Request for Information (RFI) on Public and Private Sector Uses of Biometric Technologies: Responses

**DISCLAIMER:** Please note that the RFI public responses received and posted do not represent the views or opinions of the U.S. Government, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), or any other Federal agencies or government entities. We bear no responsibility for the accuracy, legality, or content of these responses and the external links included in this document. Additionally, OSTP requested that submissions be limited to 10 pages or less. For submissions that exceeded that length, the posted responses include the components of the response that began before the 10-page limit.
ATTN: Office Science and Technology Policy

BiometricRFI@ostp.eop.gov

CC: Suresh Venkatasubramanian c/o biometric@ostp.eop.gov

RE: RFI Response: Biometric Technologies

Document # 2021-21975

CIT# 86 FR 56300

Wednesday, December 15, 2021

Dear OSTP Administrators,

This is a letter of response for public input/RFI for generalized uses of US biometrics in government and in the marketplace.

**The uses of Facial Recognition Technology should be banned, globally, for use in generalized visual surveillance in the US and more broadly, the world, to conform to a standard that regards basic human rights.** The ability to narrow down on targeted individuals should be limited to those who already have a law enforcement biometric profile and inquiry to do a comparative analysis of offending acts captured. Therefore, there is no need for placing biometric markers on the general public in technical view of the Internet, CCTV or streaming video. The human rights violation track record is not limited to the example of the People’s Republic of China, but for the sake of time, please refer to well documented repertoire of public dissents on the uses of FRT on persecuted populations, more submitted by other colleagues as expected.

**Uses of Leidos and other competing biometric scanners at US airports should be eliminated based on the low proportionate comparative threat analysis of flyers who actually had genital explosives.** Leidos, while I am sure will lobby to have their machines instilled by TSA, in US airports, should not lobby to maintain an invasive and demoralizing process instituted by the Obama Administration to inspect every US flyers genitals before entering the air transit area. While I do realize that TSA policy is not the specific burden of the OSTP offices, the demands for your influence to “improve” this process and policy will be expected. The best way to improve this TSA policy is to abolish it, eliminate the body scanners, all ensuing data and to apologize for the government’s molestation of American flying publics.

**Solicited recusal and recall of corporate contracts using PRC biometric surveillance to US cities & police departments to conform to US State Department policy and US embargoes in times of public conflict with The People’s Republic Of China.**
government buyers of Hikvision and Dahua technologies should be required to immediately remove, uninstall all biometric enabled technologies and return them to your offices for information systems audits, based on national security conveyances conforming to China’s PIPL law. I am sure they should not be exchanged for more biometric appliances, because in point 1, I requested that you ban all uses of generalized FRT and biometric surveillance be banned as subpar Human Rights standard.

Thank you for your audience on this important matter. I would like to add that my sense of ‘what it’s like’ to be profiled has pains and sensations of humiliation associated with it. When my face is being examined by an unknowable surveillant I tend to feel somatic jaw and sinus pressure pain sensation under my eyes and adjacent to my nose. That’s very specific, but this is the time when you document such things as evidence of public non-consent. I would add that previous administrations, Obama & Trump would collect input, much like this. While dissent and complaints from privacy advocates were collected, they performed the inverse of recommendations and did indeed double down, in contempt of solicited basic human rights advocacy. I urge you to not do that. Please present non-consent as non-consent in this input and not as means and need to escalate the uses of biometric technical work using public resources.

I thank you sincerely for the opportunity to generate thoughtful input on the subject of privacy, identity and biometrics at the OSTP. I look forward to reviewing your published findings.

Sincerely,

Sheila Dean
Privacy & Identity Rights Advocate

###

S. Dean
"Trust is the union of intelligence and integrity." - A Yogi
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