



Andrej Hunko

Mitglied des Deutschen Bundestages

---

Andrej Hunko, MdB • Platz der Republik 1 • 11011 Berlin

Andrzej Dziech  
Akademia Górniczo-Hutnicza  
Im. Stanisława Staszica w Krakowie  
Al. Mickiewicza  
Krakow  
POLAND

Platz der Republik 1  
11011 Berlin

Jakob-Kaiser-Haus  
Raum 2.815

Telefon 030 227 – 79133

Fax 030 227 – 76133

E-Mail: [andrej.hunko@bundestag.de](mailto:andrej.hunko@bundestag.de)

---

Berlin, 10.12.2010

## Open letter

### **Information on the EU's research project Intelligent information system supporting observation, searching and detection for security of citizens in urban environment (INDECT)**

---

Dear Sir,

The EU's INDECT research project (Intelligent information system supporting observation, searching and detection for security of citizens in urban environment) plans to develop a surveillance platform for the EU Member States by 2013.

According to the European Commission, INDECT is working, among other things, "to develop a platform for: the registration and exchange of operational data, acquisition of multimedia content, intelligent processing of all information and automatic detection of threats and recognition of abnormal behaviour or violence". The idea is that INDECT will "develop the prototype of an integrated, network-centric system supporting the operational activities of police officers, providing techniques and tools for observation of various mobile objects". The idea is to process information not only from police databases and the Internet, but also from flying cameras. The data collected is to be processed using computer-based algorithms to analyse what crimes have been committed or can be expected to be committed.

As you will be aware from media reports, INDECT is viewed with great concern by data protection activists, civil rights activists and politicians. I too view INDECT as extremely problematic, and as likely to further undermine confidence in the protection of data.



Andrej Hunko  
Mitglied des Deutschen Bundestages

Seite 2 von 6 Seiten des Schreibens vom 09.12.2010

---

The European Commission is not prepared to provide detailed information on INDECT, and the parliaments of the 27 Member States are unable to exercise adequate parliamentary oversight. The parliamentary question which I put to the German Federal Government on this subject revealed a profound lack of knowledge about the research project. In addition, the Federation Government was unable to explain the discrepancy between the INDECT project goals which you have declared and the information provided by the Commission.

The INDECT Ethics Board, too, recently decided to withhold selected documents in future, since the project had often been misunderstood in the past. Information which might pose a threat to “national security” is to be kept secret – though the term “national security” is not defined.

I am concerned about these practices, which I view as ethically problematic, and I call on you to revise the decision.

In order to allow parliamentary oversight of the project, I would be grateful if you could answer the enclosed questions as soon as possible.

Please confirm the receipt of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Andrej Hunko, Member of the German National Parliament



Andrej Hunko  
Mitglied des Deutschen Bundestages

Seite 3 von 6 Seiten des Schreibens vom 09.12.2010

---

## Appendix

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?
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?
3. What is the relationship between the Polish research project INSIGMA (Intelligent Information System for Detection and Recognition) at Krakow university and INDECT?
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?
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?
6. How, in concrete terms, is INDECT to “promote the availability of novel know-how and technologies to enhance the security of citizens”?
7. What is meant by the terms “relationship mining” and “Social Network Analysis” used on the INDECT website?
8. How is the statement contained in an INDECT presentation (c.f. [http://euro-police.noblogs.org/gallery/3874/Expectations\\_of\\_end\\_users.pdf](http://euro-police.noblogs.org/gallery/3874/Expectations_of_end_users.pdf)) on “utilizing resources available now and in the close future” to be understood?
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?
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?
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?
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?
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)?
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?
15. What measures can those affected take to protect their privacy rights?
  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?
  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”?
  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?
  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?
  20. What is the “independent authority” referred to, which is intended to control compliance with these rules?
  21. Who was involved in developing the definition of the “suspicious behaviour” which is to be assessed in the INDECT framework?
  22. What were the procedures followed in developing this definition and who ultimately took the decision concerning the definition of “suspicious behaviour”?
  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?
  24. How are “European citizens” to benefit from INDECT, as stated on the INDECT website?
  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?
  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?
  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” ?



Andrej Hunko  
Mitglied des Deutschen Bundestages

Seite 5 von 6 Seiten des Schreibens vom 09.12.2010

---

28. How can the obvious discrepancy concerning the project's goals be explained?
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?
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?
31. Apart from the partners named on the website – at <http://www.indect-project.eu/indect-partners> – have any other firms, universities or public institutions from other countries contributed to INDECT?
32. When was the Ethics Board established and on whose initiative was it set up?
33. What is the current composition of the Ethics Board in terms of its members and the organisations to which they belong?
34. Is it correct that it is the participants in the INDECT project themselves who decide on the composition of their Ethics Board?
35. If this is not the case, how are the members appointed?
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?
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?
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://euro-police.noblogs.org/gallery/3874/Expectations\\_of\\_end\\_users.pdf](http://euro-police.noblogs.org/gallery/3874/Expectations_of_end_users.pdf))?
39. Should the statement be understood to mean that, where INDECT violates laws or regulations, they should simply be changed?
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?
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?
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"?



Andrej Hunko  
Mitglied des Deutschen Bundestages

Seite 6 von 6 Seiten des Schreibens vom 09.12.2010

---

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/alvaro-menschensuchmaschine-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?