

Appeals Centre Europe Transparency Report

April 2025 to March 2026

What is Appeals Centre Europe?

Who are we?

- Appeals Centre Europe is an independent out-of-court dispute settlement body certified under Article 21 of the EU's Digital Services Act (DSA). This allows people and organisations in the EU to challenge social media platforms' decisions.
- We currently cover **Facebook, Instagram, Pinterest, Threads, TikTok and YouTube**.
- During the period covered by this report (April 2025 – March 2026), we accepted disputes about:
 - **Content which has been removed** in the last six months.
 - **Pages or Groups which have been removed** in the last six months.
 - Potentially violating **content which has been left up**.
 - **Accounts which have been suspended** in the last six months.
- Since March 2026, we have also started accepting disputes about:
 - **Content or accounts which have been restricted** (such as adding a warning screen or demoting content) in the last six months.
- While the **content can be in most languages spoken in the EU**, people must fill in our forms in either Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Polish or Spanish.
- There are **certain policies which fall outside of our scope**, meaning we cannot accept disputes in these areas. These include: impersonation, hacked accounts, copyright and Child Sexual Abuse Material.
- We continue to **expand our services** and will **add new policies, platforms and languages** over time.

To challenge a decision by a social media platform submit a dispute on our website:
www.appealscentre.eu

What we do

Below, we set out what happens when someone sends us a dispute:

- 1. Submit dispute:** A social media user in the EU goes to www.appealscentre.eu. After creating an account, they complete a short form which provides us with all the details about their case. It is free-of-charge to submit a dispute.
- 2. Check eligibility:** We check whether the dispute falls within our scope (an 'eligible' case) or whether it's about an area we don't cover (an 'ineligible' case). If it's about an area we don't cover (such as illegal content, impersonation or hacked accounts) or we haven't received enough information from the user, we message the user to tell them we cannot proceed with their case.
- 3. Request content:** Next, we contact the relevant social media platform to request the content related to the dispute. This could be the content that they've removed, the potentially harmful content they've left up, the last piece of content which caused someone's account to be suspended, or other information pertinent to a dispute. If we do not receive the content within 30 days for disputes where a platform has left up potentially violating content, we may use the hyperlink provided by the user to review the content in question and make a decision. For all dispute types, if we do not receive the content within 30 days, we may make a 'default decision' in favour of the user.
- 4. Make decision:** Our expert team reviews the content and makes an independent decision on whether the platform's decision was consistent with its own policies, including any platform standards or exceptions applied to those policies with reference to human rights. Either we disagree with the platform (we 'overturn' their decision), or we agree with the platform (we 'uphold' their decision). We message the user and platform to let them know our decision. While our decisions are non-binding, and it is up to platforms whether to implement them, they must engage in good faith. We are pushing platforms to consistently inform the user and us on whether they have implemented our decisions.

To learn more about your rights under the DSA in our User Support Guide click [here](#).

Introduction

Eighteen months after accepting our first disputes, our second Transparency Report shows the clear and growing need for independent review of social media decisions.

During the 12 months covered by this report (April 2025 – March 2026),¹ we received more than 24,000 disputes from people and organisations across the EU. More than half of these were eligible disputes, meaning they fell within our certified scope and included sufficient information for us to process them.² We saw a clear increase in disputes, receiving nine times as many eligible cases in March 2026 than we did in April 2025.

Where we were able to review the content in question, on average we disagreed with the platform's decision 59% of the time. For both cases about content which was removed (where we overturned the platform's decision in 52% of cases) and cases about potentially harmful content that had been left up (where we overturned the platform's decision in 63% of cases), we decided in favour of the user more than half the time. This shows the importance of dispute settlement bodies in helping users challenge both platform decisions to remove their content and to leave harmful content on social media.



“Our decisions are starting to reveal patterns of prominent and recurring issues with how social media platforms moderate content.”

Our decisions are starting to reveal patterns of prominent and recurring issues with how social media platforms moderate content. For example, in 70% of cases where platforms left up content after it was reported as hate speech, we disagreed with the platform. This included cases of hateful content targeting Roma people, migrants, LGBTQI+ communities and religious minorities. In around two-thirds (65%) of cases where platforms removed content for violating their restricted goods and services policy, we also disagreed with their decision.

