Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 Digital Services Act

Transparency Report
for Instagram

27 October 2023

1. Introduction

Background

This Report is published by Meta Platforms Ireland Limited ('Meta') in relation to the Instagram Online Platform ('Instagram') in accordance with the transparency reporting requirements under Articles 15, 24, and 42 of the European Union's Digital Services Act (Regulation (EU) 2022/2065) ('DSA').

This Report is limited to Instagram, the Very Large Online Platform as designated by the European Commission under Article 33 DSA, and does not cover any other Meta provided services that are outside the scope of that designation. In some situations, due to process and/or product limitations, it was not possible to provide Instagram only data. Where applicable, this is noted in the relevant sections below.

The Report contains information for a reporting period from 25 April 2023 to 30 September 2023. Our next report will have a reporting period starting from 1 October 2023.

Overview of Instagram's approach to Content Moderation

This section provides an overview of Meta's approach to content moderation for Instagram. Sections 2 to 10 of this Report then set out further details of the information required under Articles 15, 24, and 42 DSA.

Meta builds technologies that help people connect, find communities, and grow businesses. Instagram helps users connect with friends, family, and communities of people who share their interests. In doing so, Meta is committed to giving people a voice and keeping them safe. Our approach to content moderation on Instagram is based on:

- **Policies & Tools:** We maintain a set of globally applicable Community Guidelines, Advertising Standards, and Commerce Policies that define what is and isn't allowed on Instagram. We collaborate with global experts in technology, public safety, and human rights in developing these policies. We also build and enhance features for safety, so people can, for example, report content and block, hide, or unfollow accounts.

- **Enforcement:** We remove, reduce, and inform users about content that goes against our policies when we become aware of it. We remove accounts that are used to egregiously or persistently violate our policies across any of our products, including those that compromise the security of other accounts and our services. Meta uses technology and human review teams to detect, review, and take action on millions of pieces of content every day on Instagram. Further details on Meta's proactive enforcement measures can be found in Section 4 of the Report. In addition, we offer options to report content as illegal for alleged violations of Member State or European Union (EU) law or as going against our policies, directly from the piece of content, and we review requests and orders by Member State authorities.

- **Transparency:** We continue to publish our policies and regular reports to give our community and external stakeholders visibility into how we enforce our policies.

More information on our approach to content moderation can be found in the Meta Transparency Center.

2. Orders received from Member States' Authorities

Information about orders received from Member States' authorities (Article 15(1)(a) DSA)

Meta may receive orders from Member States' authorities, including orders issued in accordance with Articles 9 and 10 DSA (collectively, 'Authority Orders'). Article 9 DSA refers to orders to act against illegal content appearing on Instagram, issued by relevant national judicial or administrative authorities, on the basis of the applicable Union law or national law in compliance with Union law. Article 10 DSA refers to orders to provide specific information about one or more specific individual recipients of the service, issued by the relevant national judicial or administrative authorities on the basis of the applicable Union law or national law in compliance with Union law.

In the event we receive orders from a Member State authority to act against specific items of alleged illegal content on our platform, first, we review the reported content in line with our Community Guidelines and other relevant policies, for example Advertising Standards. If we determine that the content goes against our policies, we remove it. If content does not go against our policies, in line with our commitments as a member of the Global Network Initiative and our Corporate Human Rights Policy, we conduct a review to confirm whether the order is valid. We may then restrict access to the content in the jurisdiction where it is alleged to be unlawful.

Similarly, we have a process to handle orders from a Member State authority that requests the disclosure of information about individual recipients of the service. As explained in more detail in our Transparency Center, Member States' authorities sometimes make requests for data about people

who use Instagram as part of official investigations. Meta scrutinises every Member State authority order we receive, regardless of which authority issues the order, to make sure it is legally valid. Meta requires authorities that send orders to comply with applicable laws and our policies. We only produce narrowly tailored user information in response to such orders, and only when we have a good faith belief that the response is required by law in that jurisdiction, affects users in that jurisdiction, and is consistent with internationally recognised standards. In certain scenarios, we may also require such Member State authorities to use the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty process.

In this section, we provide data on Article 10 orders. During the report period we have received no Article 9 orders. For the next report, we will include data around other types of removal orders from relevant authorities.

