

Section 1: Allegations of Complicity in Human Rights Abuses

International Policing Concerns:

- This is a common misunderstanding about the court ruling which was around police laws in two states - Hesse and Hamburg. The ruling stated the laws around data analysis for policing were unconstitutional in their current form but was explicit that the practices themselves, of data collection and analysis by police for law enforcement purposes, presented no fundamental/inherent constitutional challenge. On the contrary, it went on to suggest that a constitutionally defensible use of this type of data and analysis for policing was possible and likely even desirable within a better defined legal framework.
- Since the 2023 ruling, several German federal states, including Hesse and Bavaria, which both use Palantir software, have amended their police laws to allow the use of data accordingly, with legal actions against the amended laws dismissed by the respective constitutional courts.
- Our work in New Orleans was not with the NOPD, it was with the City of New Orleans/Mayor's Office. This was not a Policing / Law Enforcement project. It was a philanthropic project focused on comprehensive services to support the City's murder reduction efforts. Our software was not used for predictive policing efforts.

Our response:

We have corrected the text to state that this work was with the City of New Orleans. In the full briefing, we describe the software as "software to support analysis of criminal histories, alleged gang membership and personal social media usage to predict the likelihood that individuals would commit violence or become a victim, compiling massive amounts of data on individuals". We do not describe it as predictive policing. Our sentence on the German ruling specifies it was the data processing laws, not Palantir software, that was ruled unconstitutional. We have included your statement that other German states currently use Palantir software.

Predictive policing:

- This is untrue. As a matter of company policy, Palantir does not support any predictive policing workflows.

Our response:

We have added your reply to the text. Over email, Palantir provided a definition of predictive policing as predicting 'whether someone might commit a crime'. This does not encompass our full definition. In our briefing, we describe predictive policing as "digitally analysing large amounts of data from multiple sources, with the help of algorithmic predictions, in order to help police surveil, profile or target particular persons of interest, or areas of interest, in some cases based on perceived likelihood of committing a crime"

There are multiple examples of Palantir providing software for activities which meet the above description. For example, Palantir has applied for [patents](#) for 'crime risk forecasting' technologies. A [Smart Policing: Research Snapshot](#), written by The Bureau of Justice Assistance - a component of the Office of Justice Programs within the United States Department of Justice explained that Palantir's technology was being used by Los Angeles police forces for area based predictive policing in 2011. In our briefing, we quote from the [Verge Investigation](#) which described the technology provided in New Orleans as "predicted

the likelihood that individuals would commit violence or become a victim". We note that Palantir did not respond to the specific allegations relating to creating a real-time data sharing network for some British forces.

UK Surveillance:

- These claims are untrue.
- Palantir is not, and has never been, a surveillance company. We do not conduct surveillance, we do not provide surveillance services, nor do we sell our software for the purposes of enabling unlawful surveillance. We simply help organisations better organise the information they already hold.
- Our technology has been honed over more than two decades of supporting security organisations whose work involves the most sensitive data.
- To all our customers, Palantir is designated by law as a "data processor", with our customers "data controllers". Access to data is dictated entirely by them, including for what purpose and for how long.
- The technology is equipped with granular access controls and full auditability - so that people in the institutions we serve can only see the information they need to, in order to do their job, and so that it is possible to see exactly who access what data, why and when.

Our response:

It is not clear what is meant by 'These claims are untrue' when specifics of the allegation, building a real-time data sharing network for some British police forces, were provided. We have added your above claim regarding surveillance to the text. We do not describe Palantir as a surveillance company. In the full briefing, we state "Palantir is a US-based data analytics firm specialising in artificial intelligence (AI) technologies and software commonly used by states in surveillance, border enforcement, policing and warfare". We do not claim that surveillance is unlawful. We describe that Palantir "offers its software to states and corporations, enabling them to compile and analyse data they hold by bringing together data from different sources or government departments to support decision-making."

