

Answers to questions sent by Mr. A. Hunko

1. What other research projects from the European Union or its Member States, in particular from Poland, are directly or indirectly integrated into the overall INDECT programme or have provided findings for the project?

INDECT is a separate project, not a 'programme' – no other projects are 'integrated' in INDECT.

2. Does cooperation or an exchange of information take place between INDECT and the EU projects SUBITO and ADABTS and, if so, what form does this cooperation take?

INDECT was invited to participate to Technology Workshops organised by SUBITO project (Grant Agreement Number 218004) in Genova.

3. What is the relationship between the Polish research project INSIGMA (Intelligent Information System for Detection and Recognition) at Krakow university and INDECT?

INSIGMA is a national research project with different scope than INDECT. INSIGMA is a standalone project supervised by the Polish State Ministry of Science and Higher Education. AGH participates to INSIGMA and a number of other research projects.

4. What “new, advanced and innovative algorithms and methods aimed at combating terrorism and other criminal activities affecting the security of European citizens”, as they were described by the Commission, are to be developed within INDECT?

The innovative algorithms introduced by INDECT include:

- ***A new approach to watermarking technology, using special transforms based on fast algorithms of the family of Piecewise Linear Transforms (PLT), especially the PHL, PWL Transforms.***
- ***Development of new type of search engine combining direct search of image and video based on watermark contents.***
- ***A new set of Query by Example (QbE) techniques used for searching that allow for bridging the semantic gap.***
- ***Implementation of a set of new methods used for a comprehensive analysis of sound, image and alphanumeric data.***
- ***Extraction of distinctive features of sound and visual images for recognition and automatic understanding of situations related to threats.***
- ***Effective access to information on demand, supported by technologies supplying appropriate spatial information.***
- ***CCTV video quality with fully integrated Human Visual System (HVS) based quality assurance that allows for a controlled degradation of Quality of Experience (QoE).***
- ***Recording of crime or threat-related flows for full data session analysis and search of patterns by means of dictionaries implemented by parallel Bloom filters.***

For more technical details, please kindly refer to INDECT Deliverables:

<http://www.indect-project.eu/public-deliverables>.

Some of the innovative results have been already published in well-known scientific journals and conferences.

Please see also: <http://www.indect-project.eu/benefits-for-the-security-of-citizens-selected-tools-and-applications>

5. What are the criteria and development goals for the quality of the automatic predictions and classifications of persons and suspicious behaviour carried out by the various INDECT components?

Current approaches present in commercial video analysis for safety systems are focused on detection of movement, defined as a change in the model of the scene. This employs background modelling by means of calculating the average of the image over time. It is assumed that still parts of the image don't change in time, therefore are equal to the calculated average. Moving objects differ from the average, hence are detected. This approach doesn't account cyclic movement of leaves in the wind, waves on the water or street lights changes. Moreover it is susceptible to weather conditions, or rapid lighting changes. Detected objects are not recognized; therefore a defined notification procedure is undertaken for cars, persons, or animals. INDECT Project targets those issues by implementation of new background model, and shadow detection and removal. Moreover, object classification is made for automatic distinction between various types. Consequently better event detection is possible. For example new generation safety system near the road can deal with typical movement of cars on the road and pedestrians on the pavement, and then detect a person entering the road, or a car driving fast into the roadside. Current generation of video analysis systems can't distinguish these two situations.

In practice, legacy systems operate badly at night, and very badly when it rains – research teams are improving them and in good conditions it is expected to achieve dangerous event recognition ratio of >90% and in bad conditions recognition rate is 70-80%, what is better than up to now.

6. How, in concrete terms, is INDECT to “promote the availability of novel know-how and technologies to enhance the security of citizens”?

There are numerous ways of dissemination. For example, project results are presented at conferences, in scientific journals and in standardization activities. Furthermore, 3 international conferences were organised under the auspices of the project. . Some of the tools were made available for testing to European police services.