Table 15.1.a.(1) - Number of Authority Orders to provide information

The breakdown below refers to Member States' Authorities' Orders to provide information under Article 10 DSA, which may cover requests relating to the Instagram service as well as other Meta services.

Member State	Number of Authority Orders to provide information (Article 10 orders) addressed to Meta
Austria	0
Belgium	4
Bulgaria	0
Croatia	0
Cyprus	0
Czechia	0
Denmark	0
Estonia	0
Finland	0
France	5
Germany	604
Greece	0
Hungary	2

Ireland	12
Italy	2
Latvia	0
Lithuania	37
Luxembourg	0
Malta	0
Netherlands (the)	0
Poland	0
Portugal	0
Romania	0
Slovakia	0
Slovenia	0
Spain	0
Sweden	0
Total	**666**

Table 15.1.a.(2) - Number of Authority Orders to provide information by type of reported illegality

The breakdown below refers to Member States' Authorities' Orders to provide information under Article 10 DSA, which may cover requests relating to the Instagram service as well as other Meta services.

Type of reported illegality*	Number of Authority Orders to provide information (Article 10 orders) addressed to Meta
Bullying/Harassment	40
Child Safety	59
Defamation	30
Drugs Narcotics	16
Fake/Impersonation Account	18

Financial Fraud/Scam	95
Fugitive	10
Gang Activity	1
Hacked Account	29
Hate Speech	49
Homicide Murder	8
Human Smuggling	15
Human Trafficking	1
Missing/Kidnapped Person	3
Other	14
Physical Assault	25
Possibly Counterfeiting	2
Robbery/Theft	24
Sex Crime/Sexual Assault	17
Sexual Extortion	133
Terrorist Activity	45
Threats Of Violence	32
Total	**666**

Note: The above metrics in Table 15.1.a.(2) are categorised by the type of reported illegality under investigation or prosecution, which is self-selected by Member State Authorities at the time of submission via the DSA Article 11 Point of Contact. Meta does not take responsibility for any misleading, inaccurate, or incomplete reporting by the Member States' Authorities. Furthermore, the submission of Orders does not of itself reflect the existence of illegality.

Stat 15.1.a.(3) - Time to inform the authority of receipt of an Authority Order

Automated instant responses are sent to inform the authority of the receipt of Authority Orders to act against illegal content as well as Authority Orders for data requests.

Stat 15.1.a.(4) - Median time to give effect to the Authority Order

- Median time taken to give effect to the Member States' Authorities' Orders to provide information addressed to Meta[*]: **9.1 calendar days**.

3. Notices

> Information about notices submitted in accordance with Article 16 (Article 15(1)(b) DSA)

Instagram has in place notice mechanisms in accordance with Article 16 DSA allowing users, individuals, and entities to notify Instagram of information on the service that they allege to be illegal content. This mechanism is available directly from the piece of content and is easily accessible. It is also available from the Help Center. Once we receive such a notice, we follow the process for reviewing content as outlined in Section 2.

Trusted flaggers (as designated by the Digital Services Coordinator of the Member State in which the applicant is established) can file a notice within that notice mechanism in line with Article 22 DSA. Currently the Digital Services Coordinators have not designated such trusted flaggers. In order to appropriately prioritise these reports, Meta will onboard trusted flaggers to our existing reporting channel for specific partners once these have been identified and will publish the required data in line with Article 15(1)(b) DSA in our next report.

Table 15.1.b.(1) - Number of notices submitted in accordance with Article 16 DSA, by type of alleged illegal content and actions taken for Instagram

Type of alleged illegal content*	Number of notices submitted	Number of notices with content removal	Number of notices with restriction of access to content
Intellectual Property (IP)	231,334	74,336	0
Defamation	64,966	12,138	80
Privacy	7,626	1,305	4
Other illegal content	47,477	11,065	310

The number of notices submitted by trusted flaggers is 0 (as no trusted flaggers have yet been designated).

*Note: these actions are collected based on forms that rolled out over the course of the reporting period, including before Instagram's DSA compliance date, up to 30 September 2023.

Stat 15.1.b.(2) - Notices processed by using automated means for Instagram

All Article 16 DSA notices are processed using manual review. Instances of duplicate submissions are handled by applying the original manual decision, to avoid conflicting decisions.

Stat 15.1.b.(3) - Median time needed for taking action for Instagram

- Median time needed to take action on reported content after receiving Article 16 notices: **20.4** hours.

