









































































<b>Previous Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Updated Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	We are in the process of finalizing language to include in the Community Standards that clarifies definitions for “pharmaceutical drugs” and “non-medical drugs.” We’re also aiming to provide more clarity around when content involving these drugs may not be allowed under our current policies. We will continue to work towards implementing this recommendation in Q3 2022 and will provide an update in our next Quarterly Update.
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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.</p> <p><a href="#"><i>(Post Describing Sexual Violence Against Minors #1)</i></a></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Updated Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	As part of our policy development on functional identification of child victims of sexual violence, we will use insights gathered from our policy development process to inform definitions on graphic depiction and sexualization. This work will also include outlining distinctions between legal, clinical, or medical terms and graphic content. We believe that these changes may benefit from input from our Stakeholder Engagement and Research that will be conducted as part of the policy development process for functional identification of child victims of sexual assault.
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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><a href="#"><i>(Post Describing Sexual Violence Against Minors #2)</i></a></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Updated Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress

<p><b>August 2022 Update</b></p>	<p>We plan to conduct a Policy Development process on this topic this half. As with all policy proposals that ultimately have a goal of going to the <a href="#">Policy Forum</a>, this policy development will include research and input from external experts in this area of expertise. We also will work with our enforcement teams to understand how any potential changes may be operationalized. This process also includes working group discussions with other internal stakeholders, which may help inform potential tradeoffs in any policy changes. We will provide an update on the progress of this policy development in the next Quarterly Update.</p>
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> <i>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 10 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.</i></p> <p><i>(<a href="#">PAO on Sharing Residential Information #1</a> (along with <a href="#">PAO on Sharing Residential Information #3</a>)<sup>9</sup>)</i></p>	
<p><b>Previous Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing Fully</p>
<p><b>Updated Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing Fully</p>
<p><b>Current Status</b></p>	<p>In Progress</p>
<p><b>August 2022 Update</b></p>	<p>We are working to remove the “publicly available” allowance while still allowing the sharing of imagery that displays the external view of private residences in various scenarios except when organizing protests against the resident. We are working on defining how to identify when depiction is “the focus of the news story” and how to identify protest context. Though this work remains ongoing, we are hoping to provide more updates in the next Quarterly Update.</p>
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>(<a href="#">PAO on Sharing Residential Information #4</a>)</i></p>	
<p><b>Previous Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing Fully</p>
<p><b>Updated Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing Fully</p>
<p><b>Current Status</b></p>	<p>In Progress</p>

<sup>9</sup> The board issued a similar recommendation in recommendation #3 in the [PAO on Sharing Residential Information case](#). We are tracking the progress of our work in response to this recommendation as part of our response to recommendation #1 in the PAO on Sharing Residential Information

<b>August 2022 Update</b>	We are finalizing work to implement this recommendation. This includes working to modify guidance and training materials to outline criteria for identifying high-ranking government officials at scale, as well as when the publication of addresses and imagery of official residences of high-ranking government officials should be allowed. We hope to share an update in future Quarterly Updates.
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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.</p> <p><a href="#">(PAO on Sharing Residential Information #7)</a></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Assessing Feasibility
<b>Updated Category</b>	Assessing Feasibility
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	We are finalizing work to implement this recommendation, including modifying guidance and training materials to outline criteria for when disclosing the city or the neighborhood is sufficient for identifying where a residence is located. We hope to share an update in future Quarterly Updates.
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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.</p> <p><a href="#">(PAO on Sharing Residential Information #8)</a></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Updated Category</b>	Implementing Fully
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	We are finalizing work to implement this recommendation, including establishing guidance and training materials to outline criteria for when a resident is sufficiently identified. We hope to share an update in future Quarterly Update.
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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.</p> <p><a href="#">(Video of an Edited Cartoon Depicting a Croatian City #1)</a></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Implementing in Part

