Anthropic

Acceptable Use Policy

Change ID · f3173b06-e116-4be0-bda3-272c3a919124

SCREENING DATE	JURISDICTION	RISK SCREENING	SCORE TRACE
2026-10-09 02:46:14.270Z	Global	Medium · 4/10	Baseline

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	2026-11-23 10:38:28.547Z
SANITIZED CHANNEL	direct
DATA STATUS	Available

PREVIOUS SNAPSHOT · V1

cccacc3e6ffc5d09c81742d8c1c67fff20cb861c038ec7c0faad45121f74169c

2026-07-06 07:20:09.948Z

CURRENT SNAPSHOT · V2

707935f726b40d3e3485dc68820b0efa4dee1dccaef23da182b68c3d7bd4ff75

2026-10-09 02:46:14.267Z

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

02 Explainability

SOURCE-ANCHORED TRACE

The updated policy significantly tightens rules against harmful AI uses, adding protections against manipulation, NCII, and clarifying security research.

REASON 1 — -1.5 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

New section combats AI-driven deceptive campaigns and information manipulation.

Related KPI: Content moderation · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: “Do Not Engage in Deceptive Campaigns or Artificial Activity”

REASON 2 — -1 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Expanded prohibitions on surveillance, criminal justice, and NCII enhance user safety.

Related KPI: Data collection · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: “Create, distribute, threaten to share, promote, or facilitate the creation of non-consensual intimate imagery (“NCII”), including AI-generated material or tools designed to produce it”

REASON 3 — -0.5 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Clarified security research allowances and verification programs balance safety and innovation.

Related KPI: Regulatory compliance · Snapshot side: new

Verified exact source passage: “This section does not prohibit security research, testing, or tool development conducted on systems you own or operate, with the authorization of the system owner, or within the scope of an authorized bug bounty program or vulnerability dis”

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: Opaque · Automated decisions: Opaque · AI bias and fairness: Mentioned

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: Opaque · AI bias and fairness: Mentioned · 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: Opaque · Automated decisions: Opaque · AI bias and fairness: Mentioned · Content moderation: Partial

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: Implicit · Algorithmic transparency: Opaque · AI bias and fairness: Mentioned · 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 Acceptable Use Policy source still match the recorded public snapshot version 2?

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

0fa84140ed6836cd1c8ac7f300b724ce46a2c6ee4ddd5f0a276b70f4ec33b39e

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.