The time periods refer to the time between when the notice was submitted and the first action we took in response to the notice. In instances where there are multiple pieces of content reported, we calculate turnaround time as the time between when the notice was submitted and the first action we take. As an example, if a notice contained two pieces of content and we actioned one piece within 24 hours and the other within 7 days, 24 hours was used for the median calculation. Some decisions can require different time frames due to specific nuances. More complex decisions such as defamation or harassment may require more time or additional guidance from specialised staff.

4. Content Moderation Engaged in Meta's Own Initiative

> Information about the content moderation engaged in at Meta's own initiative, including the use of automated tools, the measures taken to provide training and assistance to persons in charge of content moderation, and restrictions of the service (Article 15(1)(c) DSA)

Instagram maintains a set of globally applicable Community Guidelines that define what is and isn't allowed on Instagram. In addition, we have Advertising Standards and Commerce Policies in place for advertising and commercial content, respectively. As part of our content moderation efforts, we employ a combination of human review and technology. This Section 4 of the Report focuses on the actions taken by Meta for Instagram on its own initiative.

Use of Automated Tools

Every day, we remove millions of violating pieces of content and accounts on Instagram. In most cases, this happens automatically, with technology to detect, restrict, and remove content and accounts that may go against our Community Guidelines, Advertising Standards, and Commerce Policies. In other cases, our technology selects content for human review. Our review teams review a blend of user reports and content surfaced by our technology. Our technology also supports the review teams by prioritising the most critical content to be reviewed, based on severity, virality, and likelihood of a violation. Our review systems use technology to prioritise high-severity content with the potential for offline harm (e.g., posts related to terrorism and suicide) and viral content that is

spreading quickly and has the potential to reach a large audience, in order to prevent as much harm as possible.

Our technology is trained to identify violations of our Community Guidelines, Advertising Standards, and Commerce Policies. There are three primary forms of technology used to detect possible policy violations. First, we employ rate limits (speed limits) on how rapidly accounts can perform multiple actions on our platforms, including making posts, to prevent the usage of bots. Next, we have matching technology that identifies identical or near identical copies of accounts, URLs, text, images, audio, and videos that we have previously identified as violating our policies. When we match the content exactly or we determine it is near identical, we will typically remove the content. Finally, we also use artificial intelligence (AI) to augment and scale our human review capacity with appropriate oversight: like with the matching technology, when confident enough that a post violates one of our Community Guidelines, the artificial intelligence will typically remove the content or demote it. We also use artificial intelligence to select the content for human review on the basis of severity, virality, and likelihood of a violation. As with matching technology, artificial intelligence operates on URLs, text, images, audio, and videos. Unlike technologies that can only match violations they've seen before, artificial intelligence has the potential to identify certain violations it has never seen before.

In the context of advertisements, when advertisers place an order, each ad is reviewed against our policies. Our Advertising Standards provide policy detail and guidance on the types of ad content we allow and the types of ad content we prohibit. Our Advertising Standards also provide guidance on advertiser behaviour that may result in advertising restrictions being placed on a business account or its assets (an ad account, Page, or user account). Our ad review system relies primarily on automated tools to check ads and business assets against our policies.

Persons in charge of content moderation

Human reviewers are provided with various tools and resources when undertaking content review. For example, human reviewers receive in-depth training and often specialise in certain policy areas and regions. Please see Section 7 below on human resources dedicated to content moderation, which includes details on the measures taken to provide training and assistance to persons in charge of content moderation. Reviewers may be able to use a highlighting tool for slurs and dangerous organisations based on the region where the content is reviewed and tooltips that explain the definitions of certain words and how they should be used to inform decisions.

Metrics

Our metrics in the below tables provide an overview of the number and type of measures taken that affect the availability, visibility, and accessibility of information provided by the recipients of the service and the recipients' ability to provide information through the service, and other related restrictions of the service, categorised by the type of violation of the terms and conditions, by the use of automation, and by the type of restriction applied.

Note: Due to technical limitations, the data provided in Section 4 includes content moderation outcomes for European Economic Area countries.

