

DE MONETIZING REPEAT DISINFORMERS

Meta claims to demonetize disinformation.
**Our research shows it continues to enable
prime purveyors of it to monetize.**

CONTENTS

Executive summary	1
Meta’s Monetization Policies	2
The Study	3
The Methodology	4
Key Findings	5
<i>Onboarding</i>	5
<i>Demonetization</i>	6
<i>Reinstatement</i>	7
Limitations	8
Further Research	9
Recommendations	10
Meta’s Response	12
Annex: Question Addressed to Meta	13

WHAT TO FIX is an evidence-based tech policy and accountability nonprofit dedicated to realigning social media monetization incentives towards a more human-centered internet serving the public interest.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

We analyzed **290 Facebook pages** fact checked **10+ times** by one of Meta's Third-Party Fact-Checking partner between 2020 and 2025 and found that **Meta's existing mitigation measures fail to prevent repeat disinformation offenders from accessing monetization programs.**

We found:

- Accounts with **as many as 464 fact-checks invited by Meta to join** Facebook's *invite-only* Content Monetization program.
- Accounts able to rack **as many as 30 'false' ratings before their monetization contract was paused** by Meta.
- Monetization restrictions that were being applied **at the program-level** rather than at the account or actor-level.
- **84% of demonetized accounts regaining monetization. Over 50% in under a month; some in as little as 2 days.**
- Accounts being **reinstated for monetization despite 'false' rating(s) having not been formally lifted.**

META'S MONETIZATION POLICIES

Meta's monetization and misinformation policies prohibit the monetization of **content rated 'false' by a Meta Third-Party Fact-Checker**. They also foresee restrictions on **actors' and accounts' ability to monetize in cases of repeated violations**.

Meta's Content Monetization Policies

<https://www.facebook.com/business/help/1348682518563619>

“The following type of **content** are ineligible to monetize:
Content that has been rated false by a third-party fact checker.”

Meta's Partner Monetization Policies

<https://www.facebook.com/business/help/169845596919485>

“Monetized **creators, publishers** and third-party providers and those that have not been onboarded to a monetization product, may lose the ability to monetise if any entity (including financial accounts) connected to it has violated our policies.”

Enforcement of Fact-checker Ratings

<https://www.facebook.com/business/help/297022994952764>

“Meta takes action on [...] **accounts** that repeatedly share or publish content that is rated false or altered [...]. Penalties [...] could include the ability to monetize or advertise removed.”

[Read about Meta's content ratings →](#)

THE STUDY



This study was designed to **assess Meta’s enforcement of its policies regarding ‘Repeat Offenders’ of disinformation.**

Meta does not specify what thresholds it uses to apply repeat offender restrictions. For the purpose of this study, we focused our analysis on **Facebook accounts** that received **at least 10 ratings** from a Meta Third-Party Fact-Checking partner between 2020 and 2025.

We set out to answer three key questions:

Onboarding - How effective is Meta’s screening of repeat disinformation offenders during its business partner qualification reviews?

Demonetization - Is there a direct correlation between the number of ‘false’ ratings received and an account being subject to monetization restrictions?

Reinstatement - How easy is it for an account or actor to start monetizing again after being restricted?

[Read about Facebook’s monetization programs →](#)

THE METHODOLOGY



We partnered with Raskrinkavanje, an IFCN and EFCSN certified fact-checking organization that has been part of Meta's Third-Party Fact-Checking program since 2020 to conduct the analysis.

Account Sourcing - Raskrinkavanje isolated 290 sources from its fact-checked sources database, using the following criteria:

- Type = Facebook page
- At least 10 fact-checks between 2020 and 2025

Monetization Data - We used the WHAT TO FIX Meta Monetization Archive to access data on the monetization history of each of these 290 accounts.

Cross-referencing - Raskrinkavanje cross-referenced each account's monetization timeline against the timing of their 'false' ratings and whether they eventually lifted these ratings in response to 'disputes' or 'corrections'.

[Read Raskrinkavanje's detailed analysis →](#)

KEY FINDINGS

INADEQUATE BUSINESS PARTNER QUALIFICATION REVIEWS

- **51 of the 290** Facebook accounts fact-checked **at least 10 times** by Raskrinkavanje **(18%) have a history of being enrolled in at least one Facebook monetization program**, granting them access to financial payouts from Meta.
- **1 in 3** monetized accounts successfully registered for **more than one monetization program**.
- Raskrinkavanje's **most fact-checked source (464 fact checks / 424 uncorrected)** was among **9** repeat offenders (**median fact-checks: 71**) who were **invited by Meta to join** Facebook's new *invite-only* Content Monetization program.

