Question for written answer E-004291/2025
to the Commission
Rule 144
Hanna Gedin (The Left)

Subject: Surveillance in the workplace

Employees in Sweden are reporting extensive real-time surveillance in the workplace, with cameras pointed at staff toilets, managers who monitor the surveillance even during holidays, and follow-up meetings being called because employees drink