Table 15.1.c.(1) - Number of organic content measures for Instagram

Organic content policy violations	Removed volume	Removed automation volume
Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity	950,816	852,471
Bullying & Harassment	837,741	722,502
Child Endangerment - Child Nudity and Physical Abuse	47,154	14,077
Child Endangerment - Child Sexual Exploitation	60,364	16,886
Dangerous Organisation - Hate Orgs	46,338	23,433
Dangerous Organisation - Terrorism	26,038	21,571
Hate Speech	1,521,669	1,352,204
(Restricted Goods and Services) Drugs	49,478	44,405
(Restricted Goods and Services) Firearms	7,094	5,398
Suicide and Self-Injury	153,051	121,530
Violent and Graphic Content	10,184	8,020
Violence And Incitement	1,188,216	979,568
Total (including other violations)	**76,298,413**	**75,113,462**

Note: The above Table 15.1.c.(1) highlights the type of violations, the use of automation, and the type of restriction applied through Meta's content moderation systems between 25 April 2023 and 30 September 2023 on Instagram.

Table 15.1.c.(2) - Number of business entity measures for Facebook and Instagram combined

	Actioned volume
Advertising + Commerce Content Removed	16,071,184
Advertising + Commerce Accounts Restricted	2,714,843

Note: The data in Table 15.1.c.(2) above contains actions for Facebook and Instagram combined due to technical and product limitations.

Table 15.1.c.(3) - Number of user measures for Instagram

	Actioned volume
User Accounts removed	9,506,546

Note: The disabling of a user's account removes their ability to access all Instagram services. The Advertising and Commerce account restrictions in the previous Table 15.1.c.(2) only restrict access to those specific services.

5. Complaints received through Meta's Internal Complaint-Handling Systems

> Information about complaints received through the internal complaint-handling systems (Article 15(1)(d) DSA)

In the following, we refer to our internal complaints handling systems as "complaints" or "appeals".

As outlined above, any user can report content for going against our Community Guidelines using the in-app product feature. They also have the option to report content as illegal content in line with Article 16 DSA. We offer the possibility to appeal the decisions we take on reports about alleged illegal content or about content going against our Community Guidelines. If content is not found to go against local law or our Community Guidelines, the individual or entity that submitted the report can request a review of that decision.

If content is restricted on the basis of local law or actioned for going against our Community Guidelines, Advertising Standards, Commerce Policies, or Instagram's Terms of Use, the affected user responsible for that piece of content can request a review of that decision. If a user's content distribution has been reduced in feed, the user will generally be able to request another review. Any affected user whose account is restricted on the basis of local law or actioned for going against our Community Guidelines, Advertising Standards, Commerce Policies, or Instagram's Terms of Use can also request a review of that decision.

We inform the parties that we have received their appeal and follow up accordingly.

After that, if our original decision is not overturned or reversed, there may still be an opportunity for the user to appeal to the Oversight Board. As out-of-court dispute settlement bodies become established under Article 21 DSA, we will also take steps to engage in this process.

We set out below our metrics on the number of complaints received through our internal complaints-handling systems described above, the basis for those complaints, decisions taken with respect to those complaints, the median time needed by us for taking those decisions, and the number of instances where those decisions were reversed.

Note: Due to technical limitations, the data provided in Section 5 includes content moderation outcomes for European Economic Area countries.

Table 15.1.d.(1) - Number of organic content complaints and resulting restored content for Instagram

Organic content policy violations	Total complaints volume	Total restored content after complaint
Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity	83,839	24,405
Bullying & Harassment	108,423	21,243
Child Endangerment - Child Nudity and Physical Abuse	5,045	814
Child Endangerment - Child Sexual Exploitation	3,397	1,527
Dangerous Organisation - Hate Orgs	7,247	1,602
Dangerous Organisation - Terrorism	4,440	1,158
Hate Speech	146,602	18,830
(Restricted Goods and Services) Drugs	3,713	1,058
(Restricted Goods and Services) Firearms	972	446
Suicide and Self-Injury	11,457	2,472
Violent and Graphic Content	1,411	559

Violence And Incitement	128,919	17,209
Total (including other violations)	**610,775**	**117,571**

Table 15.1.d.(2) – Number of additional complaints and restores by entity for Facebook and Instagram combined

	Total complaint volume	Total restored content after complaint
Advertising and Commerce Content Removed	1,190,353	654,222
Advertising and Commerce Accounts Restricted	193,963	96,571

Note:
1. The volumes provided in Table 15.1.d.(2) above describe the corresponding entity appealing our decision to either prevent them from advertising or creating/managing a shop on Instagram. The entity retains access to all other Instagram services regardless of the outcome of the appeal.
2. The data in Table 15.1.d.(2) above contains complaints and restores for Facebook and Instagram combined due to technical and product limitations.

