Anthropic

Acceptable Use Policy

Change ID · f79b51da-5300-447d-adfc-4a7e0a2ee2f9

SCREENING DATE	JURISDICTION	RISK SCREENING	SCORE TRACE
2026-11-09 20:40:07.227Z	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.

01 Source Confidence

SANITIZED PUBLIC VIEW

PUBLICATION GATE	published
RETRIEVAL STATE	verified-retrieval
LATEST RETRIEVAL	2026-11-09 20:40:07.213Z
SANITIZED CHANNEL	direct
DATA STATUS	Available

PREVIOUS SNAPSHOT · V3

38321f645518cb86a6d62debf46ff043dbcbc71eb37298d7619307e70145d90c

2026-10-23 11:40:53.765Z

CURRENT SNAPSHOT · V4

c2948cc1bc558ada3ca5192b7e3dd5e2ed318214ecfe7b50614197e3556d5a8e

2026-11-09 20:40:07.213Z

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

02 Explainability

SOURCE-ANCHORED TRACE

Anthropic's Acceptable Use Policy has no significant changes, maintaining its strong stance against harmful AI uses and requiring human oversight for high-risk applications.

REASON 1 — +2 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Extensive prohibitions on harmful AI use reduce overall risk.

Related KPI: Regulatory compliance · Snapshot side: old

Verified exact source passage: “Our Universal Usage Standards are prohibitions that apply to all users and use cases.”

REASON 2 — +2 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Mandatory human-in-the-loop for high-risk AI recommendations enhances safety.

Related KPI: Automated decisions · Snapshot side: old

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 to an individual who might rely on it or before it is used to implement a decision.”

REASON 3 — -1 SCORE CONTRIBUTION

Lack of explicit user opt-out for input data training raises privacy concerns.

Related KPI: AI training opt-out · Snapshot side: Not recorded

Source passage not recorded. An unverified candidate passage is never displayed.

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

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 4?

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

02bb519abecca9ce8b532615ce08b33e248fad127f7d692ea68399e51b623bbc

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.