated on javi's role here? mike and i both react super strongly to considering javi an "approver" for this work. we should get his input and ensure that we are meeting our strategic imperatives, but i (and mike) don't want us permute our plans too strongly here. we have to balance "protect the graph" with helping developers. i think the right way to approach this is to convince ourselves that what we have developed strikes the right balance and then seek feedback.

Ilya Sukhar:

>well I did not ask him for approval

Ilya Sukhar:

>my thesis is the current proposal is the worst of both worlds. we neither solve the protection problem nor do we treat developers well.

Douglas Purdy:

>ignoring javi, i don't think we have consensus between us right now?

Douglas Purdy:

>there we go.

Douglas Purdy:

>let's have this discussion. form an opinion. ask for feedback. we decide.

Ilya Sukhar:

>I brought this up to all of you

Douglas Purdy:

>eddie: can you articulate the plan in a paragraph or so? and then ilya, i would love to get your view.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Everyone said there's a lot of history you're not aware of and we're solving Javi 's problems. going to the source seems to indicate that's not the case.

Ilya Sukhar:

>this proposal is the worst of both worlds. we thrash developers and don't actually fix the problem. you can match an address book to get a communication channel.

Edward O'Neil:

>Yeah - I've withheld judgement on the current plan until getting context from Javi independent of the current plan.

>

>Unfortunately, that meeting has slid around a bunch due to his travel schedule and this week's acquisition. Currently scheduled for Friday.

Douglas Purdy:

>javi isn't aware of a bunch of that history either (he has only been in the mteam conversations about this). also, he isn't too aware of the details here. we have spent hours and hours with zuck, etc. about this. that doesn't make the solution right however. key thing i care about is getting this "protect the graph" phase of platform over with ASAP and with min. impact to developers.

Douglas Purdy:

>i don't think we get to withhold judgement.

Edward O'Neil:

>To be clear - I'm doing what Mike asked in the last review - e.g. thinking through this from first principles as a way to gut check the current plan.

>

>Did that with Sam last week.

Ilya Sukhar:

>I feel like I am the only one with a principled stand here and you guys just want to get something done.

Douglas Purdy:

>and sam's response?

Ilya Sukhar:

>I just spent the day talking to many dozens of devs that will get totally fucked by this and it won't even be for the right reason.

Douglas Purdy:

>who is going to be fucked by this? perhaps i don't understand the current proposal well enough?

Vladimir Fedorov:

>Agree with Doug. I think this will be much easier discussion with use

>cases

Douglas Purdy:

>providing a 3rd party id by developer vs. app seems to have fixed the biggest issue i am aware of?

Ilya Sukhar:

>No it is a much easier discussion to start with what problem are we

>solving

Ilya Sukhar:

>solving

Douglas Purdy:

>ok, this may be the wrong forum for this conversation. eddie, can you send out the current thinking or point us to it?

ilya, could you articulate your opinion based on that plan? i can schedule some time over vc if needed. i am happy to be cut out of this discussion (that was what i was trying to do), but i think we have some fundamental differences here that we need to sort out. i don't think we should be talking to folks until we all agree on the approach/goals.

Ilya Sukhar:

>my opinion is don't break developers without a good reason. nobody has given me a clear articulation why the current proposal is worth the pain. non app friends was at least clearly solving a problem.

Ilya Sukhar:

>when we met with Javi nobody gave me a chance to talk so I went and talked to him.

Ilya Sukhar:

>sorry to bring this up but my engineers think this plan is insane and I'm not going to support an all hands to convince them otherwise.

Edward O'Neil:

>The purpose of talking to engineers is to give them context into why it's important to simplify platform.

>
>Not to discuss a final, fully baked plan (incl 3rd party IDs).
>
>The questions people are asking me (and others) are not about 3rd party ID model - they're about if / how their day-to-day jobs will change, why we don't like contact sync apps, and if we think there are any good apps on platform.

