# Artificial intelligence in criminal law and its use by the police and judicial authorities in criminal matters

2020/2016(INI) - 13/07/2021 - Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading

The Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs adopted an own-initiative report by Petar VITANOV (S&D, BG) on artificial intelligence (AI) in criminal law and its use by the police and judicial authorities in criminal matters.

The use of AI in law enforcement entails a number of potentially high, and in some cases unacceptable, risks for the protection of fundamental rights of individuals, such as opaque decision-making, different types of discrimination and errors inherent in the underlying algorithm which can be reinforced by feedback loops, as well as risks to the protection of privacy and personal data, the protection of freedom of expression and information, the presumption of innocence, the right to an effective remedy and a fair trial.

This report addresses the issues raised by the use of AI in criminal law and its use by police and judicial authorities in criminal matters. While recognising the potential opportunities and benefits that AI can bring, it also highlighted the significant risks and consequences that it can bring.

***Respect for fundamental rights***

Given that the processing of large amounts of data is at the heart of AI, Members believe that the EU legal framework on data protection and privacy must be fully respected and should form a basis for any future regulation of AI for law enforcement and judicial use. **The use of AI applications must be prohibited when incompatible with fundamental rights**. Moreover, the use of AI applications has to be categorised as high-risk in instances where there is the potential to significantly affect the lives of individuals.

The report reaffirmed that all AI solutions for law enforcement and the judiciary also need to fully respect the principles of human dignity, non-discrimination, freedom of movement, the presumption of innocence and right of defence, including the right to silence, freedom of expression and information, freedom of assembly and of association, equality before the law, the principle of equality of arms and the right to an effective remedy and a fair trial, in accordance with the Charter and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Any AI tools either developed or used by law enforcement or the judiciary should, as a minimum, be safe, robust, secure and fit for purpose, respect the principles of fairness, data minimisation, accountability, transparency, non-discrimination and explainability. Furthermore, their development, deployment and use should be subject to risk assessment and strict necessity and proportionality testing, where safeguards need to be proportionate to the identified risks.

***Surveillance and mass profiling***

Many algorithmically driven identification technologies currently in use disproportionately misidentify and misclassify and therefore cause harm to racialised people, individuals belonging to certain ethnic communities, LGBTI people, children and the elderly, as well as women.

Members considered that safeguards against the misuse of AI technologies by law enforcement and judicial authorities should be regulated uniformly across the EU.

The report stressed the legal obligation to **prevent mass surveillance using AI technologies** and to prohibit the use of applications that could lead to it. It called for increased efforts to avoid automated discrimination and automation bias.

***Risks of data leaks***

The report stressed that the safety and security aspects of AI systems used by law enforcement and judicial authorities must be carefully considered and sufficiently robust and resilient to prevent the consequences of malicious attacks against AI systems. It stressed the importance of **safety by design**, as well as **specific human oversight** before the use of certain critical applications and called for law enforcement and judicial authorities to use only those AI applications that respect the principle of privacy and data protection by design so as to avoid misuse.

Members called for the **precautionary principle** to be respected in all law enforcement applications of AI and stressed that in judicial and law enforcement settings, the decision giving legal or similar effect always needs to be taken by a **human**, who can be held accountable for the decisions made.

***Mandatory impact assessments***

The report called for the **algorithmic explicability, transparency, traceability and verification** as a necessary part of oversight, in order to ensure that the development, deployment and use of AI systems for the judiciary and law enforcement comply with fundamental rights and are trusted by citizens.

Members called for a compulsory fundamental rights impact assessment to be conducted prior to the implementation or deployment of any AI system for law enforcement or the judiciary, in order to assess any potential risk to fundamental rights. These impact assessments should be conducted with the active participation of civil society. They should clearly define the safeguards needed to address the identified risks and be made public, as far as possible, before the deployment of any AI system.

The report called for periodic mandatory auditing of all AI systems used by law enforcement and the judiciary where there is the potential to significantly affect the lives of individuals. It also highlighted the need for specialised training regarding the ethical provisions, potential dangers, limitations, and proper use of AI technology, especially for police and judiciary personnel.

***Facial recognition***

Members called for a **moratorium** on the deployment of facial recognition systems for law enforcement purposes that have the function of identification, unless strictly used for the purpose of identification of victims of crime, until the technical standards can be considered fully fundamental rights compliant.