While our work is starting to help identify patterns that point to flawed implementation of the platforms' policies, several challenges still remain in making out-of-court dispute settlement more efficient and effective. Disappointingly, the share of cases where we are receiving content from platforms has plateaued. In the vast majority of cases related to account suspensions, platforms are unable or unwilling to provide the content which allows us to independently review their decisions.

¹ This period (April 2025 – March 2026) overlaps with the period covered by our [last Transparency Report](#) (November 2024 – August 2025), as we wanted to provide a full year of data in this report.

² For more information about the Appeals Centre's scope, please read our [Rules of Procedure](#).

This is currently leading to a large number of default decisions, where a platform does not provide the content for an eligible case and we make a procedural decision in the user's favour. Every week, we receive messages from frustrated users who feel, understandably, that this process has fallen short of their expectations. Platforms need to change this by sending us the content and ensuring that users in the EU can challenge account suspension decisions under the DSA.

Together with platforms, national regulators, the European Commission and – of course – users themselves, our goal is to ensure that dispute settlement works for people and organisations in the EU.



We removed your content



Your content goes against our
Community Standards

Executive Summary

From April 2025 – March 2026, Appeals Centre Europe:

- Received **24,000+ disputes** from people and organisations in the EU challenging decisions on social media platforms
- On average, that's one dispute every **22 minutes**

12,000+ of these disputes fell within our scope

By the end of March 2026, we had made **10,000+ decisions** on these eligible disputes:

- In the nearly **3,000 decisions** where **we were able to review the content** we **disagreed with the platform's decision 59% of the time**
- In **7,000+ decisions** (mainly where users challenged account suspensions), we did not receive the content from the platform and **made a default decision**

We **disagreed with the platforms' decisions** in:

- **75%** of cases where platforms **left up content** after it was reported for violating their rules on **violence and crime**
- **70%** of cases where platforms **left up content** after it was reported for violating their rules on **hate speech**
- **65%** of cases where platforms **removed content** for violating their rules on **restricted goods and services**

Top 5 countries for submitting eligible disputes
(absolute number):

1. France
2. Belgium
3. Italy
4. Spain
5. Germany

Top 5 countries for submitting eligible disputes
(per capita):

1. Belgium
2. Lithuania
3. Cyprus
4. Malta
5. Slovakia

Top 5 policy areas challenged to the Appeals Centre by
users and organisations:

1. Hate Speech and Hateful Behaviours
2. Account Suspensions and Restrictions
3. Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity
4. Misinformation
5. Fraud and Scams

From April 2025 – March 2026 we:

Received **nine times as many eligible disputes** in March 2026 than in April 2025.

Expanded to **Instagram, Threads, Pinterest** and **account suspensions**


Following our last Transparency Report, **YouTube** sent us the **first pieces of content to review**

Shared input with the European Board for Digital Services and European Commission for their **report on systemic risks**, setting out how disputes can identify and mitigate such risks

Expanded the languages users can fill out our submission forms in to include **Polish**, alongside Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish

Published a **User Support Guide** to help people understand their rights under the Digital Services Act

Disputes Received From April 2025 to March 2026




In the year from April 2025 to March 2026, we received more than 24,000 disputes from people and organisations across the EU who wanted to challenge a decision by a social media platform.³ Over half of these (12,400 disputes) were eligible for us to review.⁴

In May 2025, we started accepting disputes from users about Instagram, followed by disputes challenging account suspensions across all platforms. In the months that followed, we saw growth in total and valid disputes, receiving more than 2,000 total disputes each month from July 2025 onwards (excluding September). Strong engagement from user groups made March 2026 the highest month for eligible and total disputes, with more than 3,000 submissions.

³ Please note that some of the numbers in the graph of disputes received are different to the [Transparency Report we published in October 2025](#). As the case review process includes back-and-forth with the platforms, this can lead to cases being reclassified as eligible or ineligible over time.

⁴ Eligible cases are those that fall within our scope and contain sufficient information to process.


Eligible Disputes By Social Media Platform



Of the 12,400 eligible disputes we received from April 2025 to March 2026, most were about Facebook (nearly 5,200 disputes) and Instagram (nearly 5,000 disputes). More than 1,700 eligible disputes were about TikTok and nearly 500 about YouTube. Due to the low numbers of disputes about Threads and Pinterest, this data is not broken down further in this report.