Table 15.1.d(2), continued – Number of additional complaints and restores by entity for Instagram

	Total complaints volume	Total restored entities after complaint
User accounts disabled	3,260,171	1,464,396

Note: The disabling of a user's account removes their ability to access all Instagram services.

Table 15.1.d(3) – Number of organic content complaints from reporters and resulting deleted content for Instagram

	Appealed by reporter volume	Removed after reporter appeal volume

Organic Content	204,126	16,893

Reporter Complaint

When an individual reports a piece of content (e.g., a photo, comment, post) to us, we'll take action to restrict access to the content or remove the content from Instagram if we find that it goes against our Community Guidelines or other applicable policies. Where we've reviewed the content, we'll let the individual or entity know whether it did or did not go against our policies.

If the individual or entity reports content but we find that the content does not go against our Community Guidelines or other applicable policies, we will let the individual or entity know. At that time, if the individual or entity disagrees with our decision to leave the content up, we offer the individual or entity the opportunity to request another review.

Table 15.1.d.(4) – Other complaints on legal basis (Intellectual Property, Defamation, Privacy, and other illegal content) for Instagram

	Total complaints volume	Total restored content after complaint
Actor appeal	26,690	2,763

	Total complaints volume	Total removed content after complaint
Reporter appeal	894	74

Stat 15.1.d.(5) – Median time needed for decision or action on complaints for Facebook and Instagram combined

- The median time taken for decisions on all complaints from content creators or account/entity owners on Facebook and Instagram to be made or overturned is **28.1** hours.

- The median time taken for entities to be actioned after receiving reporter appeals on Facebook and Instagram is **0.2 hours.**

6. Automated Means for Content Moderation

> Any use made of automated means for the purpose of content moderation (Article 15(1)(e), Article 42(2)(c) DSA)

Use of automated means for the purpose of own initiative and other content moderation, and purpose of those tools

As described in Section 4, we use technology to help us proactively detect content on our services that might be harmful and violate our Community Guidelines, so we can remove it faster. We described in Section 4 our primary content moderation automated tools.

These technologies run on accounts, posts, comments, photos, and other pieces of content uploaded to Instagram. They determine how probable or likely it is that this content violates a certain policy, based on those signals or patterns, and if the content should be automatically removed.

Indicators of accuracy, error rates, safeguards

Our technology learns and improves from each human decision. Over time – after learning from thousands of human decisions – the technology gets better. When reviewing violating content, review teams manually label the policy guiding their decision, which means that they mark or "label" the relevant policy that the content, account, or behaviour violates. This labelling of data helps us improve the quality of our algorithms that proactively detect and remove harmful content, accounts, and behaviour.

To ensure and improve the quality, i.e., how accurate the technologies mentioned above are in enforcing Community Guidelines and other policy violations, there are ongoing quality evaluation processes in place. Meta uses overlapping techniques and systems for maintaining a high overall accuracy for our automated content moderation.

Prior to fully launching any new rate limit (speed limit), matching technology or artificial intelligence (AI), we use the technology to only log how the technology would have behaved instead of immediately acting. We then use human reviewers to assess the accuracy against current content, behaviour, or accounts, rather than just historical ones, as we did during the technology's training. After launching rate limits, matching technologies, or artificial intelligence, we monitor the volumes of

actions and appeals by the user who posted the content as well as the rate at which appeals are granted. If any of the metrics we monitor are abnormal, our engineering teams may investigate.

For each primary form of automation technology, the investigation of abnormal metrics can vary. With rate limits, engineers typically reevaluate if the limit is preventing bot behaviour. For our matching technologies, if an entry in our list of previously identified instances of policy violations has abnormal signals, we will re-review the entry to confirm it continues to go against our policies. Similarly, if one of our artificial intelligence tools has abnormal signals, we will either send a sample of the artificial intelligence tool's recent results to human labelling to confirm the accuracy rate or deprecate the artificial intelligence tool if abnormal signals indicate a clear breakage.

