IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 2572578R **DCU** **Charles** 59656761 **Trento** 225064
Dissertation Title	Total ban or responsible use?
	A policy survey to better regulate the use of AI-powered video surveillance in law enforcement in the European Union

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade	*Reviewer 2 Initial Grade*	*Late Submission Penalty* *no penalty*
Word Count Penalty *(1-15% over/under = 1gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)*		
Word Count: *21894* **Suggested Penalty:** *no penalty*		

JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

Final Agreed Mark. *(Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).*   **Before Penalty:** A5 [18]   **After Penalty:** A5 [18]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	*Rating*
A. Structure and Development of Answer This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• *Originality of topic*	Excellent
• *Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified*	Very Good
• *Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work*	Very Good
• *Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions*	Excellent
• *Application of theory and/or concepts*	Very Good
B. Use of Source Material This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• *Evidence of reading and review of published literature*	Very Good
• *Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument*	Very Good
• *Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence*	Very Good
• *Accuracy of factual data*	Very Good
C. Academic Style This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• *Appropriate formal and clear writing style*	Excellent
• *Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation*	Excellent
• *Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)*	Excellent
• *Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?*	Yes
• *Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)*	Not required
• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The dissertation investigates the dangers and opportunities of ML-enhanced CCTVs. Its strongest point lies in the argument that a total ban would diminish the capabilities of law enforcement agencies while an unregulated use puts citizens at risk of rights infringements. It is highly appreciated that the work does not shy away from engaging the technical side of ML-enhanced CCTVs. For example, the discussion on surveillance avoidance enriches the existing debate. The landscape of possible approaches to ML-enhanced CCTVs is surveyed in a comprehensive way. This allows the dissertation to find a middle ground between normative arguments for the rights protection by bans and potential irresponsible and unchecked uses of the technology by the respective authorities. The offered roadmap serves as a sociotechnically informed point of departure for thinking about how to regulate the technology without endangering citizens' rights or law enforcement. Overall, the dissertation uses a solid methodological framework and a representative dataset. It has to be also noted that the decision to work on ML-enhanced CCTVs narrowed the vast landscape of ML risks appropriately and allowed the dissertation to reach actionable conclusions.

Reviewer 2

I enjoyed reading this thesis very much. Inquiring into the implications of AI powered video surveillance is highly relevant to security and intelligence studies. The thesis is well-structured, and the arguments are clearly developed. I have also appreciated the effort that the student put in situating their research in the literature on predictive policing and reflecting upon the contributions that they make.

Having said that, here are some comments to consider:

1) The introduction (Chapter 1) of the thesis is good. For clarity reasons, I think that it would have been better to divide it into sections (e.g., context, puzzle/research questions, structure). One thing that is perhaps missing here is a clear statement about the overall argument presented. Also, it is

stated that the main interest of the thesis is to understand how AI-powered video surveillance for predictive policing can be implemented "responsibly". It would be good to clarify what responsibility means in this context.

2) The literature review (Chapter 2) is well organised, clearly written and informative. However, the first section does not really engage with literature that has inquired into technologies through the lens of securitisation theory. Instead, the student briefly presents securitisation theory without explaining what/who is securitised in the case of surveillance technologies and how. The second section of the chapter reads more like a review of Egbert and Leese (2020), instead of an actual literature review on prevention and predictive policing.

3) Chapter three is well-written, but I think that the first section may be redundant as it basically reiterates some points about the relevance of the topic that were already presented in the introduction. Regarding methodology, I also did not understand what the student "triangulated" and how.

4) Chapter 4 is very informative. I missed, however, a proper introduction to the chapter. Especially regarding object-centred surveillance, it was not clear to me the relevance of securitisation theory. Who/what is securitised? Guns, for example, are already security-relevant (instead of securitised) objects. Also, it is worth noting that securitisation theory emerged within the field of CSS - what sort of critique is the student developing here by using this theory? For a thesis drawing on securitisation theory, I would also expect examples of concrete securitising speech acts or discursive practices. These examples were missing from the analysis. Finally, I found some of the analytical sections of the chapter – especially on the possibilities offered by AI and its challenges – a bit technical/descriptive. While I agree that description of technical elements is crucial, I would like to see more clearly the links between the analysis presented in those sections and some of the more "theoretical" ideas developed in the literature review section.

5) Chapter 5 is excellent. Very interesting proposition that the problem is not technology per se, but the system within which it is embedded.