



## Point of View's Submission

This submission is being made by [Point of View](#), a non-profit in India that builds digital gender justice. As part of our work and on media, we are seeing cases and anecdotes of AI-generated sexually explicit or suggestive images cropping up in India. Here are some examples from the Indian context, as well as our recommendations to address this issue.

1. In this case of a [homemaker from Northeast India](#), her ex-boyfriend used her image to create a fake identity of Babydoll Archi, a persona performing with sensual undertones. The survivor was completely unaware that her likeness was exploited at multiple stages from non-consensual use of her image, to repurposing it to depict her sensually, to financial gain. Along with multi-layered consent violation, her bodily autonomy was violated.
2. In a case that came to our digital security helpline, TechSakhi, a young woman complained that her male acquaintance had digitally altered her image onto nude bodies. These images were then used to threaten and pressure her to engage with him.
3. AI-generated sexual content is often used in connection with other forms of harm. In another case from TechSakhi, a community leader, found that someone had created a fake Facebook account where AI-generated videos of her with sexually explicit captions and audio, also generated by AI was being circulated. Over time, the perpetrator created five other Facebook profiles.
4. As part of Point of View's ongoing study on image-based abuse in India, a survivor with disability, shared that her ex-partner had digitally altered her image onto a body wearing lingerie and was circulating these images circulated on a Telegram group of hundreds of men<sup>1</sup>.

Cases like this do not easily fit Meta's categorisations. In this context, we recommend that:

1. Meta's Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity Community Standard be expanded to cover cases from contexts where 'sexual activity' is defined differently. For example, in India, where gender norms are tightly connected to policing of women's bodies, what is 'sexually explicit' or 'suggestive imagery' varies greatly; a seemingly simple AI-generated image of a woman taking a selfie with a boy with his arm around her can be construed

---

<sup>1</sup> Finding from Point of View's ongoing study on image-based abuse in India

as a sexual image. Young women from low-income communities have<sup>2</sup> reported such incidents.

2. The Community Standard should also be expanded to include threats. Many young women report being threatened with the sharing of their intimate images. In a context where ‘family honour’ can be weaponised, the intent is to demonstrate that they are “bad girls bring[ing] shame to their family” or reputational harm.
3. The Community Standard must define likeness as going beyond the face, genitals, nipples, or anus/buttocks. In ongoing research in India, we have found that images shared without consent – where the face is not visible - can have other identifiable information<sup>3</sup>. In one such case, while the face was not visible, there was a tattoo through which the survivor could be identified. In the context of AI-generated sexual imagery, it is even more important that the concept of ‘likeness’ be applied to the body of the person, not just the face. Using the likeness and not the actual image/video of a person, causes the same harm as other forms of TFGBV.
4. For effective design, Meta should include technical nudges for the user - to ensure that the image in AI-generated sexually explicit content, is being uploaded with consent.

---

<sup>2</sup> Shared by young women, girls and activists from the Safai Karamchaari Andolan, a movement aimed at eradicating manual scavenging from India, during Point of View’s capacity building workshop

<sup>3</sup> Case from a survivor interview as part of Point of View’s ongoing study on image-based abuse in India