KEY FINDINGS

INCONSISTENT DEMONETIZATIONS

- We found **no consistent correlation** between the number of ‘false’ ratings accumulated during a given monetization contract period and restrictions applied by Meta.
- Raskrinkavanje documented accounts racking **up to 30 ‘false’ ratings** over the course of a monetization contract.
- In a number of cases, Meta appears to have **restricted access to individual monetization programs** (e.g. Ads-on-Reels, In-stream Ads) rather than to all of its monetization services. This suggests that Meta may have allowed restricted actors to continue to monetize content on Facebook despite having accurately identified them as having violated its monetization policies on a repeated basis.

Note: Meta shifted to a consolidated ‘Content Monetization’ program in 2025. It’s unclear from our study whether current restrictions affect all content types as well as whether restrictions are consistently applied to all Facebook monetization services, including audience features (Facebook Subscription, Facebook Stars) and brand features (Affiliate Partnerships).

KEY FINDINGS

ROUTINE REINSTATEMENTS OF MONETIZATION

- **84%** of the demonetized accounts were **able to regain access to monetization** after being restricted.
- **Over 50%** of the restrictions were lifted **within a month**. In some cases, suspensions lasted **as little as 2 days**.
- Several accounts were reinstated despite their **'false' rating(s) having not been formally lifted** by Raskrinkavanje. This suggests that these accounts may have been able to earn again despite not having remediated their existing policy violations.

LIMITATIONS



Access to Data

Meta does not maintain information on the monetization history or the ratings received by the accounts it partners with. We relied on WHAT TO FIX's ongoing back up of Meta's partner-publisher disclosures to identify periods of active monetization and on Raskrinkavanje's own archiving of fact-checks and approved corrections to identify when accounts were subject to active ratings.

Data comprehensiveness

This study accounted exclusively for the 'false' flags and corrections assigned by Raskrinkavanje. It is possible that Meta had other Third-Party Fact-Checking partners assigning ratings to the studied sources, and that Meta may have removed some of the ratings itself, using expiration rules or other exemptions.


Possible Market Differences


This study builds on the ratings assigned by a Third-Party Fact-Checker based in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is possible that Meta's approach differs between markets.

Note: Some of the accounts fact-checked by Raskrinkavanje were based outside of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with at least 13 having been classified by Meta as having the majority of their admins based in Croatia, a EU member state.

FURTHER RESEARCH

Our findings raise **important questions about Meta's ability to fulfill its commitment to demonetize repeat disinformation offenders**. Further research would be particularly beneficial in the following jurisdictions:

 **European Union** - Meta is required by law to identify, assess and mitigate risks associated with its services under the Digital Services Act (DSA) in the EU. Meta is also a signatory of the EU Code of Conduct on Disinformation, which includes an explicit commitment to “demonetize disinformation” and “bar participation by actors who systematically post content or engage in behaviors which violate policies.” Our assessment of Meta's 2025 DSA Risk Assessment revealed substantial disclosure shortcomings.

 **United States** - Meta announced in January 2025 that it was ending its Third-Party Fact-Checking partnerships and replacing the program with a community note feature. According to Meta, community notes carry no penalties. In the absence of actionable disinformation signals from independent Third-Party Fact-Checkers, it is unclear how Meta is currently fulfilling its demonetization commitment as well as its brand-safety obligations towards advertisers in the US.

RECOMMENDATION

- **Strengthen business partner qualification reviews**

Meta should apply **risk-based onboarding controls**:

- evaluate an account's full monetization history (not just 'active' ratings);
- apply enhanced due diligence for high-risk accounts;
- document any exemption applied.

- **Make monetization enforcement predictable**

Meta should clarify and publish clear **enforcement standards**:

- adopt consistent thresholds for repeated offender status;
- use graduated ladder of restrictions (warning → suspension → longer suspension → permanent restriction);
- apply standardized criteria for reinstatement;
- communicate approach in transparency center and user notices.