7. What is meant by the terms “relationship mining” and “Social Network Analysis” used on the INDECT website?

The European Commission has officially and publicly answered this question:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2010-010259&language=EN>

In particular, the term can be understood as searching for relationships, e.g. in the context of events related to serious organized crime. Social networks can be used for criminal purposes: distribution of illegal content or exchange of information for criminal activities.

Such criminal activities comprise: human trafficking, production and distribution of child pornography, etc.

8. How is the statement contained in an INDECT presentation (c.f. http://europolice.noblogs.org/gallery/3874/Expectations_of_end_users.pdf) on “utilizing resources available now and in the close future” to be understood?

The key objective of INDECT is to contribute, through innovation and technology, to the security of all in the European Union. This will be done by integrating various lawful and pre-existing sources of information, which are already available to public protection agencies throughout the Union.

INDECT does not involve the creation of any new surveillance technologies. The algorithms and methodologies underlying the project rely primarily on previously available information sources. These include surveillance cameras, web pages with forbidden content, etc. INDECT will not use highly sensitive material, such as telephone intercept, VoIP, etc..

9. What is meant by the “intelligent processing” of all information on which INDECT is carrying out research, referred to by the Commission on 3 May 2010?

The “intelligent processing” is an important feature of the proposed solutions, consisting of processing of the various data (sound, vision, textural and environmental parameters), using the most recent achievements in multimedia and computing techniques. An example of “intelligent processing” could be searching for dangerous tools in video content from CCTV.

Implementation of the proposed system is necessary because the rapidly increasing stream of data (from audio and video surveillance systems in urban areas and observed in the data exchanged in digital systems) cannot be used effectively for improvement of public safety unless the services responsible for crime prevention are equipped with proper tools for acquisition, storage, searching, presentation and automatic analysis of audio, video and textural data and also for detection of criminal behaviour of persons and groups of people. The main task of the proposed solutions is generating messages that warn public safety services about the occurrence of potentially dangerous situations.

10. Did a problem analysis or assessment of security needs take place before the beginning of the INDECT project, or before the decision was taken to include the project in FP7?

The European Commission has officially and publically answered to this question: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2009-6084&language=EN>

The problem of security needs is not limited to INDECT or FP7. Security needs were known before the project – also during the project security needs are analysed.

11. Is it true that INDECT is to be used or tested during the 2012 UEFA cup in Poland, as announced by the INDECT project leader Andrzej Czyżewski in 2008 to German journalists? If so, in what way will the visitors captured on film be informed of this fact and what measures can those affected take to protect their right to privacy?

INDECT tools were not tested during 2012 UEFA.

The European Commission has officially and publically answered to this question:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2010-6912&language=EN>

12. When and where are the audio sensors also mentioned by Dziech in 2008, which, according to press reports, are to analyse fan chants for threatening pitches in people's voices, to be tested?

INDECT does not analyse fan chants. "Audio sensors" are incorporated in CCTV equipment available on the market now. Please also refer to the answer given to the question #11.

13. During what period, and precisely where, are further tests to be carried out in public places in Poland, the Czech Republic and other countries (please list the planned tests with reference to the individual 10 Work Packages)?

INDECT tests are carried out at university campuses and restricted areas. Persons involved in such tests are informed and sign 'informed consent'.

Please also refer to the answer given to the question #11.

14. Is it correct that INDECT is allowed to access surveillance-camera material from the Warsaw Palace of Culture and Science, the Warsaw metro, the Poznan Lawica airport and the University of Science and Technology in Krakow? How are those subject to surveillance informed of the fact that data on them is being automatically processed (even if this is only for test purposes) and possibly compared with information from other databases?

Tests were done with participation of 'actors'. It was important to perform them in places such as airport or a street, in order to evaluate the efficiency of the elaborated solutions in real environments.

Please see also answer to the question 13.

15. What measures can those affected take to protect their privacy rights?

No personal data (e.g. face or car number plates) of persons who did not agree to use such data was stored and used for research purposes. Besides INDECT elaborates tools for data and privacy protection.

For details on example test please refer to the project's websites:

<http://www.indect-project.eu/events/wp1/car-plate-recognition-tests>.

