



# Showing Passport Biodata in News Reporting

2026-005-FB-MR

## Summary

In a case involving a Russian activist who attempted to burn but then tore up his passport at a press event, the Oversight Board finds that Meta should carve out an exception to its privacy policies governing personally identifiable information (PII) to permit individuals to publicly disclose their own PII as an act of political expression.

## **Why This Matters**

Meta's privacy policies have understandably strict prohibitions on the posting of PII, even well-intentioned self-disclosure, to protect all users from the heightened risks of physical and financial harm from disclosing PII in the public domain. However, a newsworthiness allowance can also be applied for posts that have a high public interest value. This case has important implications for how political speech is governed and how users are protected on Meta's platforms.

## **About the Case**

In August 2025, a leading German news agency shared an image on its Facebook page of an individual's torn Russian passport. The biodata page was visible in the post, revealing the individual's PII. A caption in Russian accompanied the post, stating that the passport owner is a dual German and Russian citizen, who was previously convicted of treason in Russia for taking a picture of a military unit close to where he had been living. The passport owner was released from prison as part of a prisoner swap and is now based in Germany.

The news agency's Facebook post was part of its coverage of a press event where the passport owner first attempted to burn the passport, then tore it and threw it on the



ground, reportedly saying: “I am ashamed of Russia. I do not want to be a citizen of Russia, which tortures so many people.”

A few hours after the post was shared, Meta’s automated classifiers flagged it for violating the Privacy Violations Community Standard. The post was then reviewed by multiple human reviewers, who determined it was violating, but sent it for additional review by subject matter experts. The subject matter experts decided the content should remain on Facebook under the newsworthiness allowance.

Meta referred the case to the Board, asking the Board to decide whether the Privacy Violations Community Standard should be more flexible in allowing posts where the disclosure of an individual’s PII is central to the act of political protest.

## **Key Findings**

A majority of the Board finds that although the post violated the Privacy Violations Community Standard, Meta acted correctly in keeping the content on Facebook under the newsworthiness allowance. A majority of the Board agrees with the company’s assessment that the public interest value of the content outweighs the risk of harm to the individual.

Meta’s rules do not allow people to share posts that contain PII. This is because sharing PII, regardless of intent, can lead to physical and financial harms. However, in this case, Meta took into account that the passport owner tore his own passport at a public press event to symbolically cut ties with Russia and make a political statement.

A majority of the Board finds that although it was the news agency that shared the individual’s PII on Facebook, and not the individual himself, the publicity surrounding the event was intentional and central to the individual’s act of protest.

A minority of the Board finds that, regardless of the public nature of the protest, the risk of harm to the individual of having PII published on the platform, such as fraudulent use



of the PII or other online attacks, does not justify keeping up the post under the newsworthiness allowance.

The Board is concerned that Meta does not have dedicated classifiers to enforce the Privacy Violations policy, meaning that PII disclosures that violate the policy can remain on the platform. The Board notes that although a newsworthiness allowance was applied in this case, Meta should develop the appropriate technical capability to more proactively detect PII disclosures.

The Board also finds that the Privacy Violations Community Standard's blanket prohibition on sharing PII does not adequately account for self-disclosing PII by adults in the context of political acts and protest speech. The Board notes that a specific policy exception is warranted, based on an individual's autonomous and voluntary decision to reveal PII as a way of expressing political dissent.

The Board also finds that the balance of factors Meta uses to implement the newsworthiness allowance needs to be clearer in the online Transparency Center.

### **The Oversight Board's Decision**

The Board upholds Meta's decision to leave up the content.

The Board recommends that Meta:

- Extend the use of [recently announced](#) advanced AI systems to detect and enforce the Privacy Violations policy.
- Revise the newsworthiness allowance policy to clarify how the listed factors outlined in the current policy (e.g., country-specific circumstances, political speech) are weighted when deciding whether violating content may remain on the platform under the newsworthiness exception.
- After developing the appropriate technical capabilities, Meta should carve out an exception to the Privacy Violations policy that prohibits posts from sharing PII,



to allow the sharing of PII when self-posted by an adult user in the exercise of political speech, i.e., protest, awareness-raising and condemning contexts.

\*Case summaries provide an overview of cases and do not have precedential value.