- **Ensure comprehensive enforcement**

Meta should enforce **escalated restrictions at actor level** and actively **prevent circumvention**:

- enforce restrictions across all monetization services;
- propagate to other known accounts
- restrict all payout-accounts managed by restricted actor;
- prevent the onboarding of newly established accounts;
- prevent registration of new payout accounts.

● **Treat ‘corrections’ and ‘disputes’ differently**

Meta should review its existing **approach to ‘corrections’**:

- discount only successfully ‘disputed’ ratings;
- count all other ratings towards repeat offender status;
- apply reduced weight to ratings over time (vs. expiration);
- offer escalation pathways through independent dispute resolution mechanisms (including Oversight Board and other legally available out-of-court redress mechanisms).”

● **Guarantee minimum suspension periods**

Meta should ensure **minimum cool-off periods**

- assign progressive restriction length tied to the escalation ladder (e.g. 30/90/365days/permanent).

● **Require renewed application for reinstatement**

Meta should require all demonetized actors to **re-apply and go through human reviews** to regain access to monetization.

- limit automated reinstatement to successful disputes;
- require all ‘false’ rating(s) to be formally lifted (or expired) as a prerequisite for actors to submit a new application.

● **Ensure verifiability and auditability of practices**

- address all risks and mitigations in DSA risk assessment;
- disclose detailed approach to monetization governance and terms and policy enforcement in transparency center;
- maintain a publicly accessible monetization library;
- publish quarterly monetization enforcement reports, tracking restrictions, appeals, reinstatements, and recidivism rates;
- facilitate data access for auditors/regulators/researcher.

META'S RESPONSE



We provided Meta with an opportunity to comment on our findings and provide additional context on its existing practices (see Annex).

As of publication, we haven't heard back from Meta.

Annex : Questions addressed to Meta

We shared our executive summary along with the following list of questions with Meta on June 8, 2026. As of publication, we haven't heard back from Meta.

'Repeat Offender' status

- How does Meta define a 'repeat offender' for the purpose of its monetization enforcement?
- How do Meta's Third-Party Fact-Checking partners' ratings contribute towards that status?
- How does Meta decide which ratings to count and which to discount?
- What is the object being labelled (account, payout account, actor?) and what determines it?
- Is the determination automated, human-reviewed, or hybrid? Who owns policy and enforcement implementation?

Onboarding process

- How does Meta conduct its business partner qualification review? Please provide a list of the signals used?
- Does Meta apply enhanced due diligence procedures for high-risk applicants? If yes, what signals trigger EDD and what additional checks are performed?
- Are there override pathways that allow onboarding despite risk flags or uncorrected ratings? If so, who can approve an override? What is the governance and documentation process?

Demonetization process

- Does Meta follow a consistent escalation approach to apply monetization restrictions? If so, can you provide a table with the different steps. If not, how does Meta guarantee fairness and non-discrimination?
- How does Meta's monetization enforcement intersect with the existing strike system?
- Under what circumstances would Meta allow actors to continue to monetize through its other monetization services? using other known accounts? payout accounts? tax ID?
- When do you conduct network-level enforcement?

Reinstatement process

- Under what circumstances may an account be automatically reinstated for monetization?
- What is Meta's rationale for allowing demonetized accounts with uncorrected ratings to be reinstated? Does it require a documented exemption? If so, from whom? How is it documented?

Market specific approaches

- What controls were introduced for monetization integrity post-DSA commitments (if any)? Are these applied only in the EU or globally?
- How does Meta enforce its monetization policies and brand safety commitment in the US, where the company no longer receives inputs from independent Third-Party Fact-Checkers? Did Meta communicate about these specific changes to its users and advertising clients? How?

Transparency & Accountability

- What are Meta's existing KPIs and documented data points for monetization integrity?
- Will Meta discuss its monetization risk mitigation approach in its upcoming DSA risk assessment?
- Will Meta commit to integrating references to its monetization practices in its transparency center as well as quarterly reports (incl. policy enforcement, intellectual property, threat disruption, government restrictions)
- Will Meta commit to expanding its partner-publisher transparency to offer historical visibility, as it currently does through its ad library report for its partner-advertisers?

Get in Touch



hello@whattofix.tech

WHAT TO FIX is an evidence-based tech policy and accountability nonprofit dedicated to realigning monetization incentives towards a human-centered internet, serving the public interest (RSIN: 866872747)