Ilya Sukhar:

>OK fair enough. It's hard to ignore the elephant in the room though.

Edward O'Neil:

>Agree - that's fair. Know it's an important part of the plan, but:
>
>1/ I think it's okay if it's squishy - e.g. X-app promotion isn't
>finalized yet
>
>2/ we're not doing any throwaway engineering work (yet) because we know
>we want to move to a per-app ID model

Edward O'Neil:

>Since Doug asked, here's the current 3rd party ID plan:
>
>1/ apps get app friends
>= existing users use real ID
>= new users use opaque ID
>
>2/ apps also get non-app friends
>= all users with opaque ID
>= fields limited to first name, last initial, opaque ID, profile pic
>
>3/ once PS12n is "on", app only sees opaque ID for new users
>
>4/ other:
>= MFS work b/c app can access non-app friends = tagging works b/c app
>can access non-app friends = Games team owns solving MFS ranking in the
>absence of friend_* and read_stream = GET /{opaque-id} works =
>deprecate User.username = don't let apps reverse /{uid}/picture URLs
>into UID

Edward O'Neil:

>Stepping into a meeting - back in 30.

Douglas Purdy:

>4/other has another important bit right? 3rd party ids are stable across a developer/publisher?

Douglas Purdy:

>eddie: also, what breaking changes, if any, are present with this model?

Edward O'Neil:

>On #4: no, opaque IDs are different for each of a developer's production apps. e.g. you will have a different user ID in Farmville and Z Poker.
>
>On breaking changes:

>
>1/ apps lose access to complete friend info
>
>2/ apps lose access to friend_*. Not strictly 3rd party ID but related.
>
>3/ this change will ripple into the eng process in subtle ways
>
>Certainly possible there are other breaks I'm not thinking of ATM.

Douglas Purdy:

>i thought we concluded in another thread that we are were going to support this, so we don't screw the game x-promotion scenario?

>
>if we don't support that, i agree with ilya that we are going to fucking with a lot of developers.

Edward O'Neil:

>Nothing has been concluded wrt cross-app promotion.

>
>The proposal was to use the same UID across apps from a single vendor.
>
>This is really only a problem for vendors with > 1 app and is especially acute at the head of the games ecosystem. The games team could be happy only allowing this lookup for Canvas apps - e.g. not mobile apps.
>
>George and I were scheduled to discuss with Javi yesterday but he moved the meeting to Friday.
>
>Note: supporting this for all apps means undermining both of Growth's concerns:
>
>1/ don't let apps grow through non-FB channels 2/ make it hard to merge
>graphs across apps

Douglas Purdy:

>I am worried we aren't calibrated on who we are worried about here. Can we have a short VC tomorrow? Happy to do in msg if we can't get time for all four of us. Hope everyone Isn't frustrated, it is going to take a little time for us to get on the same page, but I think I know what a couple disconnects are here. I think it is useful to separate developers into three buckets: existing competitors, possible future competitors, developers that we have alignment with on business models. When we talk to ourselves and to internal folks we need to be super clear what we are trying to do for each one. For example, I agree with Ilya if we decide to do this to game devs.

Douglas Purdy:

>Can we steal the platform sync meeting tomorrow to talk about this?

Edward O'Neil:

>I don't feel like I have enough info to talk about this and would rather wait until George and I have talked to Javi later this week.

Edward O'Neil:

>Ilya and I discussed earlier and are going to catchup on use cases
>tomorrow. It was 3:15 AM in Israel. :)
>
>To clarify, I'm happy to discuss the three current / future / aligned cases tomorrow but don't want to set expectations that we end 30 min with a 100% final plan.

Douglas Purdy:

>Ok. Can you and George include or debrief with Ilya before we talk? He has for the "thinks like an good external Dev" view that is in the latter of the three categories. George does too. We mostly care about protecting against the first two above. Is the right next step that you (Eddie) own updating Vlad and I on decision. If you three agree, Vlad and I will likely agree.

Edward O'Neil:

>Yep, think we have some options for the aligned case.