## **Full Case Decision**

### **1. Case Description and Background**

This case concerns how Meta should address the publication of personally identifiable information (PII) on its platforms in the context of political dissent. In August 2025, a leading German news agency shared an image on its Facebook page of a person’s torn passport biodata page. The page was face-up, revealing the passport owner’s PII. A caption in Russian accompanied the post, stating that the passport owner is a dual German and Russian citizen who was previously convicted of treason in Russia for taking pictures of a military unit close to where he had been living. The passport owner was eventually released from prison as part of a prisoner swap between Russia and several Western nations. The caption also said that the person initially tried to burn his Russian passport, but did not succeed because the wind blew out the fire. This prompted the individual to tear up the passport and throw it on the ground. The person reportedly said the following while ripping apart the passport: “I am ashamed of Russia. I do not want to be a citizen of Russia, which tortures so many people.” Based on news reports, the tearing of the passport occurred at a press event convened for that purpose. The case content received about 1,000 reactions and under 1,000 comments. Most users who reacted to, commented on and reshared the post have accounts located in Germany.

A few hours after the post was shared, Meta’s automated classifier, which was trained to identify and prioritize content that may pose harm to individuals and have a high likelihood of virality, detected the content. Two hours after that, another classifier



trained to catch the most viral and potentially violating content on the platform also detected the content and put it in a queue for human review. The first classifier flag was not prioritized for human review, but the second classifier flag was reviewed by multiple human reviewers, who determined that the content violated Meta’s Privacy Violations policy. The content was then sent for additional levels of review as part of the company’s [cross-check program](#), which subjects posts from high-profile users, such as media outlets, to additional levels of human review after they are initially found to violate Meta’s Community Standards. Internal policy subject matter experts who then reviewed the case content decided that it should remain on Facebook under the newsworthiness allowance. As a result, the content remained on the platform.

Meta referred the case to the Board, asking it to weigh in on whether the Privacy Violations Community Standard “should be more flexible” and allow users to share their own PII “especially in the context of protest.”

In reaching its decision, the Board notes that the Russian government has engaged in transnational repression of political dissidents and critics through [assassination](#), [denials of services such as banking and entry into the country](#), and various forms of [harassment and abuse](#), including through the [use of digital tools](#). The Board also notes that videos of the individual in question tearing the passport at the press event were still available on various social media platforms, including Facebook, at the time of the Board’s deliberation.

## **2. User Submissions**

The author of the post was notified of the Board’s review and was given an opportunity to submit a statement. No response was received.

## **3. Meta’s Content Policies and Submissions**

### *1. Meta’s Content Policies*



## Privacy Violations Community Standard

Under the [Privacy Violations policy](#), Meta removes content “sharing personally identifiable information (information that uniquely identifies an individual) of the poster or others.” PII includes “national identification numbers” such as passport numbers or individual taxpayer identification numbers, and immigration documents. The policy aims to protect the “privacy and personal information” of Meta’s users. The prohibition on posting PII extends to “personal or confidential information” posted by users “about themselves or of others.” However, Meta may allow information to be posted if “private information [becomes] publicly available through news coverage, court filings, press releases or other sources.”

## Newsworthiness Allowance

Meta’s [newsworthiness allowance](#) permits otherwise violating content to stay on its platforms. The allowance applies if content is “newsworthy and if keeping it visible is in the public interest.” Meta weighs the public interest value of a piece of content against the risk of harm the content may pose. According to the company, it refers to “international human rights standards, as reflected in [its] [Corporate Human Rights Policy](#), to help make these judgments.”

When making a newsworthiness determination, Meta assesses whether the content “surfaces an imminent threat to public health or safety or gives voice to perspectives currently being debated as part of a political process.” Meta also considers other factors, such as:

- Country-specific circumstances, for example, whether there is an election underway, or if the country is at war.
- The nature of the speech, including whether it relates to governance or politics.
- The political structure of the country, including whether it has a free press,

Meta removes content, even if it has some degree of newsworthiness, when leaving it up presents a risk of harm, “such as physical, emotional and financial harm, or a direct threat to public safety.” According to the company’s most recent [public report](#) on the enforcement of the newsworthiness allowance, it applied a total of 44 newsworthiness



decisions from June 1, 2024, through June 1, 2025, six of which were scaled across its platforms.

