Oversight Board

Overarching Criteria for Case Selection

Overarching Criteria for Case Selection

The Overarching Criteria for Case Selection are set by the Board and are reviewed annually. The Oversight Board will select cases that raise important issues for precedential impact. Case decisions and recommendations will shape Meta's content policies and enforcement of them and advance Meta's adherence to its values and commitments to respect freedom of expression and other human rights. The cases will be significant for public discourse, affect a substantial number of people, and ensure geographic and linguistic diversity. They will seek to reflect the concerns of the people and communities who use and are affected by Facebook and Instagram around the world.

The Oversight Board's strategic priorities, announced on 20 October 2022, are also criteria for case selection. The Board has communicated to Meta its expectation that it will consider these priorities when referring cases. The Board also encourages people who use Facebook and Instagram to consider these priorities when submitting appeals, including when explaining their reasons for disagreeing with Meta's decisions. More information on how to submit appeals to the Oversight Board can be found here.

The priorities as they relate to case selection are:

- **Elections and civic space:** the Board is interested in exploring Meta's responsibilities in elections and other key moments for civic participation, such as protests. They may relate to the importance of Meta's platforms allowing elected representatives and candidates for office to engage the public without discrimination or bias, while also ensuring the public can express their political views freely and hold those with power to account. Relevant content policies may include: [Violence and Incitement](); [Misinformation](); [Dangerous Individuals and Organizations](); [Coordinating Harm and Promoting Crime](); Meta's [approach to elections]() and the [Newsworthiness Allowance]().

- **Crisis and conflict situations:** the Board is interested in exploring Meta's preparedness for potential harms its products can contribute to during armed conflicts, civil unrest, terrorist attacks, natural disasters resulting from the climate crisis, and other emergencies. They may relate to the unique challenges of respecting freedom of expression and other rights, such as the right to life, in these contexts. Relevant content policies may include: [Violence and Incitement](); [Misinformation](); [Dangerous Individuals and Organizations](); [Violent and Graphic Content](); and the [Crisis Protocol]().

- **Gender:** the Board is interested in exploring gendered obstacles women and LGBTQI+ people face to exercising their right to freedom of expression on Meta's platforms. They may relate to online forms of gender-based violence and harassment, as well as the effects of gender-based distinctions in content policies such as on depictions of adult nudity. Relevant content policies may include:

[Violence and Incitement](#); [Bullying and Harassment](#); [Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity,](#) and [Sexual Solicitation](#).

- **Hate speech against marginalized groups:** the Board is interested in exploring Meta's responsibilities in relation to hate speech on its platforms, and how to protect members of marginalized groups from harm while respecting freedom of expression. They may relate to the challenges of taking context into account for moderation at scale, addressing power dynamics and cumulative harms, while ensuring enforcement does not incorrectly target those speaking out against or challenging hate. Relevant content policies may include: [Hate Speech](#); [Violence and Incitement](#); and [Dangerous Individuals and Organizations](#).

- **Government use of Meta's platforms:** the Board is interested in exploring state actors' use of Meta's platforms for communications with the public, and the implications of content moderation in this context. This potentially relates to all content policies, though a focus may include [Violence and Incitement](#); [Misinformation](#); [Dangerous Individuals and Organizations,](#) and the [Newsworthiness Allowance](#). The Board is also interested in exploring how Meta's relationships with governments influence the development and enforcement of content policies.

- **Treating users fairly:** the Board is interested in exploring how people who use Meta's platforms are affected by the way the company moderates content and [enforces its policies](#). They may raise issues of due process, notice to users, equal treatment and prioritization of content for review, strikes and penalties, and the availability and treatment of appeals. This priority intersects with all those above, may engage multiple content policy areas, as well as Meta's commitment to remedy outlined in its [corporate human rights policy](#).

- **Automated enforcement of policies and curation of content:** the Board is interested in exploring how Meta's use of algorithms and machine learning implicate the company's values and commitments to freedom of expression and other human rights. Cases may relate to the appropriate design and deployment of automated enforcement and curation systems, less intrusive means of enforcement achieved through automation (including demotion of 'borderline' content), the accuracy of automated detection and enforcement, and transparency reporting on use of automation. This priority intersects with all those above and may engage various content policy areas.