<b>Updated Category</b>	Implementing in Part
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	In our <a href="#">August 12, 2022 response</a> , we committed to updating our Community Standards and reviewer policy guidance to clarify our approach to hate speech that is not explicit and requires additional context to interpret. It is important to note that, as we will clarify in the Community Standards, given the challenges in enforcing implicit hate speech, we will only remove this content when the context and the user’s intent can be reasonably understood. This is especially true when the content is ambiguous and could either be condemning the use of hate speech or actively engaging in it. The volume of expression that people share on our technologies every day requires that we apply a high-capacity, high-consistency approach to our at-scale content review processes. To do so, we instruct our at-scale reviewers to take action on direct attacks on protected characteristics and escalate content for additional expert review if it raises an especially challenging policy question. On escalation, we can address implicit hate speech when “reasonably understood” or with the benefit of additional context. We are still in the early stages of updating our Community Standards and reviewer policy guidance in response to this recommendation and will report on our progress in the next Quarterly Update.
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation: 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.</i></b></p> <p><i>(<a href="#">Video Depicting a Civilian Victim of Violence in Sudan #1</a> (along with <a href="#">Video Depicting a Civilian Victim of Violence in Sudan #2</a>)<sup>10</sup>)</i></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Assessing Feasibility
<b>Updated Category</b>	Assessing Feasibility
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	In our <a href="#">August 12, 2022 response</a> , we shared that we plan to conduct a policy development process to determine whether we should allow all graphic videos of people or dead bodies on our platforms with a warning screen when shared for the purpose of raising awareness of documenting human rights abuses. This policy development will include assessing what criteria we should consider to identify such content. As shared in our recommendation response, under our Violent and Graphic content policy, we generally remove videos of people or dead bodies in a non-medical setting where they are particularly graphic. Viewing this type of graphic content can potentially be harmful for users, but there are instances where people post such videos to document or raise awareness of human rights abuses. We have typically handled these situations on a case-by-case basis because the assessments are nuanced and involve a careful balance between our values of privacy, safety, and voice.

<sup>10</sup> The board issued a similar recommendation in recommendation #2 in the [Video Depicting a Civilian Victim of Violence in Sudan](#) case. We are tracking the progress of our work in response to this recommendation as part of our response to recommendation #1 in the Video Depicting a Civilian Victim of Violence in Sudan case.

	<p>While we recognize that it may be difficult to implement a general allowance for this type of graphic content given the scale at which we operate, we recognize the importance of raising awareness of and documenting human rights abuses and are committed to assessing the feasibility of introducing this change. In order to effectively weigh tradeoffs and considerations in this space, we will conduct a robust policy development process to inform any potential policy and enforcement changes. We are still in the initial scoping stages of implementing this recommendation and will report on our progress in the next Quarterly Update.</p>
--	---

## Appendix C. Enforcement

Enforcement Recommendations	
<p><b>Oversight Board Recommendation:</b> Facebook should let users indicate in their appeal that their content falls into one of the exceptions to the Hate Speech policy.                      (<a href="#">Armenian People and the Armenian Genocide Recommendation #4</a>, (along with <a href="#">PAO on Sharing Residential Information #10</a> and <a href="#">PAO on Sharing Residential Information #14</a>)<sup>11</sup>)</p>	
Previous Category	Assessing Feasibility
Updated Category	Assessing Feasibility
Current Status	In Progress
August 2022 Update	<p>In the second half of 2022, our product teams will continue to focus on initiatives related to compliance requirements and protecting the voices of people on our platforms. However, we are also prioritizing efforts to identify key drivers of trust in appeals in order to improve appeals effectiveness and ensure that people on our platforms feel heard and understand our content moderation decisions. As part of this focus, we are exploring and evaluating how to provide people with the functionality that allows them to indicate that their content falls into one of the exceptions of the Hate Speech policy. As we shared in our <a href="#">last Quarterly Update</a>, our work must account for the fact that not everyone is familiar with the specific exceptions to our Hate Speech policy, which could lead to inequitable enforcement outcomes. Additionally, adding more steps or options could lead to confusion and discourage people from appealing. We are still exploring the right way to offer this function and ensure everyone has the information they need to use it intentionally, without discouraging appeals or creating unnecessary confusion. We will provide an update on the status of this recommendation in future Quarterly Updates.</p>
<p><b>Oversight Board Recommendation:</b> To improve the accuracy of Facebook's review in the appeals stage, the company should ensure appeals based on policy exceptions are prioritized for human review.                      (<a href="#">Armenian People and the Armenian Genocide Recommendation #5</a>)</p>	
Previous Category	Assessing Feasibility
Updated Category	Assessing Feasibility
Current Status	In Progress
August 2022 Update	<p>In our <a href="#">last Quarterly Update</a>, we committed to assessing the dynamic prioritization of appeals as part of our roadmap planning for Q3 and Q4 2022. As we explained then, we generally review appeals in the order we receive them. The only current exception is</p>