## *II. Meta's Submissions*

For many of its policies, Meta allows users to share otherwise violating content if users post it for condemnation, discussion, awareness raising, or educational purposes. By contrast, its Privacy Violations Policy does not allow these exceptions for PII. The company explained that this is due to the risk that revealing PII can lead to “physical or financial harm, regardless of the sharer’s intent.” Meta drafted the current policy “with user safety in mind” to protect users “who may not fully appreciate” the risks of sharing their own PII publicly. Meta explained that “even well-intentioned disclosures,” as in awareness-raising and protest contexts, “can expose individuals to risks such as doxxing, harassment, identity theft or retaliation.” The policy is designed to prevent such harms “by default,” as intent is “difficult to reliably assess at scale and does not mitigate the risk to the individual whose information is shared.” The company also noted that it “gives users the ability to edit media (e.g., by adding filters or stickers)” on its platforms before posting. For Meta, “these filters and/or stickers could be used to cover PII.” Such tools are available on Meta’s platforms for all users before posting.

Meta also shared with the Board that reports of unwanted PII disclosures come from the subjects of PII or from other users, including from trusted partners, especially in harassment and doxxing contexts. The company further noted that, although reports of unwanted PII disclosures “occur regularly,” only a small fraction is sufficiently high risk to require immediate attention.

In response to the Board’s questions, Meta explained that it does not use dedicated classifiers for detecting PII. There are also no automated systems to differentiate between users posting their own PII versus that of others, or whether the content with PII was shared in the context of protest. Instead, the classifiers that the company uses are trained to enforce various Community Standards more broadly (such as the two classifiers that detected the case content based on virality and likelihood of harm). Meta ranks reports of unwanted disclosure of PII through these automated detection tools as well as human review, prioritizing cases with the highest risk of harm. The company relies on human review and escalation for sensitive cases. Removal would generally occur “only after human review or in specific, narrow escalation contexts, such as responding to a major doxxing incident.”



Meta explained that while it is technically possible to build classifiers that could detect PII in user content, reliably distinguishing the context – such as self-disclosure or protest – is “much more challenging, as there is nuanced intent or context, which often requires human judgment.” Meta explained further:

“Allowing at-scale exceptions based on intent or user consent would require nuanced, case-by-case assessments, which are difficult to scale reliably across billions of users and posts. Automated systems cannot easily distinguish between harmful and non-harmful intent, and even human reviewers may struggle to make consistent judgments. Any exception would have to be narrow or [it] will lead to inconsistent enforcement and potential inequities. Moreover, loosening the policy could create negative adversarial incentives that bad actors can exploit by claiming protest or awareness as a pretext for sharing PII maliciously. Additionally, different jurisdictions may have regulatory requirements around the sharing of PII that may limit [Meta’s] ability to create at-scale policy exceptions.”

The company acknowledges that the general prohibition under the policy can sometimes result in inequitable outcomes. It seeks to mitigate such inequities by applying a newsworthiness allowance where the enforcement of the policy “might otherwise result in removing speech where the public interest value outweighs the risk of harm.” The company notes that such allowances “tend to be rare” and require escalation to Meta’s internal policy and subject matter experts.

In keeping up the post under the newsworthiness allowance, Meta decided its public interest value outweighed the risk of harm. First, the individual destroyed the passport at a public press conference “with the understanding that it would be photographed, videoed and reported upon.” The act’s public nature suggests the individual knew a third party attending or witnessing the event might capture and share the PII. Second, Meta considered that the person appeared to share his own PII to “symbolically cut ties with Russia, raise awareness and make a political statement around the country’s human rights record on torture, which continues to be debated in the press.” Third, the post was shared by a news outlet that properly described the circumstances surrounding the post. In Meta’s view, the caption explained the post’s “political



importance without sensationalizing or inciting violence.” Meta noted the political importance of the event, i.e., the youngest treason convict in modern Russian history tearing up his Russian passport.

Finally, Meta considered the fact that the post was not reported by the individual owner of the PII as an alleged violation of any of the Community Standards. For images, users can specifically report privacy violations using a Facebook Image Privacy Rights form available on the platform. There is no evidence that the individual reported the content through this mechanism or any other. Meta also noted the Privacy Violations policy rationale, stating that private information may become public through news coverage.

The Board asked questions about the enforcement of Meta’s Privacy Violations policy, and requested data on policy enforcement on and volume of reports of unwanted PII disclosures that the company receives, and the number of newsworthiness allowances granted relating to the privacy policy. Meta responded to all questions.

#### **4. Public Comments**

The Board received no public comment on this case that met [the terms for submission](#).

#### **5. Oversight Board Analysis**

The Board selected this case to assess how Meta’s privacy policy should treat the expressive value of political dissent that discloses one’s own PII. The Board analyzed Meta’s decision in this case against Meta’s content policies, values and human rights responsibilities. The Board also assessed the implications of this case for Meta’s broader approach to content governance. This case is relevant to the Board’s Elections and Civic Space [strategic priority](#).

