



二零零二年公眾地方監察活動  
意見調查  
2002 Survey on Public  
Place Surveillance



Canton Road

Hennessy Road

Wan Chai Road

Queen's Rd Central

Nan

Sheppard Road

Lan Kwai Fong

在過去數年，公署曾委託香港大學社會科學研究中心在資料使用者及資料當事人之間進行抽樣調查，就與私隱有關的問題進行研究。這些調查結果在對個人資料私隱的看法及相關問題上，提供了豐富的資料。不過，隨著個人資料私隱的概念漸漸在社會上紮根，公署因此決定在二零零二年進行專題意見調查。

在二零零二年年初，香港警務處（「警方」）透露打算在蘭桂坊安裝閉路電視攝影機，以協助人群管制及防止罪行。這項宣布觸發了市民及立法會對此事的關注，大家對閉路電視攝影機的使用顯然缺乏規管、錄影帶記錄的保留及使用，以及在市民大眾可自由進出的公眾地方安裝監察攝影機可能引致私隱問題等事尤表關注。

在警方作出上述公布時，公署未能就市民對在公眾地方安裝監察攝影機的看法展開調查或作出獨立報告。公署認為適宜在此方面進行研究調查並可從中得益。公署其後委託香港大學社會科學研究中心在二零零二年六月至九月進行調查。

調查設法得知市民對在公眾地方使用監察攝影機的看法，目標是要深入了解公眾對監察的信念，以及在何種情況下監察可以或不可以接受。此外，調查亦設法找出公眾認為敏感的問題，例如攝影機的安裝位置及監察的目的，同時亦設法對實時監察及記錄監察的多個情況作出研究。調查分三個階段進行。

**聚焦小組討論：**利用聚焦小組討論來對顧客或僱員受到攝影機監察的六種情況作出探討。探討的情況涵蓋零售店的僱員、停車場使用者、地鐵／九鐵乘客、蘭桂坊的顧客及僱員、屋苑居民及專上院校的學生。此外，亦訪問了來自國內及英國的遊客，以確定監察攝影機對公眾安全的看法的影響程度，而這種看法足以對個人挑選渡假地點有所影響。

In previous years the PCO has commissioned the Social Sciences Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong to conduct research on privacy-related issues among samples of data users and data subjects. The findings of these surveys have been informative regarding perceptions towards personal data privacy and related issues. However, with the concept of personal data privacy well entrenched within the community, the PCO decided to undertake a survey with a more specific focus in 2002.

In early 2002, the Hong Kong Police revealed its plan to install CCTV cameras in Lan Kwai Fong in order to assist in crowd management and crime prevention. The announcement resulted in expressions of concern both within the community and the Legislative Council. There are particular concerns about the apparent lack of regulation of the use of CCTV cameras, the retention and use of videotaped records and the potential intrusion upon privacy in places to which the public have largely unrestricted access.

At the time of the Police announcement the PCO was unable to uncover any investigation or independent reporting into community perceptions towards the use of surveillance cameras in public places. It was considered timely and beneficial to commission a research survey in this area. As a follow-up action, the PCO commissioned the Social Sciences Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong to conduct the survey between June and September 2002.

The survey was designed to gain insights into public attitudes towards the use of surveillance cameras in public places. Its objective was to better understand the strength of public convictions held towards surveillance and the circumstances under which the practice is deemed acceptable, or otherwise. It also identified issues that the public found sensitive, such as the location of cameras and the purpose of surveillance. A number of real-time monitoring and recorded monitoring situations were also examined. The survey was conducted in three stages.

**Focus Group Discussions.** Focus group discussions were held to investigate six situations in which customers and/or employees were subject to surveillance cameras. The situations examined were retail shop employees, car park users, MTR/KCR commuters, Lan Kwai Fong customers and employees, housing estate residents and tertiary level students. In addition, tourists from Mainland China and Britain were interviewed to establish the extent to which surveillance cameras might influence perceptions towards public safety which, in turn, may impact upon an individual's choice of holiday destination.

**住戶電話訪問：**這階段的研究包括訪問1,103戶住戶。電話問卷的內容環繞著聚焦小組討論所浮現的概念及問題，目的是要向受訪者展示一連串他們熟識的情況。在每一種情況下，受訪者均被問及監察攝影機的使用(包括有沒有作出記錄)，以及錄影帶的保留期間等問題。同時，有關情況在設計上頗為多樣化，以理解市民對監察攝影機的應用的看法，即他們認為監察攝影機的哪種應用情況應受到某種形式的限制。

**監察攝影機的使用者：**研究的最後階段包括向六位監察攝影機的使用者進行深入訪問，內容涵蓋聚焦小組的情況。訪問對攝影機的使用目的及運作、錄影及管制翻查錄影帶、錄影通知、攝影機的好處、私隱保安，以及對公署制訂實務守則的態度或政府須就在公眾地方使用監察攝影機發牌等問題作出探討。

差不多所有聚焦小組的回應者均支持為防止罪行、公眾安全、人群管制及保安目的在公眾地方使用監察攝影機，但卻反對在的士及公眾海灘使用該等攝影機。至於在蘭桂坊使用監察攝影機，受訪者的意見不一。有些認為有理由在節日或特別慶典時使用該等攝影機。不過，大部分受訪者同意不得利用攝影機監察指定人士，特別是如錄得的資料是提供政府機構使用的話。此外，受訪者亦對攝影機的使用及翻查錄影資料的管制措施深表關注。大部分人均強烈支持須告知公眾攝影機正在操作，以及須制訂指引，以防可能出現濫用情況。

電話訪問發現大部分受訪者均支持為防止罪行而使用有錄影功能的監察攝影機，而非進行即場監察。這顯示出如要達致此目的，則須進行錄影監察。停車場在這方面所得的支持率最高(51%的受訪者表示有充份理據為防止罪行及破壞進行拍攝)，其次是候車月台(39%)及店舖(38%)。差不多所有受訪者均一致認為錄影帶應最少保留24小時，而支持最少須保留一星期者亦甚多。

**Household Telephone Survey.** This stage of the research involved a survey of 1,103 domestic households. The telephone-administered questionnaire was designed around concepts and issues that came to light in focus group discussions. The intention here was to present respondents with a series of situations with which they could readily identify. For each situation respondents were asked about the use of surveillance cameras, with and without recording, and the retention period for tape records. At the same time a degree of variety was given to those situations in order to develop an understanding of more specific camera applications, which, in the view of the general public, necessitated the application of some form of restrictions.

