EXHIBIT 178

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

Amir Naor:
>Hey guys, Sean mentioned we made a change yesterday to show login v4 on canvas games when they point to graph 2.0. I was able to confirm this is indeed the case. what's the context for this change?

Amir Naor:
>I'm pretty sure we were all aligned that canvas will remain on gdp 2.5 until EOY

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>It's optional

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Existing games are free to mix versions, but new games should try to work with v2

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>+Niket, this is news to me

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>Sean - so devs can opt into the new login by using the v2.0 OAuth dialog?

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Niket took part in deciding this

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>correct

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>that sounds reasonable, so long as nothing is forced

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>only new games are forced

Amir Naor:
>when we say "try" how can they opt out?

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>Oh I see...

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>if old games choose no version, or v1.0, then they see gdpv2.5

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:

1

>new games have no option, they get gdpv4

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>Hmm, OK, if Niket & Vishu have vetted this we can collect metrics and see how it works out

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>we all want games to move to v4 too, but haven't been able to force old games. But new games should find ways to work equally well on gdpv4, paving the way for old apps to also migrate

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>yeah, I agree with that statement

Amir Naor:
>This is not we were planning for, not what we communicated to partners we talked to. Who was in the loop for this decision?

Niket Biswas:
>yeah this is what we decided a while back

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>but I want to make sure we are sensitive to conversion for new games as well, in terms of growth and TPV - which I have no doubt Niket is on top of

Amir Naor:
>s/not/or

Niket Biswas:
>a 1 year deprecation plan was part of the communication plan

Niket Biswas:
>that's what this is

Niket Biswas:
>am i missing something?

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>I think the disconnect here is new games, as in an App ID that was created post f8

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>they get GDP v4 by default and cannot opt out

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>no 1 year anything

Niket Biswas:
>yeah - might have had a disconnect there, though that is what the login folks decided on, and it seems reasonable as they'll just be new apps. for partners we can make an exception (internal tool does this for test apps already)

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>We focus first and foremost on moving the ecosystem forward, and onto a consistent platform. I'm sure that we'll be able to make exceptions if really needed, but we need to start somewhere.

Amir Naor:
>I disagree on having a different rules for different developers - this should be consistent until we are confident on the impact of v4 on the games ecosystem

Amir Naor:
>and tbh this is what we discussed a lot when we agreed on this behavior

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Amir, the inconsistency is that we hold developers to different standards - it's pretty amazing that no-one has called us out on this already. We let games get away with things we publicly document we don't allow regular apps to do.

Edward O'Neil:
>Wait - this wasn't the plan we agreed upon with everyone, including partnerships, Dan, Mike, Deb, etc.
>
>Plan:
>1/ Canvas remains on GDP v2.5, including existing + new apps
>
>2/ we test the impact of Login v4 on Canvas apps + games
>
>3/ using data from #2 we assess when it makes sense to disrupt partners [and the FB business] and push them to move from 2.5 => 4
>
>Can we revert to the above plan and discuss before making any public changes?

Edward O'Neil:
>This is not different rules for different developers - it's different timeframes for different developers.
>
>Everyone [including Dan / Deb] agree that we are going to move Canvas to v4.
>
>Given the disruption of this change, we want to make it informed with data and let the data drive /when/ we make the change.

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>I only made the changes I discussed with Jeffrey, which he said Niket was onboard with

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>So to recap, for games created after f8, you want them to still be on v2.5? No-one see the big inconsistency between them having all the changes of platformv2 imposed, but not this one ui change?

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Or are Games also exempted from being forced into v2?

Edward O'Neil:
>I see the inconsistency, we just decided that it was worth it.
>
>Games are being forced into the underlying model changes [app scoped IDs, friends permissions, etc].
>
>The sensitivity from the games business is around two changes that aren't on Canvas today:
>
>1/ read + write split
>
>2/ permission x-out

3

Edward O'Neil:
>Niket / Vishu / Constantin: thoughts?

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>+Vishu

Edward O'Neil:
>^^ lol. Good call.

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>That sounds reasonable to me - I wasn't involved in the discussion with Dan/Deb but I understand the sensitivity here.

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>If there's a plan to actually get them over, then I'm fine with making gdpv4 optional only for Games.
>As an aside, what is currently preventing apps from listing as games?

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>This is restricted to canvas only and login review would prevent apps from mis-categorizing to collect reviewable permissions

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>As for the plan to move apps over - I expect we use the next year to collect data for apps that opt-in and optimize the experience

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>What do you mean by restricted to canvas only?

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>We don't currently have any distinction regarding the surface used to request tos

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>you must be a canvas game (category = games, have a canvas implementation and only available in the www oauth dialog)

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>games are prohitbited from using FB Login for www that are not on canvas AFAIK

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>right, I seem to remember something about this. Which means that canvas isn't really a topic here, only the games classification

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>given that most (all?) games on canvas are in app center, they are also reviewed

Amir Naor:
>It's not a requirement to be listed on the app center, but most developers want to get more traffic and therefore are getting listed and being reviewed. This is on top of login review as Constantin mentioned.

Amir Naor:
>In general, even before f8 (1.0) canvas games were a special case as their were on 2.5 while the rest were on 3.0

4

Amir Naor:
>s/their/they

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>What exactly are we planning on doing to actually get games to migrate? And won't this meant that in a years time, game developers who just created a game, will have their *existing* games forced onto a new platform?

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Or are we just planning on keeping a sliding window?

Edward O'Neil:
>See #1-#3 above. We need to test with some partners, collect data, and use data to drive the timing.
>
>There isn't a plan beyond that yet because we don't have data.
>
>Timing could be 1 year or 3 years.

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Can we at least limit this to existing big partners? If not we'll be creating an unnecessary amount of churn, for small developers who cannot even find documentation supporting what they are seeing

Amir Naor:
>I think the plan is to use the next couple of month to test this with a few partners (now that's it out) and see what the impact is before making a decision. Once there's an agreement on the tradeoff we are making (driven by data), we'll probably need a breaking change notice before forcing the v4 dialog on canvas. The change developers will need to do will be around login only as they are already experiencing all the other changes features of 2.0.

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Amir - rhetorical question - but how do you announce a breaking change to something which isn't even documented behavior (actually counter to documented behavior)?

Edward O'Neil:
>Sean: let's do this for all of Canvas. Easier to explain that way.
>
>Amir: let's not consider the mechanics of making the change in this thread.

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>I'll try to get a fix in tomorrow

Amir Naor:
>weird i just got some of the messages (out of order)... :/ hate when this happens. Anyway, thanks for addressing this Sean.

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Can you make something available for whomever will be working on actually supporting this from a technical point of view, regarding reasoning, timelines etc, too?

Edward O'Neil:
>Great - thanks, Sean.
>
>Amir: let's consider the follow-up questions around who to test with and opt-in separately.

FB-00433727

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>Just so it's clear, I'm not in this to disrupt the Games business (or the money business), but I do think we need someone to keep pushing you guys in that direction.
>
>We've had games on v2 2 years after v3 was launched (and we knew back then that we wanted to get games off of v2), and we now plan on letting them continue on this for up to 3 more years. Let this be the last time we do this.

Constantin Koumouzelis:
>(y)

Edward O'Neil:
>Strong agree.

Oeyvind Sean Kinsey:
>It's ironic that we're exempting the one category where trust is paramount (money is involved) from taking part in building that trust :)

Amir Naor:
>Eddie, I'll follow up separately on the next steps and questioned that were brought up here.
>
>Sean, totally agree with you that we should aim for a consistent platform. I think we are on the right track getting there.

Vishu Gupta:
>(y)