We argue that companies providing the necessary tools that underpin and digitally enable surveillance, such as data analytics and AI tools, are accountable to the ultimate use of these tools, even if that surveillance is conducted by states within legal frameworks. As per the BHR responsibilities and the UN Guiding Principles on Human rights, Palantir should exercise their leverage as suppliers to prevent the serious human rights consequences borne by the policies of their clients.

Palantir's technologies underpin multiple state surveillance systems including ICE's identification, targeting and tracking system ImmigrationOS in the US. Palantir's own website states that "Palantir was founded in 2003 with a mission to help intelligence agencies make better use of their data securely and responsibly. Today, governments around the world use Palantir Gotham and Palantir Foundry to understand and defend against evolving threats to national security, from cyberattacks, to disinformation, to insurgencies". The work it digitally enables and supports has been classified by experts, including its own employees, as surveillance.

We note that Palantir does not refute the allegation that their work with Project Maven in the US supports the use of AI in drone surveillance with decision-making for potentially lethal outcomes.

In the full briefing, we write that British police forces such as Bedfordshire Police are using Palantir's software to "combine criminal records with other intelligence sources such as financial information to create profiles of individuals and aid decision making. This will establish a: "real-time data-sharing network" that includes the personal details of vulnerable victims, children, and witnesses alongside suspects. Trade union membership, sexual orientation, health information and race were among the types of personal information being processed." We argue that this analysis and organisation of data would certainly be classed as surveillance.

We do not dispute that Palantir is a data processor. We describe Palantir as a data processor in the briefing. Palantir must still carry out human rights due diligence in respect to the full life cycle of the use of their products even if they are processors. We do not dispute that the software contains access controls.

Border Enforcement (ICE) & New tools built for ICE.

- We work with the Department of Homeland Security. That's a long standing partnership - spanning the Obama administration, the first Trump administration, Biden and now the second Trump administration.
- An accurate overview of Palantir's work with ICE can be found [here](#).

Our response:

We are aware that Palantir's work with ICE spans multiple administrations. During the first Trump administration, in 2020, Amnesty International wrote to Palantir about its human rights due diligence processes. In response, Palantir acknowledged that it had "[...] purposefully declined to take on contracts with [ICE's Enforcement and Removal Operations] and CBP under the current [then] Administration because we share your organization's concern with the potential serious human rights violations against migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers at the US – Mexico border and risks of disproportionate immigration enforcement inside the USA." This stance has clearly changed.

We note that Palantir has not refuted the claim that it helps ICE to mine Department of Health data. The blog provided also does not dispute this, but clarifies it is within data sharing agreements. We do not dispute that data sharing agreements between departments exist to enable this. We note Palantir does not dispute the claim that its employees are embedded within ICE.

Conflict in Palestine:

- Palantir has never been involved with the "Gospel" or "Lavender" targeting systems that underpin Amnesty International's claims against us - a point we have made clear to them, but they choose to ignore.
- We are, however, very proud of the work and support we have provided to Israel following the vicious attacks of October 7th.

Our response:

We do not claim that Palantir was involved in Gospel or Lavender, and there is no mention of Lavender or Gospel in the cited Amnesty report. We note that Palantir does not refute the claim that they are providing the IDF with battlefield data integration for automated decision-making. Thank you for confirming the company's support for Israel during the genocide in Gaza.

Intelligence Agency Access:

- There is absolutely no basis for the claim in the Swiss Army report, and it is entirely inaccurate. The authors did not contact us at any stage, and the assertion appears to have been based on a cursory internet search. We have published an extensive correction to the falsehoods in their report available [here](#).
- Palantir has spent two decades and invested billions of its own money in research and development to build the best product on the market, which is used extensively by critical UK allies such as the US and NATO.
- Palantir's operations in Europe are governed exclusively by European law, including applicable procurement frameworks and data protection regulations. Our work is carried out under lawful contracts with European public institutions and remains subject to democratic oversight.

