

Recommendation	Recommendation Text	Latest Assessment of Meta's Response	Latest Assessment of Implementation
Armenians in Azerbaijan #1	<p>Ensure that users are always notified of the reasons for any enforcement of the Community Standards against them, including the specific rule Facebook is enforcing. Doing so would enable Facebook to encourage expression that complies with its Community Standards, rather than adopting an adversarial posture towards users. In this case, the user was informed that the post violated the Community Standard on hate speech but was not told that the post violated the standard because it included a slur targeting national origin. Facebook satisfied the principle of legality in this instance, but Facebook's lack of transparency left its decision susceptible to the mistaken belief that it had removed the post because the user was addressing a controversial subject or expressing a viewpoint Facebook disagreed with.</p>	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #1	<p>Improve the automated detection of images with text-overlay to ensure that posts raising awareness of breast cancer symptoms are not wrongly flagged for review.</p>	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #2 (Meta calls rec #3)	<p>Ensure that users are always notified of the reasons for the enforcement of content policies against them, providing the specific rule within the Community Standard Facebook based its decision on.</p>	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information

<p>Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #3 (Meta calls rec #5)</p>	<p>Inform users when automation is used to take enforcement action against their content, including accessible descriptions of what this means.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #4</p>	<p>Ensure users can appeal decisions taken by automated systems to human review when their content is found to have violated Facebook's Community Standard on Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity. Where Facebook is seeking to prevent child sexual exploitation or the dissemination of non-consensual intimate images, it should enforce based on its Community Standards on Sexual Exploitation of Adults and Child Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Nudity, rather than rely on over-enforcing policies on adult nudity. Appeals should still be available in these cases, so incorrect removals of permitted consensual adult nudity can be reversed.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment</p>
<p>Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #5 (Meta loops into rec #1 in Q3)</p>	<p>Implement an internal audit procedure to continuously analyze a statistically representative sample of automated content removal decisions to reverse and learn from enforcement mistakes.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>

Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #6	Expand transparency reporting to disclose data on the number of automated removal decisions per Community Standard, and the proportion of those decisions subsequently reversed following human review.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #7	Revise the “short” explanation of the Instagram Community Guidelines to clarify that the ban on adult nudity is not absolute.	Not Comprehensive	Progress reported
Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #8 (Meta calls rec #2)	Revise the “long” explanation of the Instagram Community Guidelines to clarify that visible female nipples can be shown to raise breast cancer awareness.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Breast cancer symptoms and nudity #9 (Meta calls rec #2)	Clarify that the Instagram Community Guidelines are interpreted in line with the Facebook Community Standards, and where there are inconsistencies the latter take precedence.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Nazi quote #1	Ensure that users are always notified of the reasons for any enforcement of the Community Standards against them, including the specific rule Facebook is enforcing (e.g. for support of a hate organization).	Somewhat Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Nazi quote #2	Explain and provide examples of the application of key terms used in the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy, including the meanings of “praise,” “support” and “representation.” These should align with the definitions used in Facebook’s Internal Implementation Standards. The Community Standard should provide clearer guidance to users on how to make their intent apparent when discussing individuals or organizations designated as dangerous.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

Nazi quote #3	Provide a public list of the organizations and individuals designated “dangerous” under the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations Community Standard. At a minimum, illustrative examples should be provided. This would help users to better understand the policy and conduct themselves accordingly.	Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment
Claimed COVID-19 cure #1 (Meta calls recs #1, #6)	<p>The Board recommends that Facebook set out a clear and accessible Community Standard on health misinformation, consolidating and clarifying existing rules in one place (including defining key terms such as misinformation). This rule-making should be accompanied with “detailed hypotheticals that illustrate the nuances of interpretation and application of [these] rules” to provide further clarity for users (See report A/HRC/38/35, para. 46 (2018)).</p> <p>Meta should conduct a human rights impact assessment with relevant stakeholders as part of its process of rule modification (UNGPs, Principles 18-19).</p>	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

<p>Claimed COVID-19 cure #2 (Meta calls recs #2, #3, &amp; #4)</p>	<p>To ensure enforcement measures on health misinformation represent the least intrusive means of protecting public health, the Board recommends that Facebook:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarify the particular harms it is seeking to prevent and provide transparency about how it will assess the potential harm of particular content;</li> <li>- Conduct an assessment of its existing range of tools to deal with health misinformation;</li> <li>- Consider the potential for development of further tools that are less intrusive than content removals;</li> <li>- Publish its range of enforcement options within the Community Standards, ranking these options from most to least intrusive based on how they infringe freedom of expression;</li> <li>- Explain what factors, including evidence-based criteria, the platform will use in selecting the least intrusive option when enforcing its Community Standards to protect public health;</li> <li>- Make clear within the Community Standards what enforcement option applies to each rule.</li> </ul>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>
--	--	----------------------	--

<p>Claimed COVID-19 cure #3 (Meta calls rec #7)</p>	<p>In cases where users post information about COVID-19 treatments that contradicts the specific advice of health authorities and where a potential for physical harm is identified but is not imminent, the Board strongly recommends Facebook to adopt a range of less intrusive measures. This could include labelling which alerts users to the disputed nature of the post’s content and provides links to the views of the World Health Organization and national health authorities. In certain situations it may be necessary to introduce additional friction to a post - for example, by preventing interactions or sharing, to reduce organic and algorithmically driven amplification. Downranking content, to prevent visibility in other users’ newsfeeds, might also be considered. All enforcement measures, including labelling or other methods of introducing friction, should be clearly communicated to users, and subject to appeal.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed</p>
---	--	--------------------------	---

<p>Claimed COVID-19 cure #4 (Meta calls rec #5)</p>	<p>Publish a transparency report on how the Community Standards have been enforced during the COVID-19 global health crisis. This should include: data in absolute and percentage terms on the number of removals, as well as data on other enforcement measures, on the specific Community Standards enforced against, including on the proportion that relied entirely on automation; a breakdown by content type enforced against (including individual posts, accounts, and groups); a breakdown by the source of detection (including automation, user flagging, trusted partners, law enforcement authorities); a breakdown by region and language; metrics on the effectiveness of less intrusive measures (e.g., impact of labelling or downranking); data on the availability of appeals throughout the crisis, including the total number of cases where appeal was withdrawn entirely, and the percentage of automated appeals; conclusions and lessons learned, including information on any changes Facebook is making to ensure greater compliance with its human rights responsibilities going forward.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Protest in India against France #1</p>	<p>To ensure users have clarity regarding permissible content, the Board recommends that Facebook provide users with additional information regarding the scope and enforcement of this Community Standard. Enforcement criteria should be public and align with Facebook’s Internal Implementation Standards. Specifically, Facebook’s criteria should address intent, the identity of the user and audience, and context.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>

<p>Depiction of Zwarte Piet #1</p>	<p>Facebook should link the rule in the Hate Speech Community Standard prohibiting blackface to the company’s reasoning for the rule, including harms it seeks to prevent.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Depiction of Zwarte Piet #2</p>	<p>In line with the Board’s recommendation in case 2020-003-FB-UA, Facebook should “ensure that users are always notified of the reasons for any enforcement of the Community Standards against them, including the specific rule Facebook is enforcing.” In this case any notice to users should specify the rule on blackface, and also link to above mentioned resources that explain the harm this rule seeks to prevent. Facebook should provide a detailed update on its “feasibility assessment” of the Board’s prior recommendations on this topic, including the specific nature of any technical limitations and how these can be overcome.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Partial implementation demonstrated through published information</p>
<p>Punjabi concern over the RSS in India #1</p>	<p>Facebook should translate its Community Standards and Internal Implementation Standards into Punjabi. Facebook should aim to make its Community Standards accessible in all languages widely spoken by its users. This would allow a full understanding of the rules that users must abide by when using Facebook’s products. It would also make it simpler for users to engage with Facebook over content that may violate their rights.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>



<p>Punjabi concern over the RSS in India #2</p>	<p>In line with the Board’s recommendation in case 2020-004-IG-UA, the company should restore human review and access to a human appeals process to pre-pandemic levels as soon as possible while fully protecting the health of Facebook’s staff and contractors.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Punjabi concern over the RSS in India #3</p>	<p>Facebook should improve its transparency reporting to increase public information on error rates by making this information viewable by country and language for each Community Standard. The Board underscores that more detailed transparency reports will help the public spot areas where errors are more common, including potential specific impacts on minority groups, and alert Facebook to correct them.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>

<p>Former President Trump's suspension #1 (Meta calls recs #2, #3)</p>	<p>The Board believes that it is not always useful to draw a firm distinction between political leaders and other influential users. It is important to recognise that other users with large audiences can also contribute to serious risks of harm. The same rules should apply to all users of the platform; but context matters when assessing issues of causality and the probability and imminence of harm. What is important is the degree of influence that a user has over other users [...] Facebook must assess posts by influential users in context according to the way they are likely to be understood, even if their incendiary message is couched in language designed to avoid responsibility, such as superficial encouragement to act peacefully or lawfully. Facebook used the six contextual factors in the Rabat Plan of Action in this case and the Board thinks that this is a useful way to assess the contextual risks of potentially harmful speech. The Board stresses that time is of the essence in such situations; taking action before influential users can cause significant harm should take priority over newsworthiness and other values of political communication.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #2 (Meta calls rec #1)</p>	<p>When posts by influential users pose a high probability of imminent harm, as assessed under international human rights standards, Facebook should take action to enforce its rules quickly.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>