#### **5.1 Compliance With Meta’s Content Policies**

##### *Content Rules*



The Board finds that the content in this case violated the Privacy Violations policy. A majority of the Board, however, finds that the post was properly kept up under the newsworthiness allowance, while a minority disagrees with the application of the newsworthiness allowance to the post.

As the Privacy Violations policy removes content with PII with no exceptions, the post violates the policy. However, a majority of the Board finds that Meta properly applied the newsworthiness allowance to keep up the post because its public interest value outweighed the risk of harm to the individual. The post was political in nature, consisting of a news report of a protest by a Russian citizen against the government, and an expression of this individual's intent to relinquish his Russian citizenship. The protest was held at a press conference in which the individual tore up his passport in front of media representatives. These factors indicate that the publicity surrounding the event was intentional and central to the act of protest. Moreover, the protester had already left Russia and is now based in Germany. The passport biodata exposed by the post constitutes information known to relevant authorities. Given the totality of circumstances, it is reasonable to assume that the shock value of destroying the passport outweighed any concerns about exposing the PII in the act of protest. A majority of the Board believes that the individual's choice to disclose this information should be honored as a matter of personal autonomy, rather than overridden, in light of speculative risks of which the individual would likely be well-aware.

A minority of the Board finds that the open and public nature of the protest would not justify keeping up the post under the newsworthiness allowance, due to the potential risk of harm from country-specific circumstances. Even if the biodata contained in the passport is already known to Russian authorities and the individual has now left Russia, there are still potentially severe adverse safety and security risks to the individual from other non-state actors, including the risk of fraudulent use of the PII, identity theft and other online attacks. Given this risk, disclosing the individual's PII and letting it remain on the platform might create unintended risks that do not outweigh the public interest in reporting on or receiving information about the protest, which could be done without revealing the individual's PII.



## 5.2 Compliance With Meta’s Human Rights Responsibilities

A majority of the Board finds that keeping the content up on the platform under the newsworthiness allowance was consistent with Meta’s human rights responsibilities.

### *Freedom of Expression (Article 19 ICCPR)*

Article 19 of the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) provides for broad protection of expression, including the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers. This protection includes a “free, uncensored and unhindered press or other media,” “political discourse,” commentary on “public affairs” and “journalism” as “essential” to ensure freedom of expression and the enjoyment of other rights ([General Comment No. 34](#), para. 11-13). It provides “particularly high” protection for “public debate concerning public figures in the political domain and public institutions” (General Comment No. 34, para. 38,20; see also [General Comment No. 25](#), para. 12 and 25). Article 17 of the ICCPR protects the right to privacy of every person. This right is “required to be guaranteed against all such interferences and attacks whether they emanate from state authorities or from natural or legal persons” ([General Comment No. 16](#), para. 1). The United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council has called on companies to “work towards enabling technical solutions to secure and protect the confidentiality of digital communications, which may include measures for encryption and anonymity” and to ensure that privacy rights are “incorporated into the design, operation, evaluation and regulation of automated decision-making and machine-learning technologies” ([A/HRC/RES/42/15](#), para. 9).

When restrictions on expression are imposed by a state, they must meet the requirements of legality, legitimate aim, and necessity and proportionality (Article 19, para. 3, ICCPR). These requirements are often referred to as the “three-part test.” The Board uses this framework to interpret Meta’s human rights responsibilities in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which Meta itself has committed to in its Corporate Human Rights Policy. The Board does this both in relation to the individual content decision under review and what this says about Meta’s



broader approach to content governance. As the UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression has stated, although “companies do not have the obligations of governments, their impact is of a sort that requires them to assess the same kind of questions about protecting their users' right to freedom of expression” ([A/74/486](#), para. 41).

### *I. Legality (Clarity and Accessibility of the Rules)*

The principle of legality requires rules limiting expression to be accessible and clear, formulated with sufficient precision to enable an individual to regulate their conduct accordingly (General Comment No. 34, para. 25). Additionally, these rules “may not confer unfettered discretion for the restriction of freedom of expression on those charged with [their] execution” and must “provide sufficient guidance to those charged with their execution to enable them to ascertain what sorts of expression are properly restricted and what sorts are not” (*ibid*). The UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression has stated that when applied to private actors’ governance of online speech, rules should be clear and specific ([A/HRC/38/35](#), para. 46). People using Meta’s platforms should be able to access and understand the rules, and content reviewers should have clear guidance regarding their enforcement.

