

## **EXHIBIT 23**

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

---

**From:** Avichal Garg </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=AVICHALC10>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 25, 2013 11:54 PM  
**To:** Mike Vernal; George Lee; Ling Bao; Deborah Liu; Chris Daniels; Ilya Sukhar; Yuji Higaki; Douglas Purdy; Kevin Lacker; Avichal Garg; Jason Clark; Vishu Gupta; Jeffrey Spehar; Alan McConnell; Harshdeep Singh; Eddie O'Neil; TR Vishwanath; Zhen Fang; Constantin Koumouzelis; Vladimir Fedorov  
**Subject:** Message summary [id.1376659155890017]

Ling Bao:

>is "beta" a good name to use in the zuck deck? it connotes newish stuff being ironed out when a lot of this stuff is not new.

>

>even "non-core" might be a better name w/ the definition doug outlined earlier: stuff we're trying to figure out and will move to core, partner, or kill at some pt

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>I think beta is an appropriate name for developers - it has existing connotations which are not dissimilar from how we are defining that bucket.

>

>I think something like non-core implies that we are not planning on keeping the API around, which is untrue. If a beta API works well and provides value it can be moved into the core set.

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>Agree that initially it might feel a little weird as some of these APIs have existed for a long time, worth more discussion

Ling Bao:

>user\_photos and like box are super super old - beta just feels really weird as a label. yea we should discuss more

Douglas Purdy:

>that is why i didn't use beta. :-)

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>You want to go with Experimental? I'm cool with this for now, but reserve the right to sync with Content Strat :)

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>'Experimental' sounds really unstable to me, as a dev

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>as in stuff that is in nightly builds

Douglas Purdy:

>our non-core stuff is in nightly builds. :-)

>

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>ha, true

Douglas Purdy:

>I will assert the following. If it has been around a long time and we want don't want to give it a core api, it is either a partner api or a rm api.

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>What about something like Open Graph Common action type? They aren't core, partner or rm.

Douglas Purdy:

>sorry, not following. you mean things like og:like, etc?

>

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>yeah, exactly. Or video.watches, etc.

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>Those have been around for 2 years now, but we aren't going to make them core as we're still iterating on them

Douglas Purdy:

>We are iterating on the API or on how they surface in feed, etc. I think we should look at all our actions and break them into rm, partner (music is in here), core (og:like, etc.) and experimental (or beta).

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>ok - including this in the spec

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>and putting it under Avichal / Aryeh/ Marie to make a determination

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>this is also an opportunity for us to clean up our schemas and make them consistent

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>Currently working out of this shared directory:

[https://facebook.app.box.com/files/0/f/1101006748/Platform\\_Simplification](https://facebook.app.box.com/files/0/f/1101006748/Platform_Simplification)

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>Everyone should have access to read and edit docs. Please use the 'Spec' doc for the greater overview, open questions etc. Details about how platform APIs are partitioned into core, experimental, etc are in the API Matrix xls

Ling Bao:

>re: login, sharing, xlsx looks like a good start. attached is working doc for jeffrey, eddie, jason, george, vishu, myself on details

>

>highlights are potentially controversial. feel free to provide input

>

>our working group will hash this out monday and update the xlsx accordingly

Ling Bao attached Login, Sharing, Plugins Simplification [1].docx

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>Cool. We should standardize how we share information here - can you include that doc (when ready) in the box directory?

Ling Bao:

>we should standardize against your doc and xlsx format. think of my doc as a scratch pad. i'll work w/ you to integrate it into your format once login, sharing stuff is stable / highlights are gone

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>(y)

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>We should also start talking through our proposed timeline. For the moment I'm snapping to the Jan 31 announce date for all of this.

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>As we continue working the audit that might start to look like banana town.

Constantin Koumouzelis:

>But let's keep it in mind for now

Ilya Sukhar:

>Just catching up here. Is it possible for us to get to a state where core permissions are not bifurcated based on whether the app is competitive or not? That's a real core and I think it would play well in the press (e.g. "Facebook stabilized API, even for competitive apps").

Douglas Purdy:

>that is sharing.

Douglas Purdy:

>only.

Douglas Purdy:

>if we are being honest about it.

Douglas Purdy:

>and if we are just talking about the existing Platform, not Parse.

Douglas Purdy:

>javi hates that we even give profile pics to competitive apps.

Douglas Purdy:

>mike and i were discussing a "restricted" level that is just dialogs and plugins.

Douglas Purdy:

>that is a core that anyone can use.

Douglas Purdy:

>it leaks nothing.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Meaning no login at all?

Douglas Purdy:

>correct. if we are going to be honest that is where this should land in the limit.

Douglas Purdy:  
>no user data given to competitors.

Douglas Purdy:  
>now I am not including Parse here.

Douglas Purdy:  
>of course. i think this is worth a discussion, as I want to really clarify this case. mike and zuck should way in.

Douglas Purdy:  
>but the truth is that we are going to be under pressure to pull more and more user data from competitors over time.

Ilya Sukhar:  
>Yeah, that makes sense. I think we should have a crisp story re competitive apps while we're at this whole thing. Even defining the "restricted" set and being upfront about it ("this is what you get when we put you in jail..") is better than status quo.

Douglas Purdy:  
>yes. transparent is good.

Ling Bao:  
>Worth discussing. Still feel like we should provide a minimal login layer even for competitors. Apple lets gmaps into their App Store. Windows runs iTunes, etc. we don't need to give graph or any data that's key, but it'd be nice if users really could login to everything via single id. In some ways this gives us more leverage against competitors (we have some data on usage patterns)

Douglas Purdy:  
>if the minimal login layer includes FB user data, I don't think it works in the limit. Mike can weigh in here, but I think we should just tell competitors that they can use our sharing/plugins. if they want general purpose developers services, they can use parse. btw: i don't think Apple and Windows are good comps for how to think about this problem, this is data issue, not an execution issue.

Michael Vernal:  
>Ok, there's a lot going on with this thread. Some comments:  
>  
>1. In general, I think we should roughly be making decisions as follows:  
>- We should clearly understand what teams own what APIs  
>- Those teams should make decisions about core/beta/kill  
>- In making those decisions, those teams are signing-up for SLAs for those APIs  
>- If that team does not hit their SLAs, we will deprecate their API for them  
>- "Core" APIs must be owned by the platform team. (Other APIs can be owned by any org at FB.)  
>  
>That answers a few questions in the thread:  
>  
>@George - you can keep the Game APIs if you support them and meet SLA.  
>  
>@George - you own whether to keep the Request dialog.  
>  
>@Ling - you own whether to keep Send dialog. I'd just make it the Share dialog, but open to Send Message by default.  
>  
>@Vish - you own the RT updates decision.  
>

>Photo & Video tags - this is all basically a photos team question. My recommendation would be to kill all non-profile pic photos.

>

>User table fields - I think this is probably the Login + API teams to decide (Ling + Eddie)

>

>user\_likes - I have a pretty strong bias towards keeping this, but we should discuss.

>

>The "restricted" stuff - I'm not sure we can define this, but we should just discuss this live.

Michael Vernal:

>@Constantin - can you send me the slides I should look at, when you're ready?