Our response:

We have amended the text to reflect Palantir's allegation that the fears cited in the report are unfounded. We do not claim that Palantir's operations in Europe are unlawful.

Section 2: Procurement and Lobbying Practices**Procurement and lobbying:**

- Like the vast majority of companies operating at scale in the UK, Palantir engages with and consults government on policy matters, and vice versa.
- We are proud to support UK public services, including helping the NHS deliver more operations, enabling the Royal Navy to keep ships at sea for longer and supporting police forces in tackling domestic violence and organised crime.
- We will continue to work closely with the UK Government to support the delivery of effective public services.

Our response:

We note that Palantir did not respond to allegations regarding 'revolving doors', MP donations, the evidence of its successful non-competitive tenders, strategy of domination and lack of transparency. We have added part of your above statement to the text.

Section 3: Risks to Patient Privacy and Data Security**Data retention:**

- NHS England has published comprehensive information outlining how data is processed within the FDP, covering both [national level](#) products and [local Trust level](#) products.
- Further detail on the platform-wide safeguards and data handling controls is [available](#) in NHS England's overarching Data Protection Impact Assessment for the FDP.
- In addition, the programme's [Information Governance Framework](#) sets out the robust information governance strategy underpinning the platform.

Our response:

We are aware of these documents. We stand by our assertions that this represents inadequate data protection for reasons outlined in the full briefing. We have added your reference to these documents to the text.

Insufficient De-identification:

- The Privacy Enhancing Technology (PET) utilized in the FDP is provided by IQVIA, as detailed in the FDP infrastructure overview available [here](#).

Our response:

We are aware of these documents. We stand by our assertions that this is inadequate data protection for reasons outlined in the full briefing.

GP Data Concerns:

- All organisations participating in the FDP are required to comply fully with UK privacy law and the FDP Information Governance Framework. All Data Controllers must ensure that all data flows have appropriate data sharing agreements in place for the processing of any personal data that they do not solely control.

Our response:

We are aware of these documents. We stand by our assertions that this is inadequate data protection and do not dispute that GP data inclusion is subject to the specific data sharing agreements between ICBs and GPs. We have added your statement that responsibility for data compliance falls on data controllers to the text.

Staff Access:

- Palantir engineers are only able to access NHS data under the direction of the Data Controllers. This only takes place for appropriate engineering activities like data pipeline deployment and product support tasks.
- The technology includes granular access controls and full auditability, ensuring that individuals within the institutions we serve can access only the information necessary to perform their roles. It also provides a clear, traceable record of who accessed specific data, when they accessed it, and for what purpose.

Our response:

Thank you for confirming that Palantir engineers are able to access NHS data, with the consent of data controllers, as we outline in the briefing.

Cross-Departmental Access:

- There is no data sharing between separate organisations.
- To all our customers, Palantir is designated by law as a "data processor", with our customers "data controllers". Access to data is dictated entirely by them, including for what purpose and for how long.

Our response:

We do not claim that there is any current data sharing agreement between separate organisations for the FDP or claim that Palantir itself would do this.

We clearly state that a current or future government could use the data within the FDP for data-driven abuses of state power, emphasising that we believe Palantir's Foundry software provides additional capability to do so, including but not limited to the ability of

Foundry to drag and drop data with Gotham. We do not claim that Palantir is the data controller.

AI training:

- Palantir, as a Data Processor, does not utilise any customer data in any shape or form for product development.

Our response:

We have included your claim that you do not use any customer data for product development.

Separate to the issue of AI training or use of customer data, we argue that Palantir will benefit from the FDP contract through improving its software offerings using the knowledge of NHS staff and health data systems, whether that be organisational learnings, software development, or reputational benefit. We raise concerns about what implications this has for complicity in Palantir's other operations, as was noted in Palantir's questioning by the Science and Technology Committee. We note that Palantir does not dispute this.