Meta’s Privacy Violations policy categorically states that the sharing of PII is prohibited, with no exceptions. The Board finds this phrasing to be sufficiently clear.

The newsworthiness allowance states the criteria under which violating content may be kept up, as a result of prior Board decisions recommending the publication of such criteria ([Former President Trump’s Suspension](#); [Colombia Protests](#); [Iran Protest Slogan](#)). However, given the broad scope of the protections granted by the Privacy Violations Community Standard, it is not clear how Meta considers the various factors that inform the enforcement of the allowance. The Board finds that the Transparency Center should include how Meta weighs factors such as country-specific circumstances, the nature of the post and the political structure of the country, to provide better guidance to users regarding the granting or denying the newsworthiness allowance to a post.



## *II. Legitimate Aim*

Any restriction on freedom of expression should also pursue one or more of the legitimate aims listed in the ICCPR, which includes protecting the rights of others (Article 19, para. 3, ICCPR). The aim of the Privacy Violations policy is to protect the privacy and personal information of Meta’s users and others. In the [policy advisory opinion on Sharing of Private Residential Information](#), the Board recognized the policy’s aim to protect the rights of others, including the right to privacy. Additionally, the policy protects the rights to life, liberty and security of a person (Article 6 and 9, ICCPR).

## *III. Necessity and Proportionality*

Under ICCPR Article 19(3), necessity and proportionality requires that restrictions on expression “must be appropriate to achieve their protective function; they must be the least intrusive instrument amongst those which might achieve their protective function; they must be proportionate to the interest to be protected” (General Comment No. 34, para. 34).

At the outset, the Board is concerned that Meta does not have dedicated classifiers to enforce the Privacy Violations policy; instead, relying on virality and harm-based classifiers that apply to all Community Standards more broadly. While the current policy has a blanket prohibition against the disclosure of PII, the lack of sufficient detection and enforcement mechanisms means that violating content will remain on the platform if it does not meet the thresholds for the virality and harm-based classifiers. Even though, in the view of a majority of the Board, Meta was correct in keeping up the content in this case, a more proactive detection and enforcement mechanism tailored to this policy is warranted. For this reason, the Board recommends that Meta develop the appropriate technical capability to detect PII disclosures to enforce the policy.



A majority of the Board finds that the Privacy Violations policy’s requirement of blanket removal of content that discloses PII, without any exceptions, raises serious concerns about whether it is necessary and proportionate. This is because it can lead to political speech being removed, as would have happened in this case had the newsworthiness allowance not been applied. In previous decisions ([Colombia Protests](#); [Iran Protest Slogan](#)), the Board has recognized the importance of protest speech against heads of state and government, even where it is offensive, as public officials are “legitimately subject to criticism and political opposition” (General Comment No. 34, at paras 11 and 38). Moreover, the Board noted in the [Sharing of Private Residential Information](#) policy advisory opinion that disclosing private information can engage users’ right to seek and receive information “as a corollary of the specific function of a journalist and/or editor to impart information.” The majority of the Board notes that publicly tearing up the passport at a press event was a political act and a form of protest speech, on which the news outlet was reporting through its Facebook post. The facts of this case support keeping up the content as an exercise of the individual’s right to protest. A majority of the Board interprets the protester’s actions as an expression of his autonomy to disclose his own PII in the exercise of political rights. Respecting this autonomy entails allowing the individual to choose to accept risks to personal safety and security to express political criticism. The majority further notes Meta stating that the protester did not personally report the post under the Privacy Violations policy for disclosure of the PII. Although this, in and of itself, does not imply the individual’s consent to disclose PII, the other circumstances surrounding the protest event, with media outlets extensively covering it, indicate the individual’s awareness of the consequences of the public protest involving his passport.

For a majority, the unique facts of this case overcome the default presumption set by the Board’s [Sharing of Private Residential Information](#) policy advisory opinion, which called on Meta to be more privacy-protective by default. A majority of the Board finds that the enforcement of the Privacy Violations policy in this instance would undermine political expression and that Meta should, after developing the appropriate technical capabilities, carve out an exception for PII disclosures in such circumstances where an adult has a clear intent to disclose their own PII in the exercise of political dissent.