**Operators of Surveillance Cameras.** The final stage of the research involved in-depth interviews with six operators of surveillance cameras covering the focus group situations. The interviews explored issues such as the purpose and operation of cameras, taping and control of access to tapes, notification of recording, benefits of cameras, privacy safeguards and attitudes towards the PCO formulating a code of practice or, alternatively, the government licensing the use of surveillance cameras in public places.

Nearly all focus group respondents supported the use of surveillance cameras in public places for crime prevention, public safety, crowd control and security purposes. The exception was the use of such cameras in taxis or at public beaches. There were also diverse views regarding their use in Lan Kwai Fong. Some considered their use to be justified during festivals or special occasions. However, the majority of respondents agreed that cameras should not be used to monitor specific individuals, in particular where the data were to be used by government agencies. There was also considerable concern regarding the control of the cameras' use and access to the recorded contents. There was overwhelming support both for the public to be notified if cameras were being used and for the development of guidelines to avoid potential abuse.

The telephone survey found that the majority of respondents supported the use of surveillance cameras with recording capabilities over live monitoring for crime prevention purposes. This suggests that camera recording would be essential if the monitoring were to achieve the stated purpose. The highest level of support was for car parks (51% of respondents indicated full justification for the prevention of crime and damage), followed by train platforms (39%), and shops (38%). There was almost unanimous agreement that the recorded tapes should be kept for at least 24 hours, with strong support for tapes being retained for at least one week.

至於管制措施方面，訪問員向受訪者展示了可能對監察攝影機的使用作出管制的七種方法，並要求他們利用五點評級（由完全不需要至必需品）來對每一種方法作出評估。最多人選擇的是錄影帶的保安規定，71%受訪者認為必需品；其次是在使用攝影機時須給予公眾通知的規定（57%認為必需品）；只准在發生罪行時翻查錄影帶（56%認為必需品）；公署制訂運作守則（43%認為必需品）；禁止在某種情況下使用監察攝影機（43%認為必需品）；禁止定鏡拍攝個人（41%認為必需品），以及就攝影機的使用發牌（29%認為必需品）。

總而言之，調查結果反映出受訪者一般都對在某些情況下使用監察攝影機表示支持。大部分人同意雖然保安及私隱問題都是重要的考慮因素，但卻有理由基於防止及偵測罪行而在某些地點使用監察攝影機，例如犯罪率高或在節日時易發生意外的地方。受訪者一般亦對錄影表示支持，特別是在保安值得關注或顯示有需要使用攝影機防止罪行發生的情況下。

受訪者相信進行監察時，私隱是值得關注的問題，雖然它的優先處理次序可能在保安及防止罪行之後。不過，情況清楚顯示有需要在翻查錄影資料、給予公眾通知、錄影帶保安及錄影記錄的保留期間方面，對監察攝影機的使用及目的作出規管。此外，亦有需要透過公署制訂實務守則作出監管，以確保有適當的管制及防止出現濫用情況。最後，受訪者並不認為有即時需要就監察攝影機的安裝設立發牌制度，顯示出大家認為制訂指引或實務守則可為公眾提供較大的私隱保證。

意見調查提供了有用的資料，可得悉市民大眾對監察攝影機的意見。公署會繼續對在公眾地方使用攝影機作出監察，並會就保障個人資料私隱權與有關方面進行討論。

In terms of control measures, respondents were presented with seven possible means of controlling the use of surveillance cameras and asked to evaluate each one on a five-point scale from totally unnecessary to essential. The most popular option was tape security requirements with 71% of respondents considering it essential. This was followed by: public notification when using cameras (57% essential), restricted access to the tapes in the case of crime (56% essential), a PCO code of conduct (43% essential), banning the use of cameras in some situations (43% essential), banning surveillance targeted at individuals (41% essential) and licensing the use of cameras (29% essential).

In summary, the survey results reflect general support for surveillance cameras in public places under certain circumstances. Most people agree that, while both security and privacy issues are important considerations, crime prevention and detection justify the use of surveillance cameras at specific locations, such as high crime areas or where there is a high risk of accidents during festive times. There is general support for camera recording, notably in situations where security concerns are paramount or where there is a demonstrated need to use cameras in the fight against crime.

Respondents believe that privacy concerns should be addressed in surveillance, even though they may be of a lesser priority than issues such as security and crime prevention. However, there is a clear need to regulate the use and purpose of surveillance cameras in terms of accessing recorded information, public notification, tape security and the retention period for tape records. There is also a need for supervision, in the form of a code of practice drawn up by the PCO, to ensure proper controls and to avoid potential abuse. Finally, respondents do not see an immediate need to set up licensing requirements for the installation of surveillance cameras, which suggests that drawing up guidelines or a code of practice may be viewed as providing greater privacy assurance to the community.

The survey has provided valuable insights into community views towards surveillance cameras. The PCO will continue to monitor the use of surveillance cameras in public places and discuss with relevant parties protection of the personal data privacy rights of individuals.