<p>Former President Trump's suspension #3 (Meta calls rec #4)</p>	<p>While all users should be held to the same content policies, there are unique factors that must be considered in assessing the speech of political leaders. Heads of state and other high-ranking government officials can have a greater power to cause harm than other people. Facebook should recognize that posts by heads of state and other high officials of government can carry a heightened risk of encouraging, legitimizing, or inciting violence - either because their high position of trust imbues their words with greater force and credibility or because their followers may infer they can act with impunity. At the same time, it is important to protect the rights of people to hear political speech. Nonetheless, if the head of state or high government official has repeatedly posted messages that pose a risk of harm under international human rights norms, Facebook should suspend the account for a determinate period sufficient to protect against imminent harm.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #4 (Meta calls rec #5)</p>	<p>Periods of suspension should be long enough to deter misconduct and may, in appropriate cases, include account or page deletion.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>

<p>Former President Trump's suspension #5 (Meta calls rec #6)</p>	<p>Restrictions on speech are often imposed by or at the behest of powerful state actors against dissenting voices and members of political oppositions. Facebook must resist pressure from governments to silence their political opposition. When assessing potential risks, Facebook should be particularly careful to consider the relevant political context.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #6 (Meta calls rec #7)</p>	<p>In evaluating political speech from highly influential users, Facebook should rapidly escalate the content moderation process to specialized staff who are familiar with the linguistic and political context and insulated from political and economic interference and undue influence. This analysis should examine the conduct of highly influential users off the Facebook and Instagram platforms to adequately assess the full relevant context of potentially harmful speech. Further, Facebook should ensure that it dedicates adequate resourcing and expertise to assess risks of harm from influential accounts globally.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #7 (Meta calls recs #8, #9)</p>	<p>Facebook should publicly explain the rules that it uses when it imposes account-level sanctions against influential users. These rules should ensure that when Facebook imposes a time-limited suspension on the account of an influential user to reduce the risk of significant harm, it will assess whether the risk has receded before the suspension term expires. If Facebook identifies that the user poses a serious risk of inciting imminent violence, discrimination, or other lawless action at that time, another time-bound suspension should be imposed when such measures are necessary to protect public safety and proportionate to the risk.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>

<p>Former President Trump's suspension #8 (Meta calls rec #10)</p>	<p>When Facebook implements special procedures that apply to influential users, these should be well documented. It was unclear whether Facebook applied different standards in this case, and the Board heard many concerns about the potential application of the newsworthiness allowance. It is important that Facebook address this lack of transparency and the confusion it has caused.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #9 (Meta calls rec #11)</p>	<p>Facebook should produce more information to help users understand and evaluate the process and criteria for applying the newsworthiness allowance. Facebook should clearly explain how the newsworthiness allowance applies to influential accounts, including political leaders and other public figures.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #10 (Meta calls rec #12)</p>	<p>For cross check review, Facebook should clearly explain the rationale, standards, and processes of review, including the criteria to determine which pages and accounts are selected for inclusion.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #11 (Meta calls rec #13)</p>	<p>Facebook should report on the relative error rates and thematic consistency of determinations made through the cross-check process compared with ordinary enforcement procedures.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #12</p>	<p>When Facebook's platform has been abused by influential users in a way that results in serious adverse human rights impacts, it should conduct a thorough investigation into the incident. Facebook should assess what influence it had and assess what changes it could enact to identify, prevent, mitigate, and account for adverse impacts in future.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>

<p>Former President Trump's suspension #13 (Meta calls rec #14)</p>	<p>Facebook should undertake a comprehensive review of its potential contribution to the narrative of electoral fraud and the exacerbated tensions that culminated in the violence in the United States on January 6, 2021. This should be an open reflection on the design and policy choices that Facebook has made that may enable its platform to be abused. Facebook should carry out this due diligence, implement a plan to act upon its findings, and communicate openly about how it addresses adverse human rights impacts it was involved with.</p>	<p>Not Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #14 (Meta calls rec #15)</p>	<p>Facebook has a responsibility to collect, preserve and, where appropriate, share information to assist in the investigation and potential prosecution of grave violations of international criminal, human rights and humanitarian law by competent authorities and accountability mechanisms. Facebook's corporate human rights policy should make clear the protocols the company has in place in this regard. The policy should also make clear how information previously public on the platform can be made available to researchers conducting investigations that conform with international standards and applicable data protection laws.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed</p>
<p>Former President Trump's suspension #15 (Meta calls rec #16)</p>	<p>Facebook should explain in its Community Standards and Guidelines its strikes and penalties process for restricting profiles, pages, groups and accounts on Facebook and Instagram in a clear, comprehensive, and accessible manner. These policies should provide users with sufficient information to understand when strikes are imposed (including any applicable exceptions or allowances) and how penalties are calculated.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>

Former President Trump's suspension #16 (Meta calls rec #17)	Facebook should also provide users with accessible information on how many violations, strikes, and penalties have been assessed against them, as well as the consequences that will follow future violations.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Former President Trump's suspension #17 (Meta calls rec #18)	In its transparency reporting, Facebook should include numbers of profile, page, and account restrictions, including the reason and manner in which enforcement action was taken, with information broken down by region and country.	Not Comprehensive	Progress reported
Former President Trump's suspension #18 (Meta calls rec #19)	Facebook should develop and publish a policy that governs its response to crises or novel situations where its regular processes would not prevent or avoid imminent harm. While these situations cannot always be anticipated, Facebook's guidance should set appropriate parameters for such actions, including a requirement to review its decision within a fixed time.	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
"Two buttons" meme #1	Make technical arrangements to ensure that notice to users refers to the Community Standard enforced by the company. If Facebook determines that (i) the content does not violate the Community Standard notified to user, and (ii) that the content violates a different Community Standard, the user should be properly notified about it and given another opportunity to appeal. They should always have access to the correct information before coming to the Board.	Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment
"Two buttons" meme #2	Include the satire exception, which is currently not communicated to users, in the public language of the Hate Speech Community Standard.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

"Two buttons" meme #3	Make sure that it has adequate procedures in place to assess satirical content and relevant context properly. This includes providing content moderators with: (i) access to Facebook's local operation teams to gather relevant cultural and background information; and (ii) sufficient time to consult with Facebook's local operation teams and to make the assessment. Facebook should ensure that its policies for content moderators incentivize further investigation or escalation where a content moderator is not sure if a meme is satirical or not.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
"Two buttons" meme #4	Let users indicate in their appeal that their content falls into one of the exceptions to the Hate Speech policy. This includes exceptions for satirical content and where users share hateful content to condemn it or raise awareness.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
"Two buttons" meme #5	Ensure appeals based on policy exceptions are prioritized for human review.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Pro-Navalny protests in Russia #1	Facebook should amend and redraft the Bullying & Harassment Community Standard to explain the relationship between the Policy Rationale and the "Do not's" as well as the other rules restricting content that follow it.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Pro-Navalny protests in Russia #2	Differentiate between bullying and harassment and provide definitions that distinguish the two acts. Further, the Community Standard should clearly explain to users how bullying and harassment differ from speech that only causes offense and may be protected under international human rights law.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment



Pro-Navalny protests in Russia #3	Clearly define its approach to different target user categories and provide illustrative examples of each target category (i.e. who qualifies as a public figure). Format the Community Standard on Bullying and Harassment by user categories currently listed in the policy.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Pro-Navalny protests in Russia #4	Include illustrative examples of violating and non-violating content in the Bullying and Harassment Community Standard to clarify the policy lines drawn and how these distinctions can rest on the identity status of the target.	Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment
Pro-Navalny protests in Russia #5	When assessing content including a 'negative character claim' against a private adult, Facebook should amend the Community Standard to require an assessment of the social and political context of the content. Facebook should reconsider the enforcement of this rule in political or public debates where the removal of the content would stifle debate.	Not Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment
Pro-Navalny protests in Russia #6	Whenever Facebook removes content because of a negative character claim that is only a single word or phrase in a larger post, it should promptly notify the user of that fact, so that the user can repost the material without the negative character claim.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation

Öcalan's isolation #1	Immediately restore the misplaced 2017 guidance to the Internal Implementation Standards and Known Questions (the internal guidance for content moderators), informing all content moderators that it exists and arranging immediate training on it.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Öcalan's isolation #2	Evaluate automated moderation processes for enforcement of the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy. Where necessary, Facebook should update classifiers to exclude training data from prior enforcement errors that resulted from failures to apply the 2017 guidance. New training data should be added that reflects the restoration of this guidance.	Not Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Öcalan's isolation #3	Publish the results of the ongoing review process to determine if any other policies were lost, including descriptions of all lost policies, the period the policies were lost for, and steps taken to restore them.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Öcalan's isolation #4	Reflect in the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations “policy rationale” that respect for human rights and freedom of expression, in particular open discussion about human rights violations and abuses that relate to terrorism and efforts to counter terrorism, can advance the value of “Safety,” and that it is important for the platform to provide a space for these discussions. While “Safety” and “Voice” may sometimes be in tension, the policy rationale should specify in greater detail the “real-world harms” the policy seeks to prevent and disrupt when “Voice” is suppressed.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