<http://www.indect-project.eu/benefits-for-the-security-of-citizens-selected-tools-and-applications>

16. When and where have flying cameras been tested, or are being tested, in public spaces and what systems and concepts are used in this context?

INDECT UAVs (Unmanned Aerial Vehicles), thus: „flying cameras" as you called it, were not tested in areas open to the public. When needed, and if only weather permitted, tests took place in the closed area of Poznan Kobylnica Airport (Poland), ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) airport code: EPPK.

17. How can the tests announced (including at EURO 2012) be reconciled with the statement made by the European Commission on 8 July 2010, that “In the project, no actual (operational) data will be used nor recorded during the INDECT project. Only experimental data will be collected for trial purposes”?

We can confirm: no operational data is used during the INDECT project. Only experimental data is be collected for trial purposes.

18. In its answer to a written question, the Commission states that “If personal data are processed then this must be done fairly, for specified purposes and on the basis of the consent of the person concerned or some other legitimate basis laid down by law”. How is this to be applied with regard to the planned tests?

Data used in the research is either fake data or it is collected after involved persons agree to use data related to them (e.g. images of their faces or cars). Such persons are informed about the scope and objectives of the research, about their right to retrieve the data corresponding to them, etc.

For an answer, please also refer to the answers given to the questions #11, #12, #15, #16 and 17.

19. The Commission also stresses that everyone has the right to access personal data and the right to have it rectified. How can this right be exercised?

Any person who signed informed consent can, at any moment, request to rectify or withdraw her/his data. Such data would no longer be used for research or any other purposes.

20. What is the “independent authority” referred to, which is intended to control compliance with these rules?

Ethics Board controls compliance with such rules. Besides it was done at reviews and audits of the project. INDECT project was a subject to scrutiny carried out by General Inspector of Personal Data (pol. Główny Inspektor Danych Osobowych – GIODO). Following the scrutiny a letter was issued by the Office of GIODO signed by The Director of Inspection Department. The letter states that the scrutiny that was performed at AGH-UST had for the scope compliance with regulations concerning protection of personal data (law from 29th August 1997 on Protection of Personal Data) and regulation of the Minister of Interior Affairs and Administration, dated to 29th April 2004 with respect to processing of personal data and technical and organisational conditions that equipment and information systems used to process personal data should be conformant to.

21. Who was involved in developing the definition of the “suspicious behaviour” which is to be assessed in the INDECT framework?

“Suspicious behaviour”, as understood in INDECT, is related to potential threat or crime (e.g. carrying a gun in public space) or to criminal activities in the Internet (e.g.: producing and distributing child pornography).

22. What were the procedures followed in developing this definition and who ultimately took the decision concerning the definition of “suspicious behaviour”.

This was consulted with law enforcement representatives. It was also one of the subject of reviews and audits of the project.

23. Which sections of the “Homeland Security Services” mentioned on the INDECT website are intended to be the target group for the completed INDECT platform?

Police services are the main ‘target’ of INDECT solutions.

24. How are “European citizens” to benefit from INDECT, as stated on the INDECT website?

INDECT develops new, advanced and innovative algorithms and methods aiming at combating terrorism and other criminal activities, affecting citizens’ safety.

More details on it can be found at:

<http://www.indect-project.eu/benefits-for-the-security-of-citizens-selected-tools-and-applications>

The INDECT Project is exceptionally oriented to counteract terrorism and serious criminal activities, also in Internet (e.g. child pornography) to increase security of citizens.

Benefits are also related to enhanced efficiency of the work done by services responsible for public safety. Besides, new mechanisms for data and privacy protection are elaborated in INDECT.

25. How expensive was the INDECT promotional video, which, according to Patrick Hasenfuß , was shown for the first time by the German firm PSI Transcom in Stockholm at the European Security Research Conference? Who commissioned the video and who made it?