In 44% of eligible disputes people or organisations wanted to restore their account. In 16% of eligible disputes, people or organisations wanted to restore their own content, while in a further 39% of eligible disputes they wanted the platform to remove policy-violating content. As only 1% of eligible disputes were from users who wanted to restore a Page or Group, this data is not broken down further in this report.

Breakdown of Appeals Centre Decisions



From April 2025 to March 2026, the Appeals Centre made more than 10,200 decisions on disputes submitted from individuals and organisations across the EU. The time required to resolve a dispute varies and can take between two weeks and three months, although, on average, it took us 65 days to issue these decisions.

For the nearly 3,000 decisions where we received and reviewed the content, we overturned the platform more than half (59%) the time. This shows that social media users should not automatically assume that the platform has got it right and that it is worth challenging the decision to the Appeals Centre for an independent review.

In the remaining cases, we had to make default decisions. This meant that, despite the dispute being eligible, the platform did not provide us with the content and we made a default (procedural) decision in the user's favour. In the vast majority of account suspension disputes, platforms failed to provide us with the content, causing considerable frustration among users. We explore reasons for this, and its consequences for the users who sent these disputes, in the account suspensions section.

We are still not receiving consistent data about whether platforms have implemented our decisions. However, we are pushing platforms to provide this, so users can understand the final outcome of their dispute.


The Platform Suspended My Account

Banning people from social media has a real impact: from restricting information and expression, severing ties with friends, losing precious memories, or cutting off a crucial source of income. So it was no surprise that when we gave people the option to challenge account suspensions in June 2025, it quickly became our biggest dispute type. As of March 2026, individual users have sent us more than 14,000 requests to review account suspensions.

More than 5,000 of these requests fell within our scope. The majority of these accounts had been banned for supposedly violating platforms' account policies, followed by supposed violations of the adult nudity and sexual activity, and fraud and scam policies.

However, despite receiving so many eligible disputes in this area, by the end of March 2026 we had received the relevant content from platforms and thus made decisions on fewer than 150 account suspension disputes. While we only overturned platforms' decisions in around a third (35%) of these cases, this dataset is smaller than other enforcement types. We explore the lack of platform co-operation which has caused this situation in greater detail below.

Account Suspension Decisions (By Platform)



Issues Around Sharing Content

When we receive an eligible account suspension dispute, we ask the platform for the last piece of content from that account which supposedly broke the rules. However, in the vast majority of cases, platforms are unable or unwilling provide this. In some cases, they say they cannot locate the content, despite the fact the user has provided us with all the information that we have agreed with platforms is necessary to identify the content.

In other cases, they do not provide the content but provide other information, such as the 'bio' of the user's profile (which is of little use). In some instances, platforms incorrectly claim that the repeated sharing of possibly violating content does not fall under the scope of Article 21 of the DSA.

For the user who submitted the dispute this means one thing: we cannot review the platform's decision. Our next step is to make a default decision in favour of the user and send it to them and the platform. Every week, we receive messages from frustrated users who feel, quite understandably, that this process has fallen short of their expectations.

A solution is currently being worked on under a best practices recommendations process. This involves platforms, out-of-court dispute settlement bodies, national regulators and the European Commission discussing standards which could help dispute settlement work better for everyone. However, in the meantime, platforms still have an obligation to provide the content in question. We urge platforms to provide content for every eligible case to allow users to access their right to independent review under the DSA.

“

“We urge platforms to provide content for every eligible case to allow users to access their right to independent review under the DSA.”

Case Study: Upholding TikTok's Decision to Suspend User's Account

In June 2025, a user in the Netherlands submitted a dispute challenging TikTok's decision to suspend their account for violating its rules on violence and crime.

TikTok shared the content that caused the account to be suspended, which praised throwing a brick into someone's apartment. After reviewing this content, we agreed with TikTok that it promoted or incited violence and therefore violated the platform's rules. We then sent our decision to the user and TikTok.