Öcalan's isolation #5	<p>Add to the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy a clear explanation of what “support” excludes. Users should be free to discuss alleged violations and abuses of the human rights of members of designated organizations. This should not be limited to detained individuals. It should include discussion of rights protected by the UN human rights conventions as cited in Facebook’s Corporate Human Rights Policy. This should allow, for example, discussions on allegations of torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, violations of the right to a fair trial, as well as extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions, enforced disappearance, extraordinary rendition and revocation of citizenship rendering a person stateless. Calls for accountability for human rights violations and abuses should also be protected. Content that incites acts of violence or recruits people to join or otherwise provide material support to Facebook-designated organizations should be excluded from protection even if the same content also discusses human rights concerns. The user’s intent, the broader context in which they post, and how other users understand their post, is key to determining the likelihood of real-world harm that may result from such posts.</p>	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Öcalan's isolation #6	<p>Explain in the Community Standards how users can make the intent behind their posts clear to Facebook. This would be assisted by implementing the Board’s existing recommendation to publicly disclose the company’s list of designated individuals and organizations (see: case 2020-005-FB-UA). Facebook should also provide illustrative examples to demonstrate the line between permitted and prohibited content, including in relation to the application of the rule clarifying what “support” excludes.</p>	Somewhat Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information

Öcalan's isolation #7	Ensure meaningful stakeholder engagement on the proposed policy change through Facebook's Product Policy Forum, including through a public call for inputs. Facebook should conduct this engagement in multiple languages across regions, ensuring the effective participation of individuals most impacted by the harms this policy seeks to prevent. This engagement should also include human rights, civil society, and academic organizations with expert knowledge on those harms, as well as the harms that may result from over-enforcement of the existing policy.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Öcalan's isolation #8	Ensure internal guidance and training is provided to content moderators on any new policy. Content moderators should be provided adequate resources to be able to understand the new policy, and adequate time to make decisions when enforcing the policy.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Öcalan's isolation #9	Ensure that users are notified when their content is removed. The notification should note whether the removal is due to a government request or due to a violation of the Community Standards or due to a government claiming a national law is violated (and the jurisdictional reach of any removal).	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Öcalan's isolation #10	Clarify to Instagram users that Facebook's Community Standards apply to Instagram in the same way they apply to Facebook, in line with the recommendation in case 2020-004-IG-UA.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Öcalan's isolation #11	Include information in its transparency reporting on the number of requests Facebook receives for content removals from governments that are based on Community Standards violations (as opposed to violations of national law), and the outcome of those requests.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Öcalan's isolation #12	In transparency reporting, include more comprehensive information on error rates for enforcing rules on “praise” and “support” of dangerous individuals and organizations, broken down by region and language.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment
Myanmar bot #1	Facebook should ensure that its Internal Implementation Standards are available in the language in which content moderators review content. If necessary to prioritize, Facebook should focus first on contexts where the risks to human rights are more severe.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
COVID-19 lockdowns in Brazil #1	Facebook should conduct a proportionality analysis to identify a range of less intrusive measures than removing the content. When necessary, the least intrusive measures should be used where content related to COVID-19 distorts the advice of international health authorities and where a potential for physical harm is identified but is not imminent. Recommended measures include: (a) labeling content to alert users to the disputed nature of a post's content and to provide links to the views of the World Health Organization and national health authorities; (b) introducing friction to posts to prevent interactions or sharing; and (c) down-ranking, to reduce visibility in other users’ News Feeds. All these enforcement measures should be clearly communicated to all users, and subject to appeal.	Not Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation

COVID-19 lockdowns in Brazil #2	Given the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, Facebook should make technical arrangements to prioritize fact-checking of potential health misinformation shared by public authorities which comes to the company's attention, taking into consideration the local context.	Not Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
COVID-19 lockdowns in Brazil #3	Facebook should provide more transparency within the False News Community Standard regarding when content is eligible for fact-checking, including whether public institutions' accounts are subject to fact-checking.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Shared Al Jazeera post #1	Add criteria and illustrative examples to its Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy to increase understanding of the exceptions for neutral discussion, condemnation and news reporting.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Shared Al Jazeera post #2	Ensure swift translation of updates to the Community Standards into all available languages.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment

Shared Al Jazeera post #3	Engage an independent entity not associated with either side of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to conduct a thorough examination to determine whether Facebook's content moderation in Arabic and Hebrew, including its use of automation, have been applied without bias. This examination should review not only the treatment of Palestinian or pro-Palestinian content, but also content that incites violence against any potential targets, no matter their nationality, ethnicity, religion or belief, or political opinion. The review should look at content posted by Facebook users located in and outside of Israel and the Palestinian Occupied Territories. The report and its conclusions should be made public.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Shared Al Jazeera post #4	Formalize a transparent process on how it receives and responds to all government requests for content removal, and ensure that they are included in transparency reporting. The transparency reporting should distinguish government requests that led to removals for violations of the Community Standards from requests that led to removal or geo-blocking for violating local law, in addition to requests that led to no action.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Colombia protests #1	Publish illustrative examples from the list of slurs designated as violating under its Hate Speech Community Standard, including borderline cases with words which may be harmful in some contexts but not others.	Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment

Colombia protests #2	Link the short explanation of the newsworthiness allowance provided in the introduction to the Community Standards to the more detailed Transparency Center explanation of how this policy applies. The company should supplement this explanation with illustrative examples from a variety of contexts, including reporting on large scale protests.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Colombia protests #3	Develop and publicize clear criteria for content reviewers for escalating for additional review public interest content that potentially violates the Community Standards but may be eligible for the newsworthiness allowance. These criteria should cover content depicting large protests on political issues.	Not Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Colombia protests #4	Notify all users who reported content which was assessed as violating but left on the platform for public interest reasons that the newsworthiness allowance was applied to the post. The notice should link to the Transparency Center explanation of the newsworthiness allowance.	Comprehensive	Progress reported



South Africa slurs #1	<p>Notify users of the specific rule within the Hate Speech Community Standard that has been violated in the language in which they use Facebook, as recommended in case decision 2020-003-FB-UA (Armenians in Azerbaijan) and case decision 2021-002-FB-UA (Depiction of Zwarte Piet). In this case, for example, the user should have been notified they violated the slurs prohibition. The Board has noted Facebook's response to Recommendation No. 2 in case decision 2021-002-FB-UA, which describes a new classifier that should be able to notify English-language Facebook users their content has violated the slur rule. The Board looks forward to Facebook providing information that confirms implementation for English-language users and information about the timeframe for implementation for other language users.</p>	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Wampum belt #1	<p>Provide users with timely and accurate notice of any company action being taken on the content their appeal relates to. Where applicable, including in enforcement error cases like this one, the notice to the user should acknowledge that the action was a result of the Oversight Board's review process. Meta should share the user messaging sent when Board actions impact content decisions appealed by users, to demonstrate it has complied with this recommendation. These actions should be taken with respect to all cases that are corrected at the eligibility stage of the Board's process.</p>	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

Wampum belt #2	<p>Study the impacts of modified approaches to secondary review on reviewer accuracy and throughput. In particular, the Board requests an evaluation of accuracy rates when content moderators are informed that they are engaged in secondary review, so they know the initial determination was contested. This experiment should ideally include an opportunity for users to provide relevant context that may help reviewers evaluate their content, in line with the Board’s previous recommendations. Meta should share the results of these accuracy assessments with the Board and summarize the results in its quarterly Board transparency report to demonstrate it has complied with this recommendation.</p>	Comprehensive	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
Wampum belt #3	<p>Conduct accuracy assessments focused on Hate Speech policy allowances that cover artistic expression and expression about human rights violations (e.g., condemnation, awareness raising, self-referential use, empowering use). This assessment should also specifically investigate how the location of a reviewer impacts the ability of moderators to accurately assess hate speech and counter speech from the same or different regions. The Board understands this analysis likely requires the development of appropriate and accurately labelled samples of relevant content. Meta should share the results of this assessment with the Board, including how these results will inform improvements to enforcement operations and policy development and whether it plans to run regular reviewer accuracy assessments on these allowances, and summarize the results in its quarterly Board transparency report to demonstrate it has complied with this recommendation.</p>	Somewhat Comprehensive	<p>Implementation demonstrated through published information</p>

Ayahuasca brew #1	The Board reiterates its recommendation from case decision 2020-004-IG-UA and case decision 2021-006-IG-UA that Meta should explain to users that it enforces the Facebook Community Standards on Instagram, with several specific exceptions. The Board notes Meta’s response to these recommendations. While Meta may be taking other actions to comply with the recommendations, the Board recommends Meta update the introduction to the Instagram Community Guidelines (“The Short” Community Guidelines) within 90 days to inform users that if content is considered violating on Facebook, it is also considered violating on Instagram, as stated in the company’s Transparency Center, with some exceptions.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Ayahuasca brew #2	The Board reiterates its recommendation from case decision 2021-005-FB-UA and case decision 2020-005-FB-UA that Meta should explain to users precisely what rule in a content policy they have violated.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Ayahuasca brew #3	To respect diverse traditional and religious expressions and practices, the Board recommends that Meta modify the Instagram Community Guidelines and Facebook Regulated Goods Community Standard to allow positive discussion of traditional and religious uses of non-medical drugs where there is historic evidence of such use. The Board also recommends that Meta make public all allowances, including existing allowances.	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Alleged crimes in Raya Kobo #1	Meta should rewrite Meta’s value of “Safety” to reflect that online speech may pose risk to the physical security of persons and the right to life, in addition to the risks of intimidation, exclusion and silencing.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