<sup>11</sup> The board issued a similar recommendation in [PAO on Sharing Private Residential Information #10](#) and [PAO on Sharing Private Residential Information #14](#). We are tracking the progress of our work in response to this recommendations as part of our response to recommendation #4 in the Armenian People and the Armenian Genocide case.

	<p>reviewing people’s appeals for their own content we’ve removed for violating our policies before appeals of decisions when someone reports another person’s content for potentially violating our policies. We are still working to understand the tradeoffs of prioritizing certain appeals over others. There are multiple factors to consider as part of prioritization including, among other things, speed, severity of enforcement action, and recidivism. Our engineering, policy, and operations teams are still working to better understand these considerations and scope the subsequent product development. We will provide an update on the status of this ongoing in a future Quarterly Update.</p>
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> <i>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 includes 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. 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 Updates.</i></p> <p><i>(<a href="#">Depicting Indigenous Artwork and Discussing Residential Schools Recommendation #3</a>)</i></p>	
<p><b>Previous Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing in Part</p>
<p><b>Updated Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing in Part</p>
<p><b>Current Status</b></p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p><b>August 2022 Update</b></p>	<p>In response to this recommendation, we explored the question of whether the location of reviewers impacts their ability to accurately assess pieces of potential hate speech content from the same or different regions by performing research in this area. We conducted an experiment using 20 samples of Hate Speech content, where we tracked reviewer accuracy across five global sites which included three global vendors to test this in one of the highest volume Hate Speech markets. Based on this test we did not find a statistically significant difference in performance between sites. From the 3,000 reviewer responses, our results indicate that there wasn’t a huge deviation (+/-5%) across the different locations for our enforcement accuracy metric across all sites included. Following a feasibility assessment, we conducted this location-based accuracy assessment for our <a href="#">Hate Speech policy</a>, rather than hate speech policy allowances for condemnation, awareness raising, self-referential use, and empowering use. This is because, as shared in our <a href="#">initial response</a> to this recommendation, we do not ask content reviewers to mark the reason they consider content benign. This would require significant additional time to review each piece of content, limiting the amount of content that received human review. It would also create risk of inaccurate data, as it would be difficult for reviewers to consistently and accurately identify categories of benign content given the broad range of benign types of content. For these reasons, we conducted a broader Hate Speech accuracy assessment and have shared the results, which indicate limited deviation on the basis of location, here. Additionally, our Hate Speech precision metric, which measures accuracy, is consistently very high. We will share this confidential data with the board directly for visibility and to demonstrate the effectiveness of our systems in reducing the prevalence of hate speech on our platforms. We now consider this recommendation complete and will have no further updates.</p>

