| EXHIBIT 118 |
|---|
| UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

From: Ilya Sukhar </O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ILYAS8A7>

Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 8:35 PM

To: Ilya Sukhar; Eddie O'Neil

Subject: Message summary [mid.1372124439940:5a9a2582ae85b06924]

Ilya Sukhar:

>We seem to be losing the battle to get required permissions into Login v4.

Ilya Sukhar:

>I'll add you to the relevant thread so you can see.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Also, unrelated, why does the latest ps12n proposal disallow login for competitors? What's the scenario we're worried about?

Edward O'Neil:

>RE v4: thanks - that'd be great. Jeffrey is obstinate and doesn't have >a good developer sense, so I don't think this battle is over yet. :)

>

>RE competitor login: eh?

Ilya Sukhar:

>In the slide about ps12n and what you get based on how competitive you are, why don't you get login if you're wechat?

Edward O'Neil:

>So we're not brokers of authentic identity to competitive networks.

Ilva Sukhar:

>Hmm, I see. Do we think Pinterest for example will end up in this boat?

Ilya Sukhar:

>btw, added you to the ling thread

Edward O'Neil:

>FWIW, it's not clear that this proposal is right...

>

>Yes, certainly possible Pinterest could end up there. Depends on what moves they make.

>

>I actually thought Pinterest was more aligned, but Doug put them in bucket #2 because that bucket includes things he thought Mark might want to buy.

>

>Tinder might be a better example - as a dating app that rides in the graph, they're pretty aligned, but if they add chat, they become some form of competitive.

Ilya Sukhar:

>I feel like the shut-down-growth-vectors story is pretty clear but the shut-down-everything story is tenuous. We're almost creating more strict competitors by taking away a dependency on FB. Pinterest is more likely to make Login with Pinterest if we take away FB from them.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Just a thought.

Ilya Sukhar:

>On a more general note, I think one piece of context that would be useful to some consumers of this proposal (e.g. David, Bryan) would be the expected numbers of competitive apps. They have an impression that we'll just outright crush every messaging app but realistically (or at least in my expectation), we only care about the top 10 and only when they're huge already.

Ilya Sukhar:

>Anyway, everything else looks good to me and I am in strict >defend-the-proposal mode to said consumers like David & Bryan;)

Edward O'Neil:

>Hm - in practice, I agree there are few (dozens) but we're going to
>remove permission to read your inbox from the public surface area and make that a part of the OEM client program.
>
>If they're able to use any of these messaging apps today, it's a hole
>in our data policies because FB employees aren't allowed to grant inbox

>permission to 3rd party apps...:/

>And, thanks for the aircover. :)

Ilva Sukhar:

>Oh, I meant messaging in terms of just WeChat - not FB inbox readers. I >didn't know those were really being used :)

Edward O'Neil:

>Oh. I see. Yeah, there are a few apps that are FB chat clients.

>On WeChat: certainly happy to revisit that part of the proposal. It's one of the über controversial parts of the proposal.

Edward O'Neil:

>It's not really blessed until Mike / Mark are on board. :)

Ilya Sukhar:

>(y)