Alleged crimes in Raya Kobo #2	Facebook’s Community Standards should reflect that in the contexts of war and violent conflict, unverified rumors pose higher risk to the rights of life and security of persons. This should be reflected at all levels of the moderation process.	Not Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Alleged crimes in Raya Kobo #3	Meta should commission an independent human rights due diligence assessment on how Facebook and Instagram have been used to spread hate speech and unverified rumors that heighten the risk of violence in Ethiopia. The assessment should review the success of measures Meta took to prevent the misuse of its products and services in Ethiopia. The assessment should also review the success of measures Meta took to allow for corroborated and public interest reporting on human rights atrocities in Ethiopia. The assessment should review Meta’s language capabilities in Ethiopia and if they are adequate to protect the rights of its users. The assessment should cover a period from June 1, 2020, to the present. The company should complete the assessment within six months from the moment it responds to these recommendations. The assessment should be published in full.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Asking for Adderall® #1	Meta should publish its internal definitions for “non-medical drugs” and “pharmaceutical drugs” in the Facebook Community Standard on Restricted Goods and Services. The published definitions should: (a) make clear that certain substances may fall under either “non-medical drugs” or “pharmaceutical drugs” and (b) explain the circumstances under which a substance would fall into each of these categories. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when these changes are made in the Community Standard.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

Asking for Adderall® #2	Meta should study the consequences and trade-offs of implementing a dynamic prioritization system that orders appeals for human review, and consider whether the fact that an enforcement decision resulted in an account restriction should be a criterion within this system. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares the results of these investigations with the Board and in its quarterly Board transparency report.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Asking for Adderall® #3	Meta should conduct regular assessments on reviewer accuracy rates focused on the Restricted Goods and Services policy. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares the results of these assessments with the Board, including how these results will inform improvements to enforcement operations and policy development, and summarize the results in its quarterly Board transparency reports. Meta may consider if these assessments should be extended to reviewer accuracy rates under other Community Standards.	Not Comprehensive	Progress reported
Swedish journalist reporting sexual violence against minors #1	Meta should define graphic depiction and sexualization in the Child Sexual Exploitation, Nudity and Abuse Community Standard. Meta should make clear that not all explicit language constitutes graphic depiction or sexualization and explain the difference between legal, clinical or medical terms and graphic content. Meta should also provide a clarification for distinguishing child sexual exploitation and reporting on child sexual exploitation. The Board will consider the recommendation implemented when language defining key terms and the distinction has been added to the Community Standard.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

<p>Swedish journalist reporting sexual violence against minors #2</p>	<p>Meta should undergo a policy development process, including as a discussion in the Policy Forum, to determine whether and how to incorporate a prohibition on functional identification of child victims of sexual violence in its Community Standards. This process should include stakeholder and expert engagement on functional identification and the rights of the child. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes the minutes of the Product Policy Forum where this is discussed.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>
<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #1</p>	<p>removing the “publicly available” policy exception. Meta should remove the exception that allows the sharing of private residential information (both images that currently fulfill the Privacy Violations policy’s criteria for takedown and addresses) when considered “publicly available”. This means Meta would no longer allow otherwise violating content on Facebook and on Instagram if “published by at least five news outlets” or if it contains residential addresses or imagery from financial records or statements of an organization, court records, professional and business licenses, sex offender registries or press releases from government agencies, or law enforcement. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta modifies its Internal Implementation Standards and its content policies.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>

Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #2	Making sure the newsworthiness exception is consistently applied. Meta should develop and publicize clear criteria for content reviewers to escalate for additional review of public interest content that potentially violates the Community Standards but may be eligible for the newsworthiness exception, as previously recommended in case decision 2021-010-FB-UA. These criteria should cover, in addition to large protests as highlighted in Recommendation No. 3 from case decision 2021-010-FB-UA, content that shares information on investigations of corruption, tax evasion, money laundering and other criminal activities, in particular where property has been attained through such activities. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta publicly shares these escalation criteria.	Not Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
--	---	-------------------	--

<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #3</p>	<p>keeping public interest information in the form of images on the platform [this does not apply to addresses]. Meta should allow the sharing of “imagery that displays the external view of private residences” when the property depicted is the focus of the news story, even when the following conditions listed in the Privacy Violations Community Standard are met (“the residence is a single-family home, or the resident's unit number is identified in the image/caption”; “the city/neighborhood or GPS pin” is identified; “the content identifies the resident(s)”; and “that same resident objects to the exposure of their private residence”). However, Meta should not allow the sharing of such information when there is a “context of organizing protests against the resident,” that is, an attempt to organize protests in the future, and not news reporting on protests that have already taken place. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta modifies its content policies.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>
<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #4</p>	<p>Allowing the organization of protests at publicly owned official residences. Meta should allow the publication of addresses and imagery of official residences provided to high-ranking government officials, such as heads of state, heads of federal or local government, ambassadors and consuls. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta modifies its content policies.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>



Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #5	Strengthening the role of user consent. Meta should allow the resharing of private residential addresses when posted by the affected user themselves or when the user consented to its publication. Users should not be presumed to consent to private information posted by others. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta modifies its content policies.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #6	Strengthening the role of user consent. Users should have a quick and effective mechanism to request the removal of private information posted by others. We will consider this implemented when Meta demonstrates in its transparency reports that user requests to remove their information are consistently and promptly actioned. This recommendation is not applicable to official residences of high-ranking government officials.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #7	Improving the clarity of the rules. Meta should better explain, in the text of Facebook’s Privacy Violations policy, when disclosing the city where a residence is located will suffice for the content to be removed, and when disclosing its neighborhood would be required for the same matter (e.g., by specifically referencing the population threshold at which sharing only the city as part of the content will no longer be considered violating). The Board will consider this implemented when Meta modifies its content policies.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #8	Improving the clarity of the rules. Meta should explain, in the text of Facebook’s Privacy Violations policy, its criteria for assessing whether the resident is sufficiently identified in the content. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta modifies its content policies.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #9</p>	<p>Improving the clarity of the rules. The Board reiterates Recommendation No. 1 from case decision 2021-013-IG-UA that Meta should explain to users that it enforces the Facebook Community Standards on Instagram, with several specific exceptions. The Board notes Meta’s response to these recommendations. While Meta may be taking other actions to comply with the recommendations, the Board recommends Meta update the introduction to the Instagram Community Guidelines (“The Short” Community Guidelines) within 90 days to inform users that if content is considered violating on Facebook, it is also considered violating on Instagram, as stated in the company’s Transparency Center, with some exceptions. Meta should also provide a link to the Privacy Violations Community Standard in the language of the Community Guidelines. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta modifies its content policies.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>
<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #10</p>	<p>Responding more quickly to situations of increased risk. Meta should let users reporting content that may violate the Privacy Violations policy provide additional context about their claim. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta publishes information about its appeal processes that demonstrate users may provide this context in appeals.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>

<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #11</p>	<p>Responding more quickly to situations of increased risk. Meta should create a specific channel of communications for victims of doxing (available both for users and non-users) that may be easily accessed, allow the victim to explain in detail their situation and risks the content creates for them, and prompt swift action from the company. Additionally, Meta could provide financial support to organizations that already have hotlines in place. Meta should prioritize action when the impacted person references belonging to a group facing heightened risk to safety in the region where the private residence is located. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta creates the channel and publicly announces how to use it.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed</p>
<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #12</p>	<p>Responding more quickly to situations of increased risk. Meta should consider the violation of its Privacy Violations policy as “severe,” prompting temporary account suspension, in cases where the sharing of private residential information is clearly related to malicious action that created a risk of violence or harassment. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta updates its Transparency Center description of the strikes system to make clear that some Privacy Violations are severe and may result in account suspension.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment</p>

<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #13</p>	<p>Reversing enforcement errors. Meta should give users an opportunity to remove or edit private information within their content following a removal for violation of the Privacy Violations policy (i.e., a threat of harm is present, but the story could be allowed on the platform if the image of residence or other information, such as the address, the city/neighborhood, GPS pin, or the name and picture of the resident was removed). The company could issue a notification of the violation and give the user a short deadline for them to act on the content, during which the content should be made temporarily unavailable. If the user removes/edits the private residential information out of the content within the deadline, the temporary block on the content would be lifted. If not, then the content would remain blocked. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta publishes information about its enforcement processes that demonstrates users are notified of specific policy violations when content is removed and granted a remedial window before the content is permanently deleted.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #14</p>	<p>Reversing enforcement errors. Meta should let users indicate in their appeals against content removal that their content falls into one of the exceptions to the Privacy Violations policy. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta publishes information about its appeal processes that demonstrates users may provide this information in appeals.</p>	<p>Somewhat Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>

Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #15	Improving enforcement transparency. Meta should publish quantitative data on the enforcement of the Privacy Violations policy in the company's Community Standards Enforcement Report. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta's transparency report includes Privacy Violations enforcement data.	Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #16	Improving enforcement transparency. Meta should break down data in its transparency reports to indicate the amount of content removed following privacy-related government requests, even if taken down under the Privacy Violations policy and not under local privacy laws. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta's transparency reporting includes all government requests that result in content removal for violating the Privacy Violations policy as a separate category.	Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Sharing private residential information policy advisory opinion #17	Improving enforcement transparency. Meta should provide users with more detail on the specific policy of the Privacy Violations Community Standard that their content was found to violate and implement it across all working languages of the company's platforms. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta publishes information and data about user notifications.	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Sudan graphic video #1	Meta should amend the Violent and Graphic Content Community Standard to allow videos of people or dead bodies when shared for the purpose of raising awareness of or documenting human rights abuses. This content should be allowed with a warning screen so that people are aware that content may be disturbing. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta updates the Community Standard.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Sudan graphic video #2	Meta should undertake a policy development process that develops criteria to identify videos of people or dead bodies when shared for the purpose of raising awareness of or documenting human rights abuses. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes the findings of the policy development process, including information on the process and criteria for identifying this content at scale.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Sudan graphic video #3	Meta should make explicit in its description of the newsworthiness allowance all the actions it may take (for example, restoration with a warning screen) based on this policy. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta updates the policy.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Sudan graphic video #4	To ensure users understand the rules, Meta should notify users when it takes action on their content based on the newsworthiness allowance including the restoration of content or application of a warning screen. The user notification may link to the Transparency Center explanation of the newsworthiness allowance. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta rolls out this updated notification to users in all markets and demonstrates that users are receiving this notification through enforcement data.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Reclaiming Arabic words #1	Meta should translate the Internal Implementation Standards and Known Questions to Modern Standard Arabic. Doing so could reduce over-enforcement in Arabic-speaking regions by helping moderators better assess when exceptions for content containing slurs are warranted. The Board notes that Meta has taken no further action in response to the recommendation in the "Myanmar Bot" case (2021-007-FB-UA) that Meta should ensure that its Internal Implementation Standards are available in the language in which content moderators review content. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta informs the Board that translation to Modern Standard Arabic is complete.	Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Reclaiming Arabic words #2	Meta should publish a clear explanation on how it creates its market-specific slur lists. This explanation should include the processes and criteria for designating which slurs and countries are assigned to each market-specific list. The Board will consider this implemented when the information is published in the Transparency Center.	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Reclaiming Arabic words #3	Meta should publish a clear explanation of how it enforces its market-specific slur lists. This explanation should include the processes and criteria for determining precisely when and where the slurs prohibition will be enforced, whether in respect to posts originating geographically from the region in question, originating outside but relating to the region in question, and/or in relation to all users in the region in question, regardless of the geographic origin of the post. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when the information is published in Meta's Transparency Center.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information

Reclaiming Arabic words #4	Meta should publish a clear explanation on how it audits its market-specific slur lists. This explanation should include the processes and criteria for removing slurs from or keeping slurs on Meta's market-specific lists. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when the information is published in Meta's Transparency Center.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Knin cartoon #1	Meta should clarify the Hate Speech Community Standard and the guidance provided to reviewers, explaining that even implicit references to protected groups are prohibited by the policy when the reference would reasonably be understood. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta updates its Community Standards and Internal Implementation Standards to content reviewers to incorporate this revision.	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information
Knin cartoon #2	In line with Meta's commitment following the "Wampum belt" case (2021-012-FB-UA), the Board recommends that Meta notify all users who have reported content when, on subsequent review, it changes its initial determination. Meta should also disclose the results of any experiments assessing the feasibility of introducing this change with the public. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares information regarding relevant experiments and, ultimately, the updated notification with the Board and confirms it is in use in all languages.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information



Colombia police cartoon #1	<p>To improve Meta’s ability to remove non-violating content from banks programmed to identify or automatically remove violating content, Meta should ensure that content with high rates of appeal and high rates of successful appeal is re-assessed for possible removal from its Media Matching Service banks. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta: (i) discloses to the Board the rates of appeal and successful appeal that trigger a review of Media Matching Service-banked content, and (ii) confirms publicly that these reassessment mechanisms are active for all its banks that target violating content.</p>	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Colombia police cartoon #2	<p>To ensure that inaccurately banked content is quickly removed from Meta’s Media Matching Service banks, Meta should set and adhere to standards that limit the time between when banked content is identified for re-review and when, if deemed non-violating, it is removed from the bank. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta: (i) sets and discloses to the Board its goal time between when a re-review is triggered and when the non-violating content is restored, and (ii) provides the Board with data demonstrating its progress in meeting this goal over the next year.</p>	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Colombia police cartoon #3	To enable the establishment of metrics for improvement, Meta should publish the error rates for content mistakenly included in Media Matching Service banks of violating content, broken down by each content policy, in its transparency reporting. This reporting should include information on how content enters the banks and the company’s efforts to reduce errors in the process. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta includes this information in its Community Standards Enforcement Report.	Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Mention of the Taliban in news reporting #1	Meta should investigate why the December 2021 changes to the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy were not updated within the target time of six weeks, and ensure such delays or omissions are not repeated. The Board asks Meta to inform the Board within 60 days of the findings of its investigation, and the measures it has put in place to prevent translation delays in future.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Mention of the Taliban in news reporting #2	Meta should make its public explanation of its two-track strikes system more comprehensive and accessible, especially for “severe strikes.” It should include all policy violations that result in severe strikes, which account features can be limited as a result and specify applicable durations. Policies that result in severe strikes should also be clearly identified in the Community Standards, with a link to the “Restricting Accounts” explanation of the strikes system. The Board asks Meta to inform the Board within 60 days of the updated Transparency Center explanation of the strikes system, and the inclusion of the links to that explanation for all content policies that result in severe strikes.	Comprehensive	Partial implementation demonstrated through published information

Mention of the Taliban in news reporting #3	Meta should narrow the definition of “praise” in the Known Questions guidance for reviewers, by removing the example of content that “seeks to make others think more positively about” a designated entity by attributing to them positive values or endorsing their actions. The Board asks Meta to provide the Board within 60 days with the full version of the updated Known Questions document for Dangerous Individuals and Organizations.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Mention of the Taliban in news reporting #4	Meta should revise its internal Implementation Standards to make clear that the “reporting” allowance in the Dangerous Individuals Organizations policy allows for positive statements about designated entities as part of the reporting, and how to distinguish this from prohibited “praise.” The Known Questions document should be expanded to make clear the importance of news reporting in situations of conflict or crisis and provide relevant examples, and that this may include positive statements about designated entities like the reporting on the Taliban in this case. The Board asks Meta to share the updated Implementation Standards with the Board within 60 days.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Mention of the Taliban in news reporting #5	Meta should assess the accuracy of reviewers enforcing the reporting allowance under the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy in order to identify systemic issues causing enforcement errors. The Board asks Meta to inform the Board within 60 days of the detailed results of its review of this assessment, or accuracy assessments Meta already conducts for its Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy, including how the results will inform improvements to enforcement operations, including for HIPO.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Mention of the Taliban in news reporting #6	Meta should conduct a review of the HIPO ranker to examine if it can more effectively prioritize potential errors in the enforcement of allowances to the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations Policy. This should include examining whether the HIPO ranker needs to be more sensitive to news reporting content, where the likelihood of false-positive removals that impacts freedom of expression appears to be high. The Board asks Meta to inform the Board within 60 days of the results of its review and the improvements it will make to avoid errors of this kind in the future.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Mention of the Taliban in news reporting #7	Meta should enhance the capacity allocated to HIPO review across languages to ensure that more content decisions that may be enforcement errors receive additional human review. The Board asks Meta to inform the Board within 60 days of the planned capacity enhancements.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Tigray Communication Affairs Bureau #1	In line with the Board’s recommendation in the “Former President Trump’s Suspension,” as reiterated in the “Sudan Graphic Video,” Meta should publish information on its Crisis Policy Protocol. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when information on the Crisis Policy Protocol is available in the Transparency Center, within six months of this decision being published, as a separate policy in the Transparency Center in addition to the Public Policy Forum slide deck.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed

Tigray Communication Affairs Bureau #2	To improve enforcement of its content policies during periods of armed conflict, Meta should assess the feasibility of establishing a sustained internal mechanism that provides the expertise, capacity and coordination required to review and respond to content effectively for the duration of a conflict. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta provides an overview of the feasibility of a sustained internal mechanism to the Board.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Russian poem #1	Meta should add to the public-facing language of its Violence and Incitement Community Standard that the company interprets the policy to allow content containing statements with “neutral reference to a potential outcome of an action or an advisory warning,” and content that “condemns or raises awareness of violent threats.” The Board expects that this recommendation, if implemented, will require Meta to update the public-facing language of the Violence and Incitement policy to reflect these inclusions.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Russian poem #2	Meta should add to the public-facing language of its Violent and Graphic Content Community Standard detail from its internal guidelines about how the company determines whether an image “shows the violent death of a person or people by accident or murder.” The Board expects that this recommendation, if implemented, will require Meta to update the public-facing language of the Violent and Graphic Content Community Standard to reflect this inclusion.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Russian poem #3	Meta should assess the feasibility of implementing customization tools that would allow users over 18 years old to decide whether to see sensitive graphic content with or without warning screens, on both Facebook and Instagram. The Board expects that this recommendation, if implemented, will require Meta to publish the results of a feasibility assessment.	Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
UK drill music #1	Meta’s description of its value of “Voice” should be updated to reflect the importance of artistic and creative expression. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta’s values have been updated.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
UK drill music #2	Meta should clarify that for content to be removed as a “veiled threat” under the Violence and Incitement Community Standard, one primary and one secondary signal is required. The list of signals should be divided between primary and secondary signals, in line with the internal Implementation Standards. This will make Meta’s content policy in this area easier to understand, particularly for those reporting content as potentially violating. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when the language in the Violence and Incitement Community Standard has been updated.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported

UK drill music #3	<p>Meta should provide users with the opportunity to appeal to the Oversight Board for any decisions made through Meta’s internal escalation process, including decisions to remove content and to leave content up. This is necessary to provide the possibility of access to remedy to the Board and to enable the Board to receive appeals for “escalation-only” enforcement decisions. This should also include appeals against removals made for Community Standard violations as a result of “trusted flagger” or government actor reports made outside of in-product tools. The Board will consider this implemented when it sees user appeals coming from decisions made on escalation and when Meta shares data with the Board showing that for 100% of eligible escalation decisions, users are receiving reference IDs to initiate appeals.</p>	Comprehensive	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
UK drill music #4	<p>Meta should implement and ensure a globally consistent approach to receive requests for content removals (outside of in-product reporting tools) from state actors by creating a standardized intake form asking for minimum criteria, for example, the violated policy line, why it has been violated, and a detailed evidential basis for that conclusion, before any such requests are actioned by Meta internally. This contributes to ensuring more organized information collection for transparency reporting purposes. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta discloses the internal guidelines that outline the standardized intake system to the Board and in the transparency center.</p>	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported

UK drill music #5	<p>Meta should mark and preserve any accounts and content that were penalized or disabled for posting content that is subject to an open investigation by the Board. This prevents those accounts from being permanently deleted when the Board may wish to request content is referred for decision or to ensure its decisions can apply to all identical content with parallel context that may have been wrongfully removed. The Board will consider this implemented when Board decisions are applicable to the aforementioned entities and Meta discloses the number of said entities affected for each Board decision.</p>	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
UK drill music #6	<p>Meta should create a section in its Transparency Center, alongside its “Community Standards Enforcement Report” and “Legal Requests for Content Restrictions Report,” to report on state actor requests to review content for Community Standard violations. It should include details on the number of review and removal requests by country and government agency, and the numbers of rejections by Meta. This is necessary to improve transparency. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta publishes a separate section in its “Community Standards Enforcement Report” on requests from state actors that led to removal for content policy violations.</p>	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported



UK drill music #7	Meta should regularly review the data on its content moderation decisions prompted by state actor content review requests to assess for any systemic biases. Meta should create a formal feedback loop to fix any biases and/or outsized impacts stemming from its decisions on government content takedowns. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta regularly publishes the general insights derived from these audits and the actions taken to mitigate systemic biases.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #0	Meta should provide information about its implementation work in its quarterly reports on the Board. Additionally, Meta should convene a biannual meeting of high-level responsible officials to brief the Board on its work to implement the policy advisory opinion recommendations.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #1	Meta should split, either by distinct pathways or prioritization, any list-based over-enforcement prevention program into separate systems: one to protect expression in line with Meta's human rights responsibilities, and one to protect expression that Meta views as a business priority that falls outside that category.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #2	Meta should ensure that the review pathway and decision-making structure for content with human rights or public interest implications, including its escalation paths, is devoid of business considerations. Meta should take steps to ensure that the team in charge of this system does not report to public policy or government relations teams or those in charge of relationship management with any affected users.	Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed

Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #3	Meta should improve how its workflow dedicated to meet Meta's human rights responsibilities incorporates context and language expertise on enhanced review, specifically at decision making levels.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #4	Meta should establish clear and public criteria for list-based mistake-prevention eligibility. These criteria should differentiate between users who merit additional protection from a human rights perspective and those included for business reasons.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #5	Meta should establish a process for users to apply for over-enforcement mistake-prevention protections should they meet the company's publicly articulated criteria. State actors should be eligible to be added or apply based on these criteria and terms but given no other preference.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #6	Meta should ensure that the process for list-based inclusion, regardless of who initiated the process (the entity itself or Meta) involves, at minimum: (1) an additional, explicit, commitment by the user to follow Meta's content policies; (2) an acknowledgement of the program's particular rules; and (3) a system by which changes to the platform's content policies are proactively shared with them.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #7	Meta should strengthen its engagement with civil society for the purposes of list creation and nomination. Users and trusted civil society organizations should be able to nominate others that meet the criteria. This is particularly urgent in countries where the company's limited presence does not allow it to identify candidates for inclusion independently.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported

Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #8	Meta should use specialized teams, independent from political or economic influence, including from Meta's public policy teams, to evaluate entities for list inclusion. To ensure criteria are met, specialized staff, with the benefit of local input, should ensure objective application of inclusion criteria.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #9	Meta should require that more than one employee be involved in the final process of adding new entities to any lists for false positive mistake-prevention systems. These people should work on different but related teams.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #10	Meta should establish clear criteria for removal. One criterion should be the amount of violating content posted by the entity. Disqualifications should be based on a transparent strike system, in which users are warned that continued violation may lead to removal from the system and or Meta's platforms. Users should have the opportunity to appeal such strikes through a fair and easily accessible process.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #11	Meta should establish clear criteria and processes for audit. Should entities no longer meet the eligibility criteria, they should be promptly removed from the system. Meta should review all included entities in any mistake- prevention system at least yearly. There should also be clear protocols to shorten that period where warranted.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #12	Meta should publicly mark the pages and accounts of entities receiving list-based protection in the following categories: all state actors and political candidates, all business partners, all media actors, and all other public figures included because of the commercial benefit to the company in avoiding false positives. Other categories of users may opt to be identified.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed

Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #13	Meta should notify users who report content posted by an entity publicly identified as benefiting from additional review that special procedures will apply, explaining the steps and potentially longer time to resolution.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #14	Meta should notify all entities that it includes on lists to receive enhanced review and provide them with an opportunity to decline inclusion.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #15	Meta should consider reserving a minimum amount of review capacity by teams that can apply all content policies (e.g., the Early Response Team) to review content flagged through content- based mistake-prevention systems.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #16	Meta should take measures to ensure that additional review decisions for mistake-prevention systems that delay enforcement are taken as quickly as possible. Investments and structural changes should be made to expand the review teams so that reviewers are available and working in relevant time zones whenever content is flagged for any enhanced human review.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #17	Meta should not delay all action on content identified as potentially severely violating and should explore applying interstitials or removals pending any enhanced review. The difference between removal or hiding and downranking should be based on an assessment of harm, and may be based, for example, on the content policy that has possibly been violated. If content is hidden on these grounds, a notice indicating that it is pending review should be provided to users in its place.	Not Comprehensive	Progress reported

Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #18	Meta should not operate these programs at a backlog. Meta should not, however, achieve gains in relative review capacity by artificially raising the ranker threshold or having its algorithm select less content.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #19	Meta should not automatically prioritize entity-based secondary review and make a large portion of the algorithmically selected content-based review dependent on extra review capacity.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #20	Meta should ensure that content that receives any kind of enhanced review because it is important from a human rights perspective, including content of public importance, is reviewed by teams that can apply exceptions and context.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #21	Meta should establish clear criteria for the application of any automatic bars to enforcement ('technical corrections'), and not permit such bars for high severity content policy violations. At least two teams with separate reporting structures should participate in granting technical corrections to provide for cross- team vetting.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #22	Meta should conduct periodic audits to ensure that entities benefitting from automatic bars to enforcement ('technical corrections') meet all criteria for inclusion. At least two teams with separate reporting structures should participate in these audits to provide for cross-team vetting.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #23	Meta should conduct periodic multi-team audits to proactively and periodically search for unexpected or unintentional bars to enforcement that may result from system error.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #24	Meta should ensure that all content that does not reach the highest level of internal review is able to be appealed to Meta.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

<p>Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #25</p>	<p>Meta must guarantee that it is providing an opportunity to appeal to the Board for all content the Board is empowered to review under its governing documents, regardless of whether the content reached the highest levels of review within Meta.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation</p>
<p>Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #26</p>	<p>Meta should use the data it compiles to identify “historically over-enforced entities” to inform how to improve its enforcement practices at scale. Meta should measure over-enforcement of these entities and it should use that data to help identify other over-enforced entities. Reducing over-enforcement should be an explicit and high-priority goal for the company.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>
<p>Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #27</p>	<p>Meta should use trends in overturn rates to inform whether to default to the original enforcement within a shorter time frame or what other enforcement action to apply pending review. If overturn rates are consistently low for particular subsets of policy violations or content in particular languages, for example, Meta should continually calibrate how quickly and how intrusive an enforcement measure it should apply.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>
<p>Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #28</p>	<p>Meta should conduct periodic reviews of different aspects of its enhanced review system, including content with the longest time to resolution and high-profile violating content left on platform.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>

Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #29	Meta should publicly report on metrics that quantify the adverse effects of delayed enforcement as a result of enhanced review systems, such as views accrued on content that was preserved on the platform as a result of mistake-prevention systems but was subsequently found violating. As part of its public reporting, Meta should determine a baseline for these metrics and report on goals to reduce them.	Not Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
--	---	-------------------	--

<p>Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #30</p>	<p>Meta should publish regular transparency reporting focused specifically on delayed- enforcement false-positive prevention systems. Reports should contain data that permits users and the public to understand how these programs function and what their consequences on public discourse may be. At minimum, the Board recommends Meta include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Overturn rates for false- positive mistake-prevention systems, disaggregated according to different factors. For example, the Board has recommended that Meta create separate streams for different categories of entities or content based on their expression and risk profile. The overturn rate should be reported for any entity-based and content-based systems, and categories of entities or content included.</li> <li>b. The total number and percentage of escalation-only policies applied due to false- positive mistake-prevention programs relative to total enforcement decisions.</li> <li>c. Average and median time to final decision for content subject to false-positive mistake- prevention programs, disaggregated by country and language.</li> <li>d. Aggregate data regarding any lists used for mistake-prevention programs, including the type of entity and region.</li> <li>e. Rate of erroneous removals (false positives) versus all reviewed content, including the total amount of harm generated by these false positives measured as the predicted total views on the content (i.e., over- enforcement)</li> <li>f. Rate of erroneous keep-up decisions (false negatives) on content,</li> </ul>		
---	--	--	--

