

FakeHunter Fact-Checking Policy

I. How we select reports for fact checking

When deciding to fact-check a submission, we consider the following questions:

- Whether the content of the report relates or is in any way related to a fact that can be verifiable. We do not verify opinions and recognize that in the world of free speech and socio-political rhetoric socio-political rhetoric, one's own assessments, promises and predictions for the future are acceptable, that are not currently verifiable.
- Whether the information or assertion contained in the reported content appears misleading or gives rise to an assumption of factual inaccuracy.
- Whether the claim is valid and relevant to the public. We avoid "catching words" and dealing with obvious misstatements and slip-ups. We also do not review statements that relate to common and obvious knowledge (the sky is blue, the sun shines, etc.).
- Whether the information or factual assertion is widely shared, has a large Internet, or comes from places, websites, or online profiles with a high popularity and readership.
- Whether an average viewer hearing or reading this information or claim would have a problem with recognizing its accuracy, whether the publication misleads him or mislead or create uncertainty about the facts.
- We do not prioritize reports based on an arbitrary media hierarchy that divides them into more important and less important. We select information and claims for fact checking from sources, in addition to traditional, online media, these may also include posts and comments published on social media platforms. The selection criterion is substantive and is based on the content, importance, significance, and reach of the information.
- In the case of a report with regard to which manipulation is suspected, i.e. mixing In the case of submissions that are suspected of manipulation, i.e. mixing true and false information, juxtaposing incomparable data, etc., we In the case of a report that is suspected of manipulation, i.e. mixing true and false information, comparing incomparable data, etc., we assess the overall content and its aggregate value. If, on the basis of the gathered evidence and sources we demonstrate that the content of the report is summarily misleading, we evaluate it as false. If we are unable to assess this type of content unequivocally, we do not we give our verdict, marking the content as not verifiable by fact checking.
- When selecting content for fact checking, we do not use any preliminary assumptions and political criteria as to the source and author of information or statements.

II. Rules of conducting fact checks in our system

Items that we verify may take the form of text distributed on the web, posts and comments in social media, picture memes with or without text, videos, printed materials (scans-photographs of texts or their fragments placed in repositories, public disks, and on social media platforms).

We try to determine the source of the fact and information we verify. If it is not specified in the the reported publication, we try to find it nevertheless by means of a search, including social network

search engines, deep web archives, tools such as the Wayback Machine archives and by means of media monitoring. If we do not find confirmation of a fact contained in a reported publication through search We conduct research through searches on related topics, key terms associated with the original term, or statements contradicting a fact, claim or thesis contained in the reported publication.

If a multifaceted Internet search covering various types of related subject matter does not conclusively confirm or deny the fact being reviewed, we attempt to contact individuals and organizations that have the relevant knowledge or can directly verify the fact directly.

If the reported fact relates to general, scientific knowledge, we may undertake a search in Printed sources (e.g., articles from scientific journals, medical journals, and specialized trade press books, interview transcripts, statistical sources, reports and analytical studies) that have a

We try to use as much as possible of the sources that are related to the subject of the reviewed publication.

We try to use as much as possible information and data sources that are not politically (e.g. peer-reviewed journals, official statistical sources, databases).

If a verified fact is based on a source of a research-analytical nature, but with a known or not fully explained political affiliation, or is supported by the opinion of an expert with well-known political affiliations or sympathies, such sources should be treated with

Such sources should be treated with skepticism and taken into account only as a way to deepen knowledge about the topic, but not evidence verifying fact.

All published sources (both paper and digital) that we cite are grouped and listed in the "sources" module under the narrative section of each fact check report.

When an expert we contact does not have direct knowledge that would allow us to verify a fact unequivocally, we ask for hints as to sources where we can look further and deeper, or for suggestions as to other experts who are probably better versed in a given subject matter experts.

In cases where, as part of the verification process, we contact individuals, institutions or organizations by email or telephone for comment, this information is recorded in the list of sources, including identification of the person, position, role, academic title, and

similar information relevant to fact checking, and the exact time designation of obtaining the statement, position, or statement. Copies of documents and emails may be attached to sources only after editing to protect the privacy of the person making the statement or sending the document.

III. Fact checkers

Fact checking is conducted in two ways, "first line" and "second line." "First line" fact checking is a community of openly recruited fact checkers. The "second line" The "second line" of fact checking is the team of the Polish Press Agency, which undertakes verification activities when the verdicts The "second line" is the Polish Press Agency team, which takes verification action when the verdicts of community fact checkers contradict each other or fact checking is not undertaken by community, although in the opinion of the PAP team the submission is eligible.

Community fact checkers are recruited based on open criteria. They cannot be anonymous to the recruiting entity. The entity responsible for their personal data is Polish Press Agency.

The composition of the fact-checking team of the Polish Press Agency is given on the website fakehunter.pap.pl along with short professional bios of its members.

Both community fact checkers and members of the PAP fact checking team are subject to evaluation and verification of their work. The verdicts and factchecking reports prepared by them are subject to both internal and external evaluation.