

Anthropic

Acceptable Use Policy

Change ID · dc410e07-7a2e-4f3c-97a2-b37f64424aa2

SCREENING DATE	JURISDICTION	RISK SCREENING	SCORE TRACE
2026-10-23 11:40:53.773Z	Global	Medium · 4/10	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.

01Source Confidence

SANITIZED PUBLIC VIEW

PUBLICATION GATE	published
RETRIEVAL STATE	verified-retrieval
LATEST RETRIEVAL	2026-10-23 11:40:53.765Z
SANITIZED CHANNEL	direct
DATA STATUS	Available

PREVIOUS SNAPSHOT · V2

707935f726b40d3e3485dc68820b0efa4dee1dccaef23da182b68c3d7bd4ff75

2026-10-09 02:46:14.267Z

CURRENT SNAPSHOT · V3

38321f645518cb86a6d62debf46ff043dbc71eb37298d7619307e70145d90c

2026-10-23 11:40:53.765Z

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

02Explainability

SOURCE-ANCHORED TRACE

Anthropic's updated AUP structures rules into universal standards, high-risk mandates, and consumer guidelines, tightening compliance duties for businesses.

REASON 1

+1 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

New high-risk framework creates strict oversight for automated recommendations.

Related KPI: Automated decisions · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: "Certain uses of our products and services can impact an individual's health, legal rights, finances, livelihoods, or access to housing, education, or essential services."

REASON 2

+2 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Mandatory human review adds operational friction for enterprise AI workflows.

Related KPI: Consent mechanism · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: "A qualified person must meaningfully review a High-risk AI Recommendation, with the authority to change or modify it, before it is delivered as advice"

REASON 3

+1 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Explicit consumer AI disclosure requirements alter product interface obligations.

Related KPI: Algorithmic transparency · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: "All consumer-facing chatbots or AI agents that communicate directly with external users must disclose to users that they are interacting with AI"

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: Not Available · Algorithmic transparency: Published · Automated decisions: Transparent · AI bias and fairness: Committed 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: Published · AI bias and fairness: Committed · Independent audit: Mentioned · 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: Published · Automated decisions: Transparent · AI bias and fairness: Committed · Content moderation: Transparent 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: Explicit Opt-In · Algorithmic transparency: Published · AI bias and fairness: Committed · Independent audit: Mentioned 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 Acceptable Use Policy source still match the recorded public snapshot version 3?
- 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

8d56cdf64bb3dc971d024f65096d36ea5144f817c812ec51fa7e251eaff1f469

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.