Comprehensive Progress reported



Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #31	Meta should provide basic information in its Transparency Center regarding the functioning of any mistake-prevention system it uses that identifies entities or users for additional protections.	Comprehensive	Implementation demonstrated through published information
Meta's cross-check programme policy advisory opinion #32	Meta should institute a pathway for external researchers to gain access to non-public data about false-positive mistake-prevention programs that would allow them to understand the program more fully through public-interest investigations and provide their own recommendations for improvement. The Board understands that data privacy concerns should require stringent vetting and data aggregation.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Video after Nigeria church attack #1	Meta should review the public facing language in the Violent and Graphic Content policy to ensure that it is better aligned with the company's internal guidance on how the policy is to be enforced. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when the policy has been updated with a definition and examples, in the same way as Meta explains concepts such as "praise" in the Dangerous Individuals and Organizations policy.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Video after Nigeria church attack #2	Meta should notify Instagram users when a warning screen is applied to their content and provide the specific policy rationale for doing so. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta confirms notifications are provided to Instagram users in all languages supported by the platform.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported

<p>India sexual harassment video #1</p>	<p>Meta should include an exception to the Adult Sexual Exploitation Community Standard for depictions of non-consensual sexual touching, where, based on a contextual analysis, Meta judges that the content is shared to raise awareness, the victim is not identifiable, the content does not involve nudity and is not shared in a sensationalized context, thus entailing minimal risks of harm for the victim. This exception should be applied at escalation only. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when the text of the Adult Sexual Exploitation Community Standard has been changed.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>
<p>India sexual harassment video #2</p>	<p>Meta should update its internal guidance to at-scale reviewers on when to escalate content reviewed under the Adult Sexual Exploitation Community Standard, including guidance to escalate content depicting non-consensual sexual touching, with the above policy exception. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares with the Board the updated guidance to at-scale reviewers.</p>	<p>Comprehensive</p>	<p>Progress reported</p>

Iran protest slogan #1	<p>Meta’s Community Standards should accurately reflect its policies. To better inform users of the types of statements that are prohibited, Meta should amend the Violence and Incitement Community Standard to (i) explain that rhetorical threats like “death to X” statements are generally permitted, except when the target of the threat is a high-risk person; (ii) include an illustrative list of high-risk persons, explaining they may include heads of state; (iii) provide criteria for when threatening statements directed at heads of state are permitted to protect clearly rhetorical political speech in protest contexts that does not incite to violence, taking language and context into account, in accordance with the principles outlined in this decision. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when the public-facing language of the Violence and Incitement Community Standard reflects the proposed change, and when Meta shares internal guidelines with the Board that are consistent with the public facing policy.</p>	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Iran protest slogan #2	<p>Meta should err on the side of issuing scaled allowances where (i) this is not likely to lead to violence; (ii) when potentially violating content is used in protest contexts; and (iii) where public interest is high. Meta should ensure that their internal process to identify and review content trends around protests that may require context-specific guidance to mitigate harm to freedom of expression, such as allowances or exceptions, are effective. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares the internal process with the Board and demonstrates through sharing data with the Board that it has minimized incorrect removals of protest slogans.</p>	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed

Iran protest slogan #3	Pending changes to the Violence and Incitement policy, Meta should issue guidance to its reviewers that “marg bar Khamenei” statements in the context of protests in Iran do not violate the Violence and Incitement Community Standard. Meta should reverse any strikes and feature-limits for wrongfully removed content that used the “marg bar Khamenei” slogan. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta discloses data on the volume of content restored and number of accounts impacted.	Comprehensive	Meta reported implementation or described as work Meta already does but did not publish information to demonstrate implementation
Iran protest slogan #4	Meta should revise the indicators it uses to rank appeals in its review queues and to automatically close appeals without review. The appeals prioritization formula should include, as it does for the cross-check ranker, the factors of topic sensitivity and false-positive probability. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta shares with the Board their appeals prioritization formula and data that shows that it is ensuring review of appeals against the incorrect removal of political expression in protest contexts.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Progress reported
Iran protest slogan #5	Meta should announce all scaled allowances that it issues, their duration and notice of their expiration, in order to give people who use its platforms notice of policy changes allowing certain expression, alongside comprehensive data on the number of “scaled” and “narrow” allowances granted. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta demonstrates regular and comprehensive disclosures to the Board.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Iran protest slogan #6	The public explanation of the newsworthiness allowance in the Transparency Center should (i) explain that newsworthiness allowances can either be scaled or narrow; and (ii) provide the criteria Meta uses to determine when to scale newsworthiness allowances. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta updates the publicly available explanation of newsworthiness and issues Transparency Reports that include sufficiently detailed information about all applied allowances.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Iran protest slogan #7	Meta should provide a public explanation of the automatic prioritization and closure of appeals, including the criteria for both prioritization and closure. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes this information in the Transparency Center.	Somewhat Comprehensive	Recommendation declined after feasibility assessment
Gender identity and nudity #1	In order to treat all users fairly and provide moderators and the public with a workable standard on nudity, Meta should define clear, objective, rights-respecting criteria to govern the entirety of its Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity policy, ensuring treatment of all people that is consistent with international human rights standards, including without discrimination on the basis of sex or gender identity. Meta should first conduct a comprehensive human rights impact assessment to review the implications of the adoption of such criteria, which includes broadly inclusive stakeholder engagement across diverse ideological, geographic and cultural contexts. To the degree that this assessment should identify any potential harms, implementation of the new policy should include a mitigation plan for addressing them.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Gender identity and nudity #2	In order to provide greater clarity to users, Meta should provide users with more explanation of what constitutes an "offer or ask" for sex (including links to third party websites) and what constitute sexually suggestive poses in the public Community Standards. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when an explanation of these terms with examples is added to the Sexual Solicitation Community Standard.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Gender identity and nudity #3	In order to ensure that Meta's internal criteria for its Sexual Solicitation policy do not result in the removal of more content than the public-facing policy indicates and so that non-sexual content is not mistakenly removed, Meta should revise its internal reviewer guidance to ensure that the criteria reflect the public-facing rules and require a clearer connection between the "offer or ask" and the "sexually suggestive element." The Board will consider this implemented when Meta provides the Board with its updated internal guidelines that reflect these revised criteria.	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Sri Lanka pharmaceuticals #1	To provide more clarity to users, Meta should explain in the landing page of the Community Standards, in the same way the company does with the newsworthiness allowance, that allowances to the Community Standards may be made when their rationale, and Meta's values, demand a different outcome than a strict reading of the rules. The company should include a link to a Transparency Center page which provides information about the "spirit of the policy" allowance. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when an explanation is added to the Community Standards.	Comprehensive	Progress reported

Sri Lanka pharmaceuticals #2	<p>To provide more certainty to users, Meta should communicate when reported content benefits from a “spirit of the policy” allowance. In line with Meta’s recent work to audit its user notification systems as stated in its response to the Board’s recommendation in the “Colombia protests” case (2021-010-FB-UA), Meta should notify all users who reported content which was assessed as violating but left on the platform because a “spirit of the policy” allowance was applied to the post. The notice should include a link to a Transparency Center page which provides information about the “spirit of the policy” allowance. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta introduces the notification protocol described in this recommendation.</p>	Comprehensive	Recommendation omitted, declined or reframed
------------------------------	---	---------------	--

Sri Lanka pharmaceuticals #3	<p>In line with the Board’s recommendations five and six in the “Iran protest slogan” case (2022-013-FB-UA) the Board specifies that Meta should publish information about the “spirit of the policy” allowance in its Transparency Center, similar to the information it has published on the newsworthiness allowance. In the Transparency Center, Meta should: (i) explain that “spirit of the policy” allowances can be either scaled or narrow; (ii) publicize examples of content which benefited from this allowance; (iii) provide criteria Meta uses to determine when to scale “spirit of the policy” allowances; and (iv) include a list of all “spirit of the policy” allowances Meta has issued at scale in the past three years with explanations of why Meta decided to issue and terminate each of them. Meta should keep this list updated as new allowances are issued. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta makes this information publicly available in the Transparency Center.</p>	Comprehensive	Progress reported
Sri Lanka pharmaceuticals #4	<p>In line with the Board’s recommendations five and six in the “Iran protest slogan” case (2022-013-FB-UA) the Board specifies that Meta should publicly share aggregated data, in its Transparency Center, about the “spirit of the policy” allowances issued, including the number of instances in which they were issued, and the regions and/or languages impacted. Meta should keep this information updated as new “spirit of the policy” allowances are issued. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta makes this information publicly available in the Transparency Center.</p>	Comprehensive	Progress reported



Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #1A	The company must put a process in place, as soon as feasible, to consider a broader set of perspectives in evaluating whether the removal of each claim is needed by the exigencies of the situation. The experts and organizations consulted should include public health experts, immunologists, virologists, infectious disease researchers, misinformation and disinformation researchers, tech policy experts, human rights organizations, fact-checkers, and freedom of expression experts. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes information about its processes for consultation with a diverse set of experts on its policy on Misinformation about health during public health emergencies, as well as information about the impact of those conversations on its policy.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #1B	Meta should establish the timing for this review (e.g., every three or six months) and make this public to ensure notice and input. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes the minutes of its review meeting publicly, in a similar fashion to its publication of its public policy forum minutes in its Transparency Center.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #1C	Meta should articulate a clear process for regular review, including means for interested individuals and organizations to challenge an assessment of a specific claim (e.g., by providing a link on the Help Center page for public comments, and virtual consultations). The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta creates a mechanism for public feedback and shares information on the impact of that feedback on its internal processes with the Board.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response

