PayPal
Privacy Statement

Change ID · 29a2723c-77af-4cd9-94d0-b7442275aa42

SCREENING DATE	JURISDICTION	RISK SCREENING	SCORE TRACE
2026-11-24 12:44:50.488Z	EU	High · 7/10	0, unchanged

This packet records PolicyWatcher evidence and AI-assisted screening for one public change. It is not legal advice, a compliance verdict, a certification, or proof that the external source remains unchanged.

01 Source Confidence

SANITIZED PUBLIC VIEW

PUBLICATION GATE	published
RETRIEVAL STATE	verified-retrieval
LATEST RETRIEVAL	2026-11-24 19:40:01.312Z
SANITIZED CHANNEL	direct
DATA STATUS	Available

PREVIOUS SNAPSHOT · V12

f39944eb31cc83ea4b2a9eead7b7f2a21a2e16645fe004159712e7689d0a9f82

2026-11-22 10:42:20.777Z

CURRENT SNAPSHOT · V13

8323bbee96911722b84e4bbaf21d6828ba0d8902511b66918a5cd0fca153b5dd

2026-11-24 12:44:50.467Z

Source confidence describes recorded retrieval and publication state. It does not rate the provider policy or certify source authenticity.

02 Explainability

SOURCE-ANCHORED TRACE

PayPal's Privacy Statement update is minor, only changing DPO and regulatory contact emails for Brazil, South Korea, and Nevada, with no impact on user data or rights.

REASON 1 — 0 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Extensive collection of personal and sensitive data, including biometric information.

Related KPI: Data collection · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: “Biometric data: Such as voice identification, photo identification, or face scans, which we may collect when you consent in the user experience to authenticate you for certain actions related to your account”

REASON 2 — 0 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Broad sharing of user data with numerous third parties for various business purposes.

Related KPI: Third-party sharing · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: “We disclose your Personal Information with service providers and third parties, including those participating in the payment network, to help us provide Services, protect our customers from risk and fraud, market our products, and comply wi”

REASON 3 — 0 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Automated decision-making processes can have significant effects on users, impacting service access.

Related KPI: Automated decisions · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: “Our Automated Decision Making technology may use profiling techniques to evaluate personal aspects about you, including to analyze or predict your economic situation, reliability and/or behavior.”

03 Governance Relevance

ADVISORY MAPPING

EU AI Act

MAPPED EVIDENCE

Official Journal text, 2024

Which recorded policy statements may be relevant to transparency, automated decisions, data use and human oversight review?

AI training opt-out: Opt-Out · Algorithmic transparency: Mentioned · Automated decisions: Partial · AI bias and fairness: Absent

Framework source

ISO/IEC 42001

MAPPED EVIDENCE

ISO/IEC 42001:2023 overview

Which recorded policy statements may inform an AI management-system review of transparency, risk oversight and independent assurance?

Algorithmic transparency: Mentioned · AI bias and fairness: Absent · Independent audit: Absent · Regulatory compliance: Comprehensive

Framework source

NIST AI RMF

MAPPED EVIDENCE

AI RMF 1.0; NIST revision in progress, checked 2026-07-29

Which recorded policy statements may support Govern, Map, Measure or Manage review questions?

Algorithmic transparency: Mentioned · Automated decisions: Partial · AI bias and fairness: Absent

Framework source

OECD AI Principles

MAPPED EVIDENCE

OECD AI Principles, updated 2024

Which recorded policy statements may be relevant to transparency, fairness, accountability and user agency review?

Consent mechanism: Opt-Out · Algorithmic transparency: Mentioned · AI bias and fairness: Absent · Independent audit: Absent

Framework source

Mappings identify review relevance between recorded PolicyWatcher KPI fields and framework topics. They are not legal interpretations, conformity assessments, certifications or compliance verdicts.

04 Report Output

HUMAN REVIEW

QUESTIONS BEFORE REUSE

01 Does the original Privacy Statement source still match the recorded public snapshot version 13?

02 Do the cited source passages support each displayed reason, KPI value and regional note?

03 Which advisory framework topics require specialist legal, risk or governance review for this use case?

04 Has a later public change superseded this packet before it is reused in a decision or publication?

RELATED RECORDS

Original public change

Confidence methodology

Provider policy source

PACKET CONTENT DIGEST · SHA-256

e733ae726a9f9607d02ca7d9174ee9e13d71b7d56a9ab105875590cf26e2c069

Score reasons and deltaScore values are stored AI-assisted screening outputs. Verified anchors confirm only that the quoted passage occurs in the named snapshot; they do not prove the interpretation.

This packet records PolicyWatcher evidence and AI-assisted screening for one public change. It is not legal advice, a compliance verdict, a certification, or proof that the external source remains unchanged.