>

>George and I specifically want to talk to Javi about cross app promotion.

Douglas Purdy:

>Javi doesn't need to be consulted about cross app promotion.

Douglas Purdy:

>As long as it only is allowed to the folks in the 3rd category.

Douglas Purdy:

>We should consult him on how we are protecting ourselves in case 1 and 2, however.

Douglas Purdy:

>Mike and I are lined up here.

Douglas Purdy:

>We talked to George about this in the games review. We should talk about getting you visibility to those.

Douglas Purdy:

>Sorry.

Douglas Purdy:

>Does that make sense?

Edward O'Neil:

>No, it doesn't - and not having context into the games conversations makes this hard especially since this is mostly a games issue.

>

>e.g. most non-game apps only have a single production app ID.

Edward O'Neil:

>When I talked to George about this last Thursday, we *both* wanted to understand Javi's concern here.

Edward O'Neil:

>The separation between those categories doesn't feel clean to me - e.g. apps can transition from aligned => competitive and will ultimately make us sad that we leaked a bunch of data to them when they were aligned.

>

Douglas Purdy:

>Javi doesn't care about games

Douglas Purdy:

>The separation is not clean.

Douglas Purdy:

>That is why there is a bucket between.

Edward O'Neil:

>Really? Last time we talked to him, he brought up Zynga as an example of what we didn't want to have happen.

>

>If Javi doesn't care about games, then it's not clear that we should be doing *any* of this opaque ID stuff.

Douglas Purdy:

>The only why to do that is removing email from Login.

Douglas Purdy:

>We aren't going to do that.

Edward O'Neil:

>Not sure I follow...

Douglas Purdy:

>A lot of the canvas ecosystem is still email based.

Douglas Purdy:

>I made a mistake here. I ask you guys to talk to Javi before we were lined up internally. Vlad told me that, but I didn't listen. Can we all meet before everyone talks to Javi again? I'll even bring in mike so you guys know we are really on the same page. This is my fault. Will fix.

Edward O'Neil:

>Well, Mike asked for the same thing. :)

Douglas Purdy:

>Are you talking to him about this now?

Edward O'Neil:

>No - he asked for us to talk to Sam and Javi in the last Core Platform review two Thursdays ago.

Douglas Purdy:

>He is ok with it -- if we have the right framing.

Douglas Purdy:

>We don't

Edward O'Neil:

>This was when he asked that we re-think this from first principles...

Edward O'Neil:

>Maybe it is worthwhile to spend tomorrow's meeting fixing this information asymmetry?

Douglas Purdy:

>Exactly. Our motto should be to remove all I18Y.

Edward O'Neil:

>Okay - then let's do that. :) Assume that's worth everyone's time?

Douglas Purdy:

>I think so....

Edward O'Neil:

>Okay - sounds good.

>

>Do you consider Dropbox aligned? Or competitive?

Douglas Purdy:

>Possibly competitive, could move to aligned with a big deal between us.

Edward O'Neil:

>Makes sense - does that imply there's a 4th category of apps?

Douglas Purdy:

>I think three is enough for this model, but i am still thinking about it. We have really complex connections, but I would like a simple model for most cases and then an exception process as a check/relief here.

Edward O'Neil:

>Yeah, agree... In that case, we'd assume Dropbox is competitive, which matches my expectation.

Douglas Purdy:

>What are the three states in your model?

Edward O'Neil:

>I'm just reusing yours - competitive now, competitive future, aligned.

>

>And would assume Dropbox is future.

Douglas Purdy:

>Yes

Douglas Purdy:

>Exactly.

Douglas Purdy:

>Partner is the other state, but I think we can omit.

Edward O'Neil:

>Agree.

Edward O'Neil:

>And, a partner could move from aligned => competitive * - e.g. two mid-level game partners merge and buy Layer for messaging?

Edward O'Neil:

>Okay - thanks for the context. Will be good to discuss in more detail in the AM.