<p>Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #1D</p>	<p>Meta’s review of the claims should include the latest research on the spread and impact of such online health misinformation. This should include internal research on the relative effectiveness of various measures available to Meta, including removals, fact-checking, demotions, and neutral labels. The company should consider the status of the pandemic in all regions in which it operates, especially those in which its platforms constitute a primary source of information and where there are less digitally literate communities, weaker civic spaces, a lack of reliable sources of information, and fragile health care systems. Meta should also evaluate the effectiveness of its enforcement of these claims. Meta should gather, if it doesn’t already possess, information about which claims have systemically resulted in under and over enforcement problems. This information should inform whether a claim should continue to be removed or should be addressed through other measures. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares data on its policy enforcement review and publishes this information publicly.</p>	<p>Awaiting first response</p>	<p>Awaiting first response</p>
---	---	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

<p>Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #1</p>	<p>Given the World Health Organization’s declaration that COVID-19 constitutes a global health emergency and Meta’s insistence on a global approach, Meta should continue its existing approach of removing globally false content about COVID-19 that is “likely to directly contribute to the risk of imminent physical harm.” At the same time, it should begin a transparent and inclusive process for robust and periodic reassessment of each of the 80 claims subject to removal to ensure that: (1) each of the specific claims about COVID-19 that is subject to removal is false and “likely to directly contribute to the risk of imminent physical harm”; and (2) Meta’s human rights commitments are properly implemented (e.g., the legality and necessity principles). Based on this process of reassessment, Meta should determine whether any claims are no longer false or no longer “likely to directly contribute to the risk of imminent physical harm.” Should Meta find that any claims are no longer false or no longer “likely to directly contribute to the risk of imminent physical harm,” such claims should no longer be subject to removal under this policy. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta announces a reassessment process and announces any changes to the 80 claims on the Help Center page.</p>	<p>Awaiting first response</p>	<p>Awaiting first response</p>
--	---	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

<p>Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #1E</p>	<p>In order to provide transparency on the types of experts consulted, their input, the internal and external research considered and how the information impacted the outcome of the analysis, Meta should provide to the Board a summary of the basis for its decision on each claim. The summary should specifically include the basis for the company’s decision for continuing to remove a claim. Meta should also disclose what role, if any, government personnel or entities played in its decision-making. If the company decides to cease removing a specific claim, the company should explain the basis of that decision (including: (a) what input led the company to determine that the claim is no longer false; (b) what input, from what source, led the company to determine the claim no longer directly contributes to the risk of imminent physical harm, and whether that assessment holds in countries with lowest vaccination rates and under-resourced public health infrastructure; (c) did the company determine that its enforcement system led to over-enforcement on the specific claim; (d) did the company determine that the claim is no longer prevalent on the platform.) The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares the assessment of its policy evaluation process. This information should align with the reasons listed publicly in the Help Center post for any changes made to the policy, as outlined in the first paragraph of this recommendation.</p>	<p>Awaiting first response</p>	<p>Awaiting first response</p>
---	--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #2	Meta should immediately provide a clear explanation of the reasons why each category of removable claims is “likely to directly contribute to the risk of imminent physical harm.” The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta amends the Help Center page to provide this explanation.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #3	Meta should clarify its Misinformation about health during public health emergencies policy by explaining that the requirement that information be “false” refers to false information according to the best available evidence at the time the policy was most recently re-evaluated. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta clarifies the policy in the relevant Help Center page.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response

Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #4	<p>Meta should immediately initiate a risk assessment process to identify the necessary and proportionate measures that it should take, consistent with this policy decision and the other recommendations made in this policy advisory opinion, when the WHO lifts the global health emergency for COVID-19, but other local public health authorities continue to designate COVID-19 as a public health emergency. This process should aim to adopt measures addressing harmful misinformation likely to contribute to significant and imminent real-life harm, without compromising the general right to freedom of expression globally. The risk assessment should include: (1) a robust evaluation of the design decisions and various policy and implementation alternatives; (2) their respective impacts on freedom of expression, the right to health and to life and other human rights; and (3) a feasibility assessment of a localized enforcement approach. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publicly communicates its plans for how it will conduct the risk assessment and describes the assessment process for detecting and mitigating risks and updates the Help Center page with this information.</p>	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #5	<p>Meta should translate internal implementation guidelines into the working languages of the company's platforms. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta translates its internal implementation guidelines and updates the Board in this regard.</p>	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response

Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #6	User appeals for a fact-check label should be reviewed by a different fact-checker than the one who made the first assessment. To ensure fairness and promote access to a remedy for users that have their content fact-checked, Meta should amend its process to ensure a different fact-checker that has not already made the assessment on the given claim, can evaluate the decision to impose a label. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta provides a mechanism to users to appeal to a different fact-checker, and when it updates its fact-checking policies with this new appeals mechanism.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #7	Meta should allow profiles (not only pages and groups) that have content labeled by third party fact-checkers enforcing Meta's misinformation policy, to appeal the label to another fact-checker through the in-product appeals feature. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta rolls out the appeal feature to profiles in all markets and demonstrates that users are able to appeal fact-check labels through enforcement data.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #8	Meta should increase its investments in digital literacy programs across the world, prioritizing countries with low media freedom indicators (e.g. Freedom of the Press score by Freedom House) and high social media penetration. These investments should include tailored literacy trainings. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes an article on its increased investments, specifying the amount invested, the nature of the programs and the countries impacted, and information it has about the impacts of such programs.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response

Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #9	<p>For single accounts and networks of Meta entities that repeatedly violate the misinformation policy, Meta should conduct or share existing research on the effects of its newly publicized penalty system, including any data about how this system is designed to prevent these violations. This research should include analysis of accounts amplifying or coordinating health misinformation campaigns. The assessment should evaluate the effectiveness of the demonetization penalties that Meta currently uses, in addressing the financial motivations/benefits of sharing harmful and false or misleading information. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares the outcome of this research with the Board and reports a summary of the results on the Transparency Center.</p>	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #10	<p>Meta should commission a human rights impact assessment of how Meta’s newsfeed, recommendation algorithms, and other design features amplify harmful health misinformation and its impacts. This assessment should provide information on the key factors in the feed-ranking algorithm that contribute to the amplification of harmful health misinformation, what types of misinformation can be amplified by Meta’s algorithms, and which groups are most susceptible to this type of misinformation (and whether they are particularly targeted by Meta’s design choices). The assessment should also make public any prior research Meta has conducted that evaluates the effects of its algorithms and design choices in amplifying health misinformation. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes the human rights impact assessment, which contains such analysis.</p>	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response



Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #11	Meta should add a change log to the Help Center page providing the complete list of claims subject to removal under the company’s Misinformation about health during public health emergencies policy.The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when a change log is added to the Help Center page.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #12	Meta should provide quarterly enforcement data on Misinformation in the Quarterly Enforcement Report, broken down by type of misinformation (i.e., physical harm or violence, harmful health misinformation, voter or census interference, or manipulated media) and country and language. This data should include information on the number of appeals and the number of pieces of content restored. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta starts including enforcement data on the Misinformation policy in the company’s enforcement reports.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #13	Meta should create a section in its “Community Standards Enforcement Report” to report on state actor requests to review content forthe policy onMisinformation about health during public health emergencies violations. The report should include the details on the number of review and removal requests by country and government agency, and the number of rejections and approvals by Meta. The Board will consider this implemented when Meta publishes a separate section in its “Community Standards Enforcement Report” information on requests from state actors that led to removal for this type of policy violation.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response

Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #14	Meta should ensure existing research tools, such as CrowdTangle and Facebook Open Research and Transparency (FORT) continue to be made available to researchers. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publicly states its commitment to sharing data through these tools to researchers.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #15	Meta should institute a pathway for external researchers to gain access to non-public data to independently study the effects of policy interventions related to the removal and reduced distribution of COVID-19 misinformation, while ensuring these pathways protect the right to privacy of Meta’s users and the human rights of people on and off the platform. This data should include metrics not previously made available, including the rate of recidivism around COVID-19 misinformation interventions. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta makes these datasets available to external researchers and confirms this with the Board.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #16	Meta should publish the findings of its research on neutral and fact-checking labels that it shared with the Board during the COVID-19 policy advisory opinion process. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publishes this research publicly in its Transparency Center.	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response

Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #17	<p>Meta should ensure equitable data access to researchers around the world. While researchers in Europe will have an avenue to apply for data access through the Digital Services Act (DSA), Meta should ensure it does not over-index on researchers from Global North research universities. Research on prevalence of COVID-19 misinformation and the impact of Meta’s policies will shape general understanding of, and future responses to, harmful health misinformation in this and future emergencies. If that research is disproportionately focused on the Global North, the response will be too. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta publicly shares its plan to provide researchers around the world with data access similar to that provided to EU countries under the DSA.</p>	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response
Removal of COVID-19 misinformation #18	<p>Meta should evaluate the impact of the cross-check Early Response Secondary Review (ERSR) system on the effectiveness of its enforcement of the Misinformation policy and ensure that Recommendations 16 and 17 in the Board’s policy advisory opinion on Meta’s cross-check program apply to entities that post content violating the Misinformation about health during a public health emergency policy. The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta shares its findings with the Board and publicizes it.</p>	Awaiting first response	Awaiting first response