Case Study: Overturning TikTok's Decision to Suspend User's Account

In March 2025, a user from Romania submitted a dispute challenging TikTok's decision to suspend their account for violating its rules on hate speech and hateful behaviour.

In May 2025, we received the piece of content which caused the account to be suspended and found that it did not degrade an individual from a protected group. As such, we recommended that TikTok restore the content and remove the 'strike' against the user's account. We then sent our decision to TikTok and the user. TikTok subsequently informed us that they had implemented our decision.


The Platform Removed My Content

From crucial health information, to legitimate political speech, we've seen hundreds of examples so far where people across the EU have had their content removed unfairly.

From April 2025 to March 2026, we received around 2,000 eligible disputes from people whose content had been removed for violating platform policies. The top three policy areas where we received eligible disputes were adult nudity and sexual activity, hate speech and hateful behaviours, and restricted goods and services.


By the end of March 2026, we had made nearly 1,800 decisions about content which had been removed. In around two-thirds of these, the platform did not provide us with the content, leading to us making a default decision in favour of the user. In the nearly-600 remaining cases where the platform shared the content with us, we overturned the platform around half (52%) of the time.

Decisions Where the Platform Removed a User's Content (By Policy Area)



We were most likely to overturn a platform's decision to remove content under its restricted goods and services policy, which we did around two-thirds (65%) of the time. This was followed by dangerous organisations and individuals (61% overturn rate), violence and crime (60%) and fraud and scams (58%).

Decisions Where the Platform Removed a User's Content (By Platform)



For each platform, we overturned their decisions to remove users' content around half the time. For Facebook this figure was 55%, for TikTok it was 49% and for Instagram it was 47%.

Case Study: Non-Violating Photo Removed From Facebook

In December 2025, a photographer from Czechia who takes artistic, nude pictures submitted a dispute after their photo was removed from Facebook. While the image depicted a nude person, both nipples were blurred out in line with Meta's rules.

After reviewing the content, we overturned Meta's decision to remove the photo. We recommended restoring the photo and restricting access to users over 18 years of age in line with Meta's Adult Nudity and Sexual Activity policy. We sent our decision to Meta and the user in question. In March 2026, Meta implemented our decision and restored the photo to Facebook.

The Platform Left Up Potentially Harmful Content


Hate, harassment and other types of violating content have real-world consequences. The Appeals Centre has received many thousands of disputes about such content, including antisemitic, Islamophobic, misogynistic, racist, xenophobic, anti-Roma, homophobic and transphobic attacks on people and communities.

From April 2025 to March 2026, we received nearly 5,000 eligible disputes from organisations and individuals about potentially violating content that been left up on social media platforms. The top three policy areas where we received eligible disputes were hate speech and hateful behaviours, misinformation, and violence and crime.

Out of the nearly 5,000 eligible disputes we have received in this area, by the end of March 2026 we had made more than 3,200 decisions. In around 1,100 of these cases the platform did not provide us with the content, leading to us making a default decision in favour of the user. In the remaining 2,100-plus cases, we reviewed the content in question and made a decision. Of these, we overturned the platform nearly two-thirds (63%) of the time. This is the highest overturn rate of any dispute type.


While it is alarming that platforms are leaving up content that violates their policies so often, it is positive so many people and organisations have submitted disputes in this area and, in doing so, shown where platforms need to improve implementation of their policies. It is thus crucial that people and organisations can readily access and exercise their right to report violations of platform policies under Article 20 and 21 of the DSA.

Decisions Where the Platform Left Up Content (By Policy Area)




We were most likely to overturn a platform's decision to remove content under its fraud and scams policy, which we did 80% of the time. While this is based on a small sample of 45 cases (as we only expanded to fraud and scams in December 2025), we will be tracking whether this overturn rate remains high as we make more decisions in this area. For violence and crime, we overturned platforms' decisions 75% of the time, while we overturned decisions to leave up content reported as hate speech 70% of the time.

Decisions Where the Platform Left Up Content (By Platform)



For all platforms, we overturned their decisions to leave up potentially harmful content at least half the time, if not more frequently. Across all policy types, we overturned Instagram most in this area (71% of the time), followed by TikTok (63%), Facebook (55%) and YouTube (53%).