In addition, many of our machine learning classifiers are automatically reassessed for accuracy after each human review. This classifier reassessment is an example of the general feedback loop between human review and technology. The content labelling decisions taken by human reviewers are used to train and refine our technology. As a part of this process, the review teams manually label the policy guiding their decision, i.e., they mark the policy that the content, account, or behaviour violates. This helps to improve the quality of our artificial intelligence algorithms and our lists of known policy-violating content used by our matching technology. To maintain quality control in all of these decisions, we regularly audit random samples of decisions taken by the algorithm and our content reviewers and measure them against our expectations for policy enforcement. In the context of automation relating to language, some automation is developed to support specific languages whilst others are language agnostic.

7. Human Resources dedicated to content moderation

The human resources that Meta dedicates to content moderation in respect of the service offered in the Union, their qualifications and linguistic expertise and training and support given to such staff (Article 42(2)(a) and (b) DSA)

Meta uses human resources dedicated to content moderation, including for compliance with the obligations set out in Articles 16 and 22 DSA, as well as for compliance with the obligations set out in Article 20 DSA.

Qualifications And Training

Human reviewers come from different backgrounds, reflect our diverse community, and include experts in enforcement in policy areas such as child safety, hate speech, and counterterrorism. Human reviewers undergo extensive training when they join and are regularly trained and tested beyond this initial training, with specific examples, such as on how to uphold the Community Guidelines

and take the correct action on a report. We also do our own proactive audits, where we conduct re-reviews that help us figure out if we are getting it right.

Human reviewers who review content alleged to be illegal receive distinct training based on the nature of their respective work. Every member receives several weeks of training focused heavily on operational proficiency and in preparation for processing such content. For example, the reviewers who review content for defamation receive training specifically on assessing defamation, including background material on the law.

Support

We recognise that reviewing content can be challenging work. Keeping people safe online sometimes means review teams have to look at content that may be objectionable or graphic. We respect the difficulty of this work and work with industry leading vendors to ensure reviewers have access to the resources they need to do their job and support their health. There is a robust and diverse program to support human reviewers. Our vendor contracts mandate high quality support in a variety of areas, including pay, benefits, work environment, and wellbeing and psychological support. The assistance model depends on what type of content reviewers work on. Such assistance, for example, can take the form of psychological support, including individual and group sessions, and a 24/7 independent support program which includes a range of offerings that include clinical services.

Volume of human resources dedicated to content moderation and linguistic capabilities

The team working on safety and security is made up of around 40,000 people. About 15,000 of those are content reviewers; they include a mixture of full-time employees, contractors, and outsourced support. We partner with companies to help with content review, which allows us to scale globally with coverage across time zones, languages, and markets.

For content that requires specific language review in the EU, there are dedicated teams of reviewers that perform content moderation activities specifically for that content. This includes the 24 official languages of the EU as well as commonly spoken languages across the EU. For EU languages that are widely spoken outside the EU, like Portuguese and Spanish, we have content moderation teams that provide global coverage. Our global scale allows us to quickly redeploy capacity if there is a surge in demand in a specific country, in times of crisis, or when unpredictable events occur. When these instances transpire, we are able to adapt our resources appropriately. This means that we are also able to rely temporarily on our teams that provide global coverage to mitigate EU risks.

This content review team is global and reviews content 24/7 in over 70 languages. The team includes reviewers with language expertise to enforce our policies in cases where certain words or content require additional contextual understanding. Not all content requires language expertise; for example, nudity and sexual activity is language agnostic. For this type of content, Meta has a global pool of content moderators who review these types of reports. Currently there are just under 2,000 language agnostic reviewers globally. These reviewers also review EU content that falls under this language agnostic category. Content in this category generally does not contain language.

Table 42.2.(a) EU Content Moderators Broken Down by Official EU Language

EU Language	Number of Reviewers
Bulgarian	20
Croatian	19
Czech	19
Danish	17
Dutch	54
English*	109
Estonian	3
Finnish	15
French*	226
German	242
Greek	22
Hungarian	24
Irish	42
Italian	179
Latvian	2
Lithuanian	6
Maltese	1
Polish	65
Portuguese*	58

Romanian	35
Slovak	11
Slovenian	9
Spanish*	163
Swedish	21

Note:
1. These numbers apply to Facebook and Instagram. The numbers are reflective of reviewers, as outlined above, who work on EU-specific content across EU official languages. This includes a mixture of full-time employees, contractors and outsourced support.
2. For EU content that is in a language other than the 24 official languages of the EU, there are additional language-based content reviewers.
3. *For languages that are widely spoken outside of the EU, there are additional content reviewers that review reports from non-EU countries in these languages.