Section 4: Institutional Risks and Software Suitability

Vendor Lock-In:

- In contrast to many legacy IT systems, Palantir software has interoperability at its core.
- Users interact with the platform entirely through open-source frameworks and languages.

Our response:

We note that Palantir does not dispute the allegation that they retain the rights to the "specially written software" for the FDP. We have added your claim that analysts interact through open-source frameworks to the text.

Unreadable Code:

- The code is in a generic language that can be exported into any other platform with minor changes required. Our use of Python, standard testing frameworks, standard build and dependency management tools, the Apache Spark framework all support and underpin this interoperability and act as a safeguard against lock-in.

Our response:

By unreadable code we mean the code that shapes Foundry itself, not the code that analysts use to interact with Foundry - we have clarified this in the text. We have added your claim that only minor changes would be needed to export to another platform to the text.

Poor Functionality and High Cost:

- The FDP is already delivering measurable benefits for patients.
 - 79 NHS Trusts are active on the FDP and reporting patient benefits.
 - Nationally, the programme has delivered 100,000 additional operations, while reducing discharge delays by 12 per cent, and removed more than 675,000 patients from the waiting list.

- The FDP is also demonstrating strong performance and value for money.
 - The UK Government's National Infrastructure & Services Transformation Authority has rated the NHS FDP programme "green."
 - The FDP is one of only 30 projects, out of 213 major government projects assessed, to receive this rating.
 - A "green" rating demonstrates that FDP is delivering and is highly likely to continue to succeed.
 - The UK Government estimates that the FDP will realise benefits in the order of £780 million over the 7-year appraisal period. This indicates a benefit-cost ratio of 4.92, meaning that for every pound spent on the programme, the Government expects to receive almost £5 back in benefits

Our response:

We cannot see any publicly available data or methodology for these benefit claims, which are made on NHS England's website, but we have added them to the text. We have added the NISTA rating to the text.

Hidden Costs:

- FDP adoption costs are funded by NHS England as part of the programme.

Our response:

We are aware that the majority of adoption costs are funded by NHS England as part of the programme. However, as highlighted in this report, some Trusts have spent additional money, which we understand comes from their own budgets.

Section 5: Public Trust and Staff Opposition

Clinical Resistance:

- One of the driving forces behind the introduction of the FDP was staff feedback.
- Hundreds of doctors and nurses have raised concerns about how difficult to use and inefficient NHS data systems can be. The FDP addresses that and saves healthcare workers hours in admin.
- Where the FDP has already been introduced, doctors, nurses and other NHS staff have reported positive experiences:
 - "[Palantir's software is] a game-changer for me. It's helping me to do my job faster and more efficiently, and has reduced my administrative burden." - [Jeffrey Ahmed](#), **Consultant Gynaecologist at Chelsea and Westminster Hospital.**
 - "We save large amounts of time using the NHS FDP product Outpatient CCS. Our Referral to Treatment validation team has freed up a day per week by using this product, which allows the team to review patient treatment lists in one place." - [Jenny Dando](#), **Care Coordination System Delivery Manager at Royal United Hospitals Bath NHS Foundation Trust.**
 - "This is a really good tool as it brings together a mix of important patient data sets into one system which allows the more efficient and effective use of theatre times and ultimately helps reduce patient waits." - [Dean Oliver](#), **Executive Director of Performance, Planning and Strategy, North Cumbria Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust.**
 - "This software has given everyone, from our board members to our medical secretaries, a clear and accurate picture of planned surgery activity for the

first time. The tool allows us to use a series of metrics to help us keep track of trajectory against our wider objectives and push ourselves to be as efficient as we can. We are not only saving staff time but have significantly improved how we use our surgical theatres, helping us see an increase to cases per list.” - [Jordan Todd](#), **Service Manager for Theatres, Anaesthesia and Critical Care at North Cumbria Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust**