Decisions Where the Platform Left Up Content Reported As Hate Speech (By Platform)



Having made more than 1,400 decisions after reviewing content which was left up by platforms after being reported as hate speech, we have a significant data set in this area. To gain further insights, we have broken this down by platform.

Where we reviewed the content, we overturned each platform's decisions to leave up potential hate speech between half and four-fifths of the time. We were most likely to overturn decisions by TikTok (overturned 83% of the time), followed by Instagram (74%), Facebook (61%) and YouTube (58%).

Case Study: Manipulated News Story About Ukraine-Russia War

In March 2026, non-profit media development organisation [International Media Support \(IMS\)](#) submitted a dispute about a video on TikTok for violating its misinformation policy.

The video, which is visible in the EU, shows a newsreader talking about Russia launching missiles at Ukraine. The video has clearly been manipulated with AI. The voiceover has been added by the person who posted the content and the words have been artificially synchronised to the presenter's speech.

The artificial voiceover and editing meant that the video was using a trusted news source to mislead people on a matter of public importance. For this reason, we decided it violated TikTok's policy on AI-generated content and overturned the platform's decision to leave it up. We then sent our decision to IMS and TikTok. As of mid-April, the video remains online and TikTok has not implemented our decision.

IMS has observed a significant number of similar AI-generated videos being posted recently and believes this represents a broader pattern of AI-manipulated content related to the war between Russia and Ukraine.

Submissions From User Groups

User groups often face unique challenges when content is removed or harmful content is left up by social media platforms. So far, we have received thousands of disputes from such entities across the EU, including civil society organisations promoting media freedom and diversity.

These organisations are using their rights under the DSA to represent a collective interest and ensure that platforms apply their own rules correctly. In this section we set out how user groups are successfully using the DSA.

Civil Society Organisations: Identifying Systemic Risks

Many user groups have sent us large numbers of cases about potentially harmful content left up on social media platforms. As we make decisions on these cases it has become clear that, quite often, harmful content relating to a specific group or issue eludes the platform's moderation checks and remains online. In many cases the organisations are seeking the removal of specific instances of potentially violating content, as well as building data sets which they can use to identify systemic risks and advocate for change. It is important to note that we make decisions on individual disputes submitted and do not include general policy observations in our decisions.

In March 2026, the European Board for Digital Services and European Commission invited us to share input for the second edition of the DSA Article 35 report on systemic risks. In response, we shared case examples of disputes submitted by three civil society organisations focused on hate speech:

- [digiQ](#) – a Slovak civic association working on digital safety and risk prevention.
- ['NEVER AGAIN' Association](#) – a Polish civil society organisation that campaigns against racism, antisemitism and xenophobia, for peace, intercultural dialogue and human rights.
- [Media Diversity Institute Global \(MDI Global\)](#) – a Belgium-based international media development and literacy organisation that works to encourage accurate and nuanced reporting on race, religion, ethnicity, class, age, disability, gender and sexual identity issues in the media.

In the more than 1,000 disputes we received from these organisations where we reviewed content which was left up on Facebook, Instagram, TikTok or YouTube, we overturned the platform more than two-thirds (68%) of the time. The European Commission has encouraged us to publish our input to their report. With permission from the organisations themselves, below we include summaries of the disputes they submitted and the systemic risks they identified.

| Case Study: digiQ (Slovakia)

digiQ submitted disputes about social media content attacking groups including the Roma community, the LGBTQI+ community, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, and religious minorities, especially Muslim and Jewish people. These included content that incited people to commit violence, claimed that these groups are physically or mentally inferior or targeted them with slurs. The vast majority of these disputes contained hate speech in Slovak that had either escaped automated filtering by social media platforms or was not assessed by the platforms at all.

In the vast majority (84%) of the digiQ disputes where we reviewed the content, we decided that the content violated the platform's hate speech policy and overturned the platform.

| Case Study: 'NEVER AGAIN' Association (Poland)

'NEVER AGAIN' Association submitted disputes where harmful hate speech has been amplified by prominent politicians and public figures via social media causing a negative effect on public discourse in Poland.

These included hate speech, including praise of violence, against minorities, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, and victims of the Holocaust. The vast majority of these disputes were in Polish, with antisemitism being an overriding theme. Failure to remove hate speech, content promoting holocaust denial and dehumanising speech against minorities, migrants and refugees as disputed by 'NEVER AGAIN' Association, creates the risk of normalising hostility and violence.

