

**Question for written answer E-002452/2024/rev.1**

**to the Commission**

Rule 144

**Martin Hojsik (Renew), Ludovít Ódor (Renew), Veronika Cifrová Ostrihoňová (Renew), Ľubica Karvašová (Renew), Michal Wiezik (Renew), Lucia Yar (Renew), Svenja Hahn (Renew), Kim Van Sparrentak (Verts/ALE), Sergey Lagodinsky (Verts/ALE), Brigitte van den Berg (Renew), Vladimír Prebilič (Verts/ALE), Jana Toom (Renew), Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE), Danuše Nerudová (PPE), Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE), Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew), Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE)**

**Subject:** Clarification of Article 5 of the Artificial Intelligence Act regarding the deployment of remote biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces

1. Can the Commission clarify the distinction between ‘publicly accessible spaces’ and other spaces (e.g. around schools) in relation to the prohibition of real-time facial recognition under the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act, notably in cases where remote biometric identification (RBI) systems are deployed outside school premises and monitor individuals in public areas and those entering the premises of the school?
2. While referring to the national security exemption under the AI Act, how does the Commission ensure that national security claims do not circumvent the AI Act safeguards against mass biometric surveillance, particularly in spaces where minors are present?
3. Can the Commission clarify whether deploying RBI around schools on the grounds of national security, with the aim of detecting individuals who are behaving unusually or suspiciously, would be proportionate, necessary and justifiable under the AI Act, given the sensitive population (minors) involved and the strict conditions regarding authorisation?

Submitted: 6.11.2024