EXHIBIT 203

UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE LODGED UNDER SEAL

Edward O'Neil:
>if iOS(read) grants basic_info + email + user_birthday, that works for lots of games in the top 25. but it doesn't work well for "good" apps that rely on FB data. it means:

Edward O'Neil:
>Foursquare needs 4 clicks

Edward O'Neil:
>Redfin needs 3 clicks

Edward O'Neil:
>Path needs 3 clicks

Michael Vernal:
>Why 4 clicks for Foursquare?

Edward O'Neil:
>1: basic_info+email+user_birthday

Edward O'Neil:
>2: publish_stream

Edward O'Neil:
>3: user_locations / user_checkins

Edward O'Neil:
>4: friend_checkins

Michael Vernal:
>Why can't 3 + 4 be combined?

Edward O'Neil:
>we could let apps ask for "checkins" and grant user_ + friend_

Edward O'Neil:
>right -- they can be combined.

Michael Vernal:
>I assume 1 + 2 are native dialogs, and 3 is FAS?

Edward O'Neil:
>yes - FAS or iOS native.

FB-00483662

Edward O'Neil:
>now imagine 4SQ supports photos + videos. 5 clicks.

Michael Vernal:
>Why? Why isn't 3 clicks the max?

Michael Vernal:
>Can't you get everything in a single FAS?

Edward O'Neil:
>if we get iOS(*) and it's native, it's click-per-permission.

Edward O'Neil:
>if we're okay with FAS, we can grant multiple permissions / click.

Michael Vernal:
>Ah, ok.

Edward O'Neil:
>so, i think we prefer FAS unless we don't care about such apps.

Edward O'Neil:
>[i think apps in the ecosystem are better if we let them read data from
>us]

Edward O'Neil:
>are y'all happy with FAS?

Michael Vernal:
>I'm booked pretty solid today, but we need to figure this out. Can you + Doug or you + Zach work through what you
think is reasonable and propose any changes to our POR from yesterday? I'm scrambling to pull together a deck for
something else atm.

Michael Vernal:
>(I can also drop/move my deck, but non-ideal.)

Edward O'Neil:
>sure. headed to apple at 3 today. doug / zach - can we discuss asap? can also defer apple until monday.

Michael Vernal:
>Should meet w/ Apple otday. If can't get their attention, I'll move stuff.

Edward O'Neil:
>k.

Edward O'Neil:
>doug / zach - around to discuss?

Edward O'Neil:
>based on the other thread iOS(read) is still up in the air. to match the data in the address book, we'd need to grant:
>

2

>1/ basic_info + friends
>2/ user_email [+ friends_email, doesn't exist] 3/ user_location +
>friends_location 4/ user_work_history + friends_work_history 5/
>user_birthday + friends_birthday 6/ user_website + friends_website

Edward O'Neil:
>there's also CalDAV and the event permissions, but i'm less worried about those ATM.

Edward O'Neil:
>Got the ball rolling with Apple. They want to drop More Info and want to do a native UIAlertView that can request multiple permissions.

Zachary Rait:
>Awesome

Edward O'Neil:
>Also willing to let us whitelist read+write.

Edward O'Neil:
>If iOS(read) would grant basic / friends / email / birthday, they would like to list those explicitly.

Edward O'Neil:
>(list = show to the user)

Zachary Rait:
>Hm, how hard a limit is that? Seems like a worse user experience and
>it's not like they require twitter to enumerate everything that's on
>your profile (that you therefore get access to)

Michael Vernal:
>Holy crap, way to go Eddie!

Michael Vernal:
>You're a total stud.

Michael Vernal:
>(And, agreed w/ Zach - we should just argue these are common, and we
>should disclose up front and not in the dialog.)

Edward O'Neil:
>We might sway them with changes to the iOS(read) language. Think they prefer transparency vs. legalese disclosure, so enunerating perms might be a discussion...

Edward O'Neil:
>We could also frame it as iOS(identity), iOS(write), iOS(permissions).

Edward O'Neil:
>Vlad was on the phone; interested in his read.

Douglas Purdy:
>Great work. Know it sucks but this a great outcome.

Zachary Rait:
>Oh, I'm also curious if there was any reaction to the write privacy.

Edward O'Neil:
>Not really - think they view that as a cost of having two buttons, and the implementation is obvious. They did ask about having an Only Me level, which could make sense for apps like the weight tracker. But it wasn't an issue.

Zachary Rait:
>Sweet

Edward O'Neil:
>(yet)

Vladimir Fedorov:
>My read is that they really wanted to get rid of FAS and took our proposal as a way to get that. What they have in mind after the conversation is that they will implement a single blue alert which displays a sentence per permission. That way an alert would scroll if you ask for a few permissions - this is what they initially wanted but we pushed them off that because it was just like our old scary GDP design. They expect to get the text from us. In their mind they they could have a very consistent experience without permissions bundles by just treating all permissions and scenarios the same. We need to consider if we are happy with that UI experience (I don't have the full context) and what adjustments we want them to make.

FB-00483665