In a clear majority (64%) of the 'NEVER AGAIN' Association disputes where we reviewed the content, we overturned the social media platform's decision.

Case Study: MDI Global (Belgium)

MDI Global has identified disputes where poorly calibrated content moderation systems allow ethnic tensions to gain traction within Balkan diaspora communities in the EU, serving to radicalise members of ethnic groups affected by the wars during the nineties. Much of the reported ethnic hate targeted migrants and refugees, stemming from intolerance towards racial minorities. This affects both migrants in the Western Balkans and the EU, and fuels racial and ethnic animosity within the Balkan diaspora. The disputes included hate speech targeting ethnic groups, women and LGBTQI+ groups with slurs, dehumanising comparisons, calls and hopes for harm and unfounded allegations of immorality and criminality.

In two-thirds (67%) of the MDI Global disputes where we reviewed the content, we overturned the social media platform's decision.

Despite having communicated more than 1,000 decisions on these cases to Facebook, Instagram, TikTok and YouTube, we are only aware of a handful of cases thus far where platforms have implemented our decision. For the rest they have either rejected our decisions or not responded at all. This means that, in the vast majority of these cases, the violating content remains online, causing continued harm to the affected people and communities.

DSA Article 35, paragraph 1, section g. lists implementing the decisions of out-of-court dispute settlement bodies, like the Appeals Centre, as a way of mitigating systemic risks. As such, we would strongly encourage platforms to implement these decisions and remove the violating content.

Future Areas of Co-operation

While we have received many cases from civil society organisations, we are also aware that entities in other areas, including sports, content creators, financial institutions and consumer bodies, are beginning to use the DSA and submit disputes. Below, we briefly outline a few of the examples we are aware of.

Sports Bodies

Every day, athletes, officials and supporters face hate and abuse online in clear violation of the various platform hate speech and bullying and harassment guidelines. So far, we have received hundreds of disputes challenging violating content which targets these groups. In addition to the immediate remedy of receiving a decision, several sports bodies have indicated that they intend to collect information related to successful disputes into objective datasets to assist in identifying systemic risks.



Case Study: Racist Abuse on Instagram Following Champions League Match

In March 2026, non-profit organisation Vigilia Tech submitted hundreds of disputes about racist content visible in the EU posted on Instagram during or after the Liverpool-Galatasaray Champions League match. Many of these were about comments comparing Black football players to monkeys. Dehumanising comparisons of this kind are forbidden under Meta's hateful conduct policy. In all 20 cases where we have reviewed the content so far, we overturned Meta's decision and recommended that they remove the content. However, several of these racist posts remain on Instagram.

Co-operation With United Against Online Abuse (UAOA)

Founded by FIA President Mohammed Ben Sulayem in 2023, United Against Online Abuse (UAOA) is the global coalition leading the fight against online abuse in sport. Supported by the FIA Foundation, UAOA has also received funding from the European Commission's ERASMUS programme to develop a pan-EU framework. This initiative is being piloted with FIA member clubs in Spain (Royal Spanish Automobile Federation), Slovenia (Autosport Federation of Slovenia), Czech Republic (Autoclub of the Czech Republic) and Sweden (Swedish Automobile Sports Federation). The goal is to help federations and clubs strengthen safeguarding and protect their personnel, community and sport from online abuse. Supporting the programme's capacity-building workstream, the Appeals Centre will receive disputes from FIA clubs, enabling UAOA to build a clearer picture of hate speech and abuse in motorsport and identify any systemic risks.

Financial Institutions and Consumer Bodies

Since we expanded to fraud and scams in December 2025, we have received increasing numbers of disputes in this area, ranging from misleading crypto, loan and investment offers, to 'solve your financial problems' and give-away deceptions.

In March 2026, we received more eligible disputes about fraud and scams than any other policy area. Since we started making decisions on fraud and scam cases in early 2026, we have made 45 decisions about potential scam content left up by platforms, overturning the platform's decision 80% of the time. This is the highest overturn rate of any policy area and indicates that platforms may be leaving up a significant amount of violating content in this area. We understand that a number of consumer bodies, anti-scam organisations and financial institutions are interested in using decision information collected as a result of dispute submission to the Appeals Centre to paint a clearer picture of social media scams to ultimately help them tackle this problem.