- “This tool has allowed our operational teams to improve the management and coordination of the planned elective surgery lists for each speciality. Our surgeons are managing theatre sessions online and the trust is able to operate on more patients each day, helping drive down waiting lists.” - [Lesley Neary](#), **Chief Operating Officer at Mersey and West Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust.**
- “Connecting data and joining up our patient records gives clinicians all the information they need to prioritise the patients with the most urgent needs, book surgery and manage pre-assessment in one secure place, instead of logging in and out of numerous hospital systems. As well as reducing a patient’s waiting time, this also frees up vital clinical time so that they can focus on what matters most – caring for our patients.” - [Stella Vig](#), **Clinical Director and Consultant Surgeon at Croydon Health Services NHS Trust and Joint National Clinical Director for Elective Care at NHS England.**
- “This has revolutionised how we book our theatres. We have everything in one place, and everyone is kept informed on all changes, saving a lot of time, and avoiding confusion. When I come in on a Monday morning, I can instantly see what sessions are over or under-booked meaning I can send out messages informing people which sessions are available.” - [John Wells](#), **Theatre Manager, Great Western NHS Foundation Trust**
- “This solution is transformational and implementing new technology to support different ways of working has been motivational for those staff involved, whilst helping to provide greater access to treatment for our patients. We had disparate systems across our three sites and different theatre planning processes, and no single version of the truth in terms of a patient tracking list. This tool has helped us to align processes and come out the other side with a single planning framework. It’s been a hugely positive experience and has made a significant difference to our patients and staff.” - [Mark Major](#), **Deputy Group Director of Operations – Surgical Care Group, University Hospitals Dorset NHS Foundation Trust**
- “We are currently onboarding large numbers of our anaesthetists who have found the software an absolute goldmine in terms of being able to plan their work. We now have staff wanting to log in to this platform as the first thing in the morning - and that’s not just our theatre staff, its also our clinicians. I think the advantages to the patients are really quite stark and clear - because we are doing more cases per list we are then reducing our waiting lists for elective care.” - [Jon Cort](#), **Chief Digital Officer and Consultant Intensivist, Chesterfield Royal Hospital NHS Trust.**
- “I know that the FDP is perceived to be controversial in some circles, but for a digitally immature system, having that level of support and guidance has helped us and informed our data science strategy. The FDP is now at the centre of how we plan to innovate. Using the [Optimised Patient Tracking & Intelligent Choices \(OPTICA\)](#) cloud application supported our winter plan last year and remains one of the most popular applications I’ve ever deployed.” -

[Ed Prosser-Snelling](#), CDIO, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

- “The implementation of Cancer 360 has enabled my team to monitor and safely carry our patients through their cancer pathway. The tool has reduced the amount of admin time spent by our cancer team therefore enabling them to focus on the patient journey. I have witnessed an improvement in performance, team spirit and most importantly patient experience.” - **[Suraiya Abdi](#), Consultant Obstetrician and Gynaecologist, Chelsea and Westminster Foundation Trust.**
- “Every cancer patient deserves swift, effective care, and our new Cancer 360 solution harnesses data to ensure exactly that. By giving clinicians a comprehensive view of patient pathways, we can identify and address delays immediately. As Cancer 360 expands to more hospitals nationwide, I’m confident we’ll see meaningful improvements in both treatment times and patient experience.” - **[Dr Vin Diwakar](#), NHS England’s Clinical Transformation Director**
- “We’ve found it to be a valuable tool, and we’ve seen massive productivity gains in the things that we’ve implemented so far, so we think that if we can get it right, that data piece can be a huge opportunity for all of our teams across UHL and UHN.” - **[Will Monaghan](#), Group CDIO at University Hospitals of Leicester and University Hospitals of Northamptonshire.**

Our response:

We do not dispute that some staff claim to have benefits from the FDP and have noted this in the text. This does not change our assertion that many other staff are not happy to use Palantir software.