The INDECT promotional video was produced by an external, professional video production company; however, since the cost has been not included into the INDECT eligible financial statement, we are not in the position to provide any further details on this matter. Please note that the German firm PSI Transcom never was involved in the “making of” the video, and the company didn’t pay for it. It is also not true, as you stated in your open letter that the video “was shown for the first time by the German firm PSI Transcom”. In fact the video was presented by Professor Andrzej Dziech (INDECT Coordinator) at the European Security Research Conference in Stockholm:

http://www.src09.se/src_templates/Page.aspx?id=646..

26. According to the information available to the Federal Government, which industrial partners have been invited to carry out the market studies for the introduction of the technology developed into the day-to-day work of the police?

As you refer to “information available to the Federal Government” (assuming you mean German Federal Government), the question should be directed to the German Federal Government.

27. How are the market studies announced on the INDECT website and the presentation of INDECT findings at conferences to be viewed against the background of the answer given by the European Commission on 8 July to a parliamentary question, in which it states that “The outcome of the project will be a technology demonstration prototype/test-bed rather than a production phase product” ?

The consortium confirms that the outcome of the project will be a technology demonstration prototype/test-bed rather than a production phase product. This in line with EU rules telling that the implementation of technology to create a “production” system is not covered by FP7 (Framework Programme 7).

Anyway, the same rules tell that FP7 projects should demonstrate potential impact and exploitation. This is done by market studies.

These rules cover all FP7 projects, not only INDECT project. Same rules appeared in previous Framework Programmes, so the rules have been in force already for several years (the Framework Programme 1 has been initiated in 1984).

28. How can the obvious discrepancy concerning the project’s goals be explained?

We don’t see any “obvious discrepancy concerns the project’s goals”.

29. Does the announcement of a workshop for the “intelligence community” on the INDECT website mean that European intelligence services are also viewed as end users?

Police services are meant as the main end-users of INDECT tools. It is not clear what context do you exactly mean by “announcement of a workshop for the intelligence community on the INDECT website”. The INDECT website does not directly mention such term:

<http://www.indect-project.eu/search?SearchableText=intelligence+community>.

30. Who is to be responsible for the training courses for police officers to “familiarize them with the system” and how are the training courses to be financed?

Academic partners assure assistance to police officers as concerns familiarization with the elaborated tools. Project resources are used for this purpose.

31. Apart from the partners named on the website – at <http://www.indectproject.eu/indect-partners> – have any other firms, universities or public institutions from other countries contributed to INDECT?

Any feedback to the researches, also this coming from politicians, can be treated as a kind of contribution. The main contribution, however, comes from INDECT partners.

32. When was the Ethics Board established and on whose initiative was it set up?

Ethics Board was established at the beginning of the project – the main initiative was from the European Commission and from independent experts who evaluated the project proposal. Please also refer to the answer given to the question #11.

33. What is the current composition of the Ethics Board in terms of its members and the organisations to which they belong?

Current composition of the Ethics Board is publicly available at: <http://www.indect-project.eu/ethics-board-members>

34. Is it correct that it is the participants in the INDECT project themselves who decide on the composition of their Ethics Board?

Ethics Board members were appointed from INDECT partnership and from outside of the project. Ethics Board cooperates with Inspector General of Personal Data Protection and NGO focused on human rights protection. Their suggestions and comments are considered by Ethics Board members. The European Commission has officially and publically answered to this question: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2010-6842&language=EN>

35. If this is not the case, how are the members appointed?

Activities and Decisions performed by Ethics Board members require specific expertise and experience in the field of Security and Ethical Issues. This is the main criterion of participation to the Ethics Board.

36. What safeguards exist to ensure that the Ethics Board is sufficiently critical in assessing the project and, in particular, has the necessary independence to do so?

INDECT was a subject of ethical review performed by a group of independent experts from Austria, France, Germany and UK. The review was accomplished successfully. Additionally the project successfully passed an audit carried out by General Inspector of Personal Protection. INDECT also was a subject of Mid-Term-Review – a part of it was dedicated to evaluation of the project approach to the ethical issues.

None of the audits questioned the activities realised by the Ethics Board.