Although the newsworthiness allowance is available, it is used extremely rarely, and a majority finds that a policy-specific exception is warranted because such an exception would not be anchored on the public interest value of a post. Rather, it would be based on an individual’s voluntary decision to reveal PII as a way of expressing political dissent. Because the nature of the protest involved inviting press to the occasion, the resulting media coverage is itself a part of the protest, and a way for the protester to bring the message to a wide audience. The majority notes that concerns relating to user consent identified in the Sharing of Private Residential Information policy advisory opinion do not apply here, in light of the actions of the individual demonstrating knowledge and anticipation of the potential consequences of the public protest. Given this, the concerns articulated in the policy advisory opinion about the risks of presuming consent do not apply. The majority is cognizant of the fact that the case content was posted by a news outlet, and not by the individual. For the majority, a policy-specific exception can complement the newsworthiness allowance to more robustly address self-disclosure scenarios in the exercise of political speech.

For a minority of the Board, removing the case content would be necessary and proportionate, and content removal for privacy violations more broadly is a necessary and proportionate response. For the minority, a safety-based, privacy-protective approach to the Privacy Violations policy is warranted based on the reasoning in the [Sharing of Private Residential Information](#) policy advisory opinion, where the Board recommended that Meta should “strengthen the role of user consent.” The Board recommended in that opinion that, by default, users should not be presumed to consent to private information posted by others ([Sharing of Private Residential Information](#), recommendation 5). This is because once personal information is shared, it can lead to further harm that is difficult to remedy.

The minority notes that a privacy-protective approach is consistent with UN Human Rights Council guidance stating that the protection of the right to privacy is “not limited to private, secluded spaces, such as the home of a person, but extends to public spaces and information that is publicly available ... *The public sharing of information does not render its substance unprotected*” (emphasis added) ([A/HRC/39/29](#), para. 6). “The effect



of privacy breaches is difficult to undo and may result in ongoing consequences and further human rights implications. The ease of retaining, sharing, repurposing and fusing data and profiles influences the permanence of digital data, meaning an individual may face new and ongoing risks to their rights into the future” ([A/HRC/39/29](#), para. 56). This is especially the case here, given the Russian government’s history of transnational repression, including through private proxies, which magnifies the potential harms from disclosing the protestor’s PII.

The minority further notes that the passport was initially intended to be burned, which, if it had been successful, would have erased all PII and prevented it from being visible to the people present at the conference, including media outlets. The act of tearing up the passport was intended as a last resort, and it would be far-fetched to imply consent from this action. Similarly, the public nature of the protest cannot be equated to the individual’s consent for third parties to post his PII on social media, where such information can be potentially accessed indefinitely by all users, even if shared in the context of news reporting.

## **6. The Oversight Board’s Decision**

The Board upholds Meta's decision to leave up the content.

## **7. Recommendations**

### **A. Content Policy**

1. To more proactively enforce the Privacy Violations policy, and following Meta’s [recent announcement](#) on deploying advanced AI systems across its apps to enhance support and content enforcement, the company should extend the use of this technology to detect and enforce these types of privacy violations.



The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta discloses to the Board that it is in their roadmap for using this technology to enforce this category of privacy violations.

2. To improve transparency about how Meta enforces the newsworthiness allowance, Meta should revise the policy to clarify how the listed factors outlined in the current policy (e.g., country-specific circumstances, political speech) are weighted when deciding whether violating content may remain on the platform under this exception.

The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when the Transparency Center page on the newsworthiness allowance has been updated to reflect the recommendation.

3. To prevent the indiscriminate removal of political self-expression that reveals one's own PII and after developing the appropriate technical capabilities to implement the following rule change, Meta should carve out an exception to the Privacy Violations policy that prohibits posts from sharing PII, to allow the sharing of PII when self-posted by an adult user in the exercise of political speech, i.e., protest, awareness-raising and condemning contexts.

The Board will consider this recommendation implemented when Meta discloses to the Board that it has developed the appropriate technical capabilities to identify such self-posted PII in these contexts, and the Privacy Violations Community Standard has been updated to reflect the recommendation.

**\*Procedural Note:**

- The Oversight Board's decisions are made by panels of five Members and approved by a majority vote of the full Board. Board decisions do not necessarily represent the views of all Members.



- Under its [Charter](#), the Oversight Board may review appeals from users whose content Meta removed, appeals from users who reported content that Meta left up, and decisions that Meta refers to it (Charter Article 2, Section 1). The Board has binding authority to uphold or overturn Meta’s content decisions (Charter Article 3, Section 5; Charter Article 4). The Board may issue non-binding recommendations that Meta is required to respond to (Charter Article 3, Section 4; Article 4). Where Meta commits to act on recommendations, the Board monitors their implementation.