Content Creators

Influencers depend on content for their livelihood. However, every week creators' have their content demonetised or their account suspended. Dispute settlement bodies like the Appeals Centre offer content creators a free, independent way to challenge platform decisions and help protect their livelihoods.

Platform Co-operation

We regularly engage with the platforms we cover. Here, we take each in turn: Meta (Facebook, Instagram, Threads), Pinterest, TikTok and YouTube. For each, we highlight what we consider to be the most pressing issue that the platform needs to address. While we call out specific issues with individual platforms' signposting below, all platforms need to do more to tell their users in the EU about dispute settlement bodies.



Meta (Facebook, Instagram, Threads)



Despite receiving more than 4,600 eligible Facebook and Instagram account suspension disputes from people across the EU, we only received the content from Meta in fewer than 100 of these cases. This is causing significant frustration among users as we are unable to independently review their account suspension.



Pinterest

Between September 2025, when we expanded to Pinterest, and March 2025, we have only received eight eligible disputes. While Pinterest has fewer users than other platforms we cover, we have suggested to them how they could more clearly tell their users about dispute settlement bodies.



TikTok

In July 2025, the Network of Out-of-court Dispute Settlement Bodies (ODS Network - of which the Appeals Centre is a founding member) sent a letter to TikTok requesting improvements to its signposting, including ensuring this aligned with the European Accessibility Act. In August 2025, TikTok responded, saying that they anticipated making changes by the end of 2025. In December 2025, we followed up with TikTok about these changes, but have received no response.

YouTube



Since our last Transparency Report in October 2025, we finalised a data-sharing agreement with YouTube and received our first pieces of content from the platform. We are, however, concerned that YouTube still asserts that comments are outside the scope of the DSA.

What's Next?

In the last year, we have made good progress, receiving more than 24,000 disputes, adding new platforms and policy areas, receiving our first pieces of content from all social media platforms, and demonstrating the link between dispute settlement decisions and systemic risks. However, there is still a long way to go to create a fully-functioning dispute settlement system which works for people across the EU.

During the rest of 2026, and into 2027, we will be making several changes to improve our services, including:

- **Expanding to new platforms, policies and languages**
 - We want to bring the benefits of dispute settlement to as many people as possible. Following our recent expansions to policy areas like ads and new languages like Polish, we'll be expanding further to include more social media platforms.
- **Making faster and more detailed decisions**
 - We have recently taken steps to reduce turnaround times, meaning users should receive their decisions more quickly. We've also redrafted our decision templates to make them less technical and easier to understand. Finally, we'll be providing platforms, people and organisations with more information about why we made our decision.
- During 2026 a **best practices recommendations** process will be taking place. This involves platforms, out-of-court dispute settlement bodies, national regulators and the European Commission discussing standards to help dispute settlement work better for everyone.

- As part of the ODS Network, we will be pushing – on behalf of our current and future users – for some key improvements:
 - **Making sure platforms tell their users about dispute settlement bodies.** Despite clear obligations to tell their users about dispute settlement bodies in a clear, accessible and user-friendly way, platforms have not made progress in this area. We will continue to push platforms to include references to dispute settlement bodies in their internal appeals processes, statements of reasons and on a dedicated webpage.
 - **Increasing the number of cases where we receive content to review.** Currently, the number of default decisions, where the platform does not provide us with the content to review, is too high. This is particularly true for account suspension disputes, which matter a great deal to users.
 - **Getting information on whether platforms have implemented our decisions.** While the decisions of dispute settlement bodies are non-binding, platforms are required to engage in good faith. As part of this, we are asking platforms to help us support users by telling us whether they have implemented our decisions. We can then pass this information onto users.



I enjoyed this report! What can I do next?

Whether you're a membership body, a civil society organisation, or just someone who enjoys using social media - help us spread the word! Share this report, mention us on your website, include us in your newsletter or tell someone you know about us:

Contact communications@appealscentre.eu
to discuss how we can work together.

Create an account at www.appealscentre.eu
and submit a dispute!