37. How is the Ethics Board – which may not be independent – to access the information it needs “to report to the Commission on potential improper use of research results”, as stated by the Commission in its answers to parliamentary questions E-1332/10 and E- 1385/10?

Ethics Board is an independent body, it has access to all project reports. Moreover – Work Package Leaders, or other representatives of research groups, are invited to Ethics Board meetings to give account of the work performed and to answer questions from Ethics Board members. All technical deliverables have a section dedicated to ethical issues. Such sections indicate potential ethical challenges and give indications how to prevent and react to potential misuse.

38. What possibilities does the Ethics Board have to intervene in the INDECT Project? How is the following statement made by the AGH University, which is leading the project, to be understood: “all products must fulfill the obligations put on us by both national and European law regulations, however when we face a new legal challenge we have the possibility of legal initiative” (cf. http://europolice.noblogs.org/gallery/3874/Expectations_of_end_users.pdf)?

Ethics Board provides guidelines and recommendations to INDECT researchers concerning the research itself and to potential implementation of the results. Reviews and audits of the project verified if the project fulfils these recommendations.

39. Should the statement be understood to mean that, where INDECT violates laws or regulations, they should simply be changed?

INDECT does not “violate laws or regulations”. Scientific research and development most often is related to work on tools and solutions which are innovative – it is obvious that it may happen that no regulations exist concerning a specific domain.

40. Which documents or pieces of information to be kept secret by the Ethics Board in the future might damage the project’s reputation? What kind of “national and public security”, which is not specified further, would be at risk were this information to be published?

The European Commission has officially and publically answered to this question:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2010-7521&language=EN>

In particular disclosing details related to police operational work can negatively influence efficiency of counteracting serious crimes.

41. In view of INDECT’s desire to provide the investigative authorities with a “maximum amount of relevant information available”, how are principles like privacy or data minimisation adhered to?

While we agree that citizens have their right to privacy, please note that with respect to figureheads, suspects and criminals, investigative authorities such as police, in order to fulfil their statutory duties, may utilise personal data, including electronic data, obtained by other authorities, services and state institutions in the course of preliminary investigations and may process the data without the knowledge or consent of the individual concerned.

For example legal basis of this statement please refer to the Act on the Polish Police of 6 April 1990 (with amendments), Chapter 3 (“Scope of the Police powers”), Article 14.4:

http://www.policja.pl/ftp/pliki/police_act.pdf (in English).

INDECT does not “desire” to limit the privacy of citizens. On the contrary: within the project tools are developed aiming at protecting sensitive information from misuse and to enhance the privacy of citizens. The later can be done through applying of digital watermarking technology for hiding sensitive parts of images (such as faces or car number plates).

42. Does the statement quoted on the website in the “Ethical Issues” section – “if you have done nothing wrong, you have nothing to fear” – represent the stance of the Ethics Board, particularly with regard to the principle of “privacy by design”?

As you can see on the same website the statement is followed by statements that complete the preceding one: „However, this is only true if every aspect of the criminal justice system works perfectly, on every occasion. INDECT will provide EU Member States with the technology to ensure that decisions around public safety are based on the maximum amount of relevant information available”, which should give an answer to your question.

43. In view of the numerous concerns expressed publicly by politicians, academics, journalists, students and civil-rights activists (most recently via an initiative launched by numerous MEPs, cf. <http://www.alexander-alvaro.de/archives/1308/alvaromenschensuchmaschine-indect>), are the researchers involved in INDECT interested in exposing the project, or the possible future implementation of the project, to a broad public debate?

These “numerous concerns expressed publicly by politicians, ...” are quite often based on publicly distributed misleading statements - example of which can be seen in question 42.

Researchers involved in INDECT continuously undertake efforts to inform the public about project objectives and the research done in the project. This comprises:

- ***Constantly updated web-page***
- ***Publicly available project reports***
- ***Large number of scientific publications (almost 300 by now)***
- ***Participation to events related to security research, privacy and ethical issues***
- ***Contacts with politicians on national and European level***
- ***Relatively high number of interviews and appearances in media***
- ***Etc.***