<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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.</p> <p><i>(<a href="#">Post Requesting Advice on Pharmaceutical Drugs #2</a>)</i></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Assessing Feasibility
<b>Updated Category</b>	Assessing Feasibility
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	As explained in our <a href="#">Q1 2022 Quarterly Update</a> , we generally review appeals in the order we receive them. The only current exception is reviewing appeals regarding decisions made about a person’s own content (actors) before appeals of decisions made when someone reports another person’s content (reporters). In response to the board’s recommendation, however, we will be designing an initial model to test appeals prioritization in Q3 and Q4 of this year. As we are still in the initial stages of this multi-stage process, our goal for this year is to identify key drivers of trust in appeals in order to improve their overall effectiveness – exploring and evaluating <i>how</i> we should prioritize appeals in order to inform future iterations of prioritization models in 2023. Once we have completed this initial scoping, we will also be considering how the appeal prioritization impacts legitimacy, fairness, and user impact. We will provide an update on the status of this recommendation in the next Quarterly Update.
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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.</p> <p><i>(<a href="#">Post Requesting Advice on Pharmaceutical Drugs #3</a>)</i></p>	
<b>Previous Category</b>	Implementing in Part
<b>Updated Category</b>	Implementing in Part
<b>Current Status</b>	In Progress
<b>August 2022 Update</b>	As explained in our <a href="#">initial response</a> to this recommendation, we currently collect and assess reviewer accuracy data on the basis of takedowns and restorations – including takedowns under our <a href="#">Restricted Goods and Services policy</a> – to feed into continuous development of our classifiers and review protocols and policies. If we identify performance issues in the course of these continuous assessments, we attempt to identify the source of the issues and, depending on the source of the issue, will involve the appropriate team to address it. In the interest of transparency around how we identify and address potential mistakes in the enforcement of our Restricted Goods and Services Policy, we report on the amount of



	<p>appealed content and content that is restored on Facebook and Instagram under that policy in our quarterly <a href="#">Community Standards Enforcement Report</a>. As shared in our response to <a href="#">Punjabi Concern Over the RSS in India recommendation #3</a>, our work defining accuracy metrics is underway and we aim to launch these metrics by Q4 2023.</p> <p>In terms of expanding our reporting to cover other community standards, as mentioned in our response to <a href="#">Support of Abdullah Ocalan recommendation #11</a>, we are currently working on the necessary system updates to build violation type metrics in a scalable manner, including improvements to our internal data logging infrastructure. We plan to complete the initial changes to internal infrastructure this year, but expect this to be a complex, long-term project. We will provide an update on the timeline for public reporting of these metrics in a future Quarterly Update.</p>
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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><i>(PAO on Sharing Residential Information #12)</i></p>	
<p><b>Previous Category</b></p>	<p>Assessing Feasibility</p>
<p><b>Updated Category</b></p>	<p>Assessing Feasibility</p>
<p><b>Current Status</b></p>	<p>In Progress</p>
<p><b>August 2022 Update</b></p>	<p>We are continuing to work through considerations for this recommendation and parameters for content that is “clearly related to malicious action that created a risk of violence or harassment.” Given the board’s recommendation for account suspension as a reaction to violating this policy change, there are a number of factors to weigh before aligning on an approach to implement a policy or enforcement change in a way that continues to balance values such as safety and voice. As such, we are exploring ways to potentially implement aspects of this recommendation, and will continue to keep the board updated on next steps in future Quarterly Updates.</p>
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> 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. 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><i>(PAO on Sharing Residential Information #13)</i></p>	
<p><b>Previous Category</b></p>	<p>Assessing Feasibility</p>
<p><b>Updated Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing in Part</p>
<p><b>Current Status</b></p>	<p>Complete</p>