8. Out-of-court dispute settlement submissions

Information about disputes submitted to the out-of-court dispute settlement bodies referred to in Article 21 (Article 24(1)(a) DSA)

We inform users, individuals, and entities that if they do not agree with relevant enforcement decisions, they may have the right to challenge the decision in a relevant court and that they may also be able to refer the decision to a certified dispute settlement body. At the cut-off date of this Report, there are no accredited out-of-court settlement bodies pursuant to Article 21 DSA, which is why we have no data to share.

9. Measures and protection against misuse

The number of suspensions imposed pursuant to Article 23 (Article 24(1)(b) DSA)

If users post content that goes against Community Guidelines, we remove it and may then apply a strike to their Instagram account. Whether we apply a strike depends on the severity of the content, the context in which it was shared, and when it was posted. More information can be found in the Meta Transparency Center. When users persistently or severely breach our policies, we may suspend or disable their account. More information can be found in the Meta Transparency Center. We have also developed a Misuse Policy in line with Article 23 DSA for users who frequently upload manifestly illegal content.

We may suspend, for a limited period of time, users who, after being warned, repeatedly post manifestly illegal content. This does not preclude us from terminating their use of the service as set out in the "Content removal and disabling or terminating your account" section of the Instagram Terms of Use.

We may suspend the processing of notices and complaints submitted through our notice and complaints mechanisms, for a limited period of time, where individuals and entities have, after being warned, frequently submitted notices and complaints that are abusive. We do not have any volumes to report for this reporting period relating to manifestly unfounded notices or manifestly unfounded complaints.

We set out below the number of suspensions imposed pursuant to Article 23 DSA for the provision of manifestly illegal content.

Table 24.1.b - Number of suspensions by basis for Instagram

Suspension basis	Number of suspensions
Provision of manifestly illegal content	748

Note: The data provided is currently representative of the number of suspensions enacted for the provision of manifestly illegal content.

10. Average Monthly Active Users for each Member State

> Information about the average monthly active recipients of the service for each Member State (Article 42(3) DSA).

Every 6 months, Meta publishes information on the average monthly active users on Instagram in the EU, as required by Article 24(2) DSA. Meta has published such information in February and August 2023.

Meta is also required under Article 42(3) to publish a breakdown of the average monthly users for each Member State in this Report, which we include below. The breakdown per Member State for Instagram below is calculated as an average over a 6-month period, ending September 30 (i.e., 1 April 2023 - 30 September 2023), rounded to zero decimal points and then approximated. For this period, there were a total of approximately 259 million average monthly active users on Instagram in the EU.

For Instagram, we define a monthly active user as a registered and logged-in Instagram account who visited Instagram through our website or a mobile device in the last 30 days as of the date of measurement.

Table 42.3 - Average Monthly Active Users for each Member State

Member State	Average Monthly Active Users
Austria	4.7M
Belgium	7M
Bulgaria	2.7M
Croatia	2.1M
Cyprus	1.3M
Czechia	5.5M
Denmark	3.8M
Estonia	Less than 1 million
Finland	3.4M
France	39.7M
Germany	42.5M
Greece	6.1M
Hungary	4M
Ireland	3.4M
Italy	39M
Latvia	Less than 1 million
Lithuania	1.3M
Luxembourg	Less than 1 million
Malta	Less than 1 million
Netherlands (the)	11.4M
Poland	16.8M
Portugal	8.2M
Romania	7.8M
Slovakia	2.3M
Slovenia	Less than 1 million
Spain	34.3M
Sweden	8M

Note:

1. This information on the use of Instagram in the EU has been prepared for Articles 24(2) and 42(3) DSA. This information may differ from user metrics reported in other contexts in certain key respects, including, for example, periodic reports filed with other regulatory authorities, and should not be used for other purposes.

2. Where applicable, the Member State breakdown above includes any monthly active user metrics available for outermost regions or other territories associated with such Member States.

3. There are inherent challenges in measuring usage of our services across large online and mobile populations across the world. Many people in our community have user accounts on more than one of our services, and some people have multiple user accounts within an individual service. The above monthly active user estimates by online platform do not represent estimates of the number of unique people using these services.

---

from

Meta