<p><b>August 2022 Update</b></p>	<p>While we continue to explore opportunities for self-remediation prior to potential infractions on our platforms and real-time education about our content moderation policies, we have identified a recently launched system called “Post-time Friction” (PTF) as the best tool for achieving the spirit of this recommendation. PTF is an early warning system on Facebook and for plain text posts on Instagram that notifies people when content they intend to post may violate our policies, including our privacy policies, giving them the option to avoid posting potentially violating content. PTF is available globally across several policy areas – including Bullying and Harassment, Hate Speech, Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity, and Violent and Graphic Content. In Q3 and Q4 2022, we plan to expand PTF to support Violence and Incitement policies, and will prioritize future policy expansions on the basis of reducing harm on the platform. This year, we are also experimenting with extending PTF to cover auto-delete scenarios. Auto-delete scenarios occur when we know that the content someone is attempting to post, or comment on an existing post, is certain to violate our policies. In these cases, PTF would tell people that the content they have written is certain to violate our policies and give them the opportunity to edit or delete their post themselves to avoid immediate auto-deletion. With the launch of Post-time Friction, we have completed the bulk of the recommendation by giving users a remedial window to remove their content before it is permanently deleted and if applicable, subsequently post a non-violating alternative. While we will continue to expand PTF to further policy areas, we now consider this recommendation complete. We may share future updates on related product work in the interest of ongoing transparency around board priorities.</p>
----------------------------------	---

***Oversight Board Recommendation:*** 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.

[\*\(Post Containing Pictures of Derogatory Words in Arabic #2\)\*](#)

<p><b>Previous Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing Fully</p>
<p><b>Updated Category</b></p>	<p>Implementing Fully</p>
<p><b>Current Status</b></p>	<p>Complete</p>
<p><b>August 2022 Update</b></p>	<p>In our <a href="#">August 12, 2022 response</a> on our Transparency Center, we shared a clear explanation of our approach to developing market-specific slur lists. This overview captured the teams, including public policy, content policy, regional markets, and stakeholder engagement, that are involved in the complex process of designating a slur. It described the ongoing qualitative and quantitative analysis our regional teams conduct and their use of contextual resources including news articles, academic studies, and other linguistic research. It also shared the ways we analyze the prevalence and use of certain words on our platforms to determine the extent to which they meet our slur definition. Based on this explanation, we now consider this recommendation complete.</p>

***Oversight Board Recommendation:*** 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

<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>(<a href="#">Post Containing Pictures of Derogatory Words in Arabic #3</a>)</i></p>	
Previous Category	Implementing Fully
Updated Category	Implementing Fully
Current Status	Complete
August 2022 Update	<p>In our <a href="#">August 12, 2022 response</a> on our Transparency Center, we shared a clear explanation of how we enforce our market-specific slur lists. This overview described how, across all violation areas, we have reviewers that are covering multiple regions across multiple languages (to cover all dialects as much as possible). These reviewers are assigned to queues based on language expertise and violation type skill set, so they have an informed sense of which slur lists will be most relevant for their respective content queues. It also shared that our content moderation routing incorporates both language and region to determine the appropriate reviewer(s) for content, but generally, language plays a larger role in that complex routing. Based on this explanation, we now consider this recommendation complete, and will have no further updates.</p>
<p><b><i>Oversight Board Recommendation:</i></b> <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>(<a href="#">Post Containing Pictures of Derogatory Words in Arabic #4</a>)</i></p>	
Previous Category	Implementing Fully
Updated Category	Implementing Fully
Current Status	Complete
August 2022 Update	<p>In our <a href="#">August 12, 2022 response</a> on our Transparency Center, we shared a clear explanation of how we audit our market-specific slur lists. This described the annual audit of our slur lists performed by our operational teams in collaboration with regional market teams, who together review the slurs and reach a conclusion as to whether the word retains the offensive character that initially qualified it for the list. It also covered that regional teams, including at-scale review partners, continually monitor the linguistic development of their market and, based on this, propose new slurs that should be added to their market list or suggest that existing words on the list be revised. Finally, we shared that we regularly ask the civil society and non-governmental organizations with whom we engage to provide input on what words should be considered slurs. Based on this explanation, we now consider this recommendation complete, and will have no further updates.</p>

## IV. Index

Case	Recommendation	Updated Category	Status	Section	Page
Armenians in Azerbaijan	2020-003-FB-UA-1	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	21
Breast cancer symptoms and nudity	2020-004-IG-UA-2	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	29
	2020-004-IG-UA-3	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 3	21
	2020-004-IG-UA-5	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	22
	2020-004-IG-UA-6	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	22
Nazi quote	2020-005-FB-UA-1	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 3	21
Former President Trump	2021-001-FB-FBR-11	Implementing fully	Complete	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	23
	2021-001-FB-FBR-18	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	23
	2021-001-FB-FBR-19	Implementing fully	Complete	<a href="#">Policy</a>	29
Depiction of Zwarte Piet	2021-002-FB-UA-2	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 3	21
Punjabi Concerns Over the RSS in India	2021-003-FB-UA-3	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	24
January 2021 Protests in Russia	2021-004-FB-UA-3	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	30
	2021-004-FB-UA-4	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a> Footnote 8	30
Armenian People and the Armenian Genocide	2021-005-FB-UA-4	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	38
	2021-005-FB-UA-5	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	38
Support of Abdullah Ocalan	2021-006-IG-UA-9	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	24
	2021-006-IG-UA-10	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a> Footnote 7	29
	2021-006-IG-UA-11	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	25
Al Jazeera Post on Tensions Between Israel and Palestine	2021-009-FB-UA-1	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	31
	2021-009-FB-UA-3	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	25
	2021-009-FB-UA-4	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 5	25

Post Depicting Protests in Colombia While Using a Slur	2021-010-FB-UA-1	Implementing in part	Complete	<a href="#">Policy</a>	31
	2021-010-FB-UA-2	Implementing fully	Complete	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 4	23
	2021-010-FB-UA-4	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	26
South Africa Slur	2021-011-FB-UA-1	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 3	21
Depicting Indigenous Artwork and Discussing Residential Schools	2021-012-FB-UA-1	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	26
	2021-012-FB-UA-3	Implementing in part	Complete	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	39
Post Discussing a Substance with Psychoactive Properties	2021-013-IG-UA-1	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a> Footnote 7	29
	2021-013-IG-UA-2	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 3	21
	2021-013-IG-UA-3	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	32
Post Requesting Advice on Pharmaceutical Drugs	2021-015-FB-UA-1	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	32
	2021-015-FB-UA-2	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	40
	2021-015-FB-UA-3	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	40
Post Describing Sexual Violence Against Minors	2021-016-FB-FBR-1	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	33
	2021-016-FB-FBR-2	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	33
PAO on Sharing Private Residential Information	2021-001-FB-PAO-1	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	34
	2021-001-FB-PAO-3	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a> Footnote 9	34
	2021-001-FB-PAO-4	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	34
	2021-001-FB-PAO-7	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	35
	2021-001-FB-PAO-8	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	35
	2021-001-FB-PAO-9	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a> Footnote 7	29
	2021-001-FB-PAO-10	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Enforcement</a> Footnote 11	38
	2021-001-FB-PAO-12	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	41
	2021-001-FB-PAO-13	Implementing in part	Complete	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	42
	2021-001-FB-PAO-14	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Enforcement</a> Footnote 11	38
	2021-001-FB-PAO-17	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 3	21

<b>Video of an Edited Cartoon Depicting a Croatian City</b>	2022-001-FB-UA-1	Implementing in part	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	35
	2022-001-FB-UA-2	Implementing fully	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a>	27
<b>Video Depicting a Civilian Victim of Violence in Sudan</b>	2022-002-FB-MR-1	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a>	36
	2022-002-FB-MR-2	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Policy</a> Footnote 10	36
	2022-002-FB-MR-3	Implementing fully	Complete	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 3	23
	2022-002-FB-MR-4	Assessing feasibility	In progress	<a href="#">Transparency</a> Footnote 6	26
<b>Post Containing Pictures of Derogatory Words in Arabic</b>	2022-003-IG-UA-1	No further action	No further updates	Footnote 2	13
	2022-003-IG-UA-2	Implementing fully	Complete	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	42
	2022-003-IG-UA-3	Implementing fully	Complete	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	43
	2022-003-IG-UA-4	Implementing fully	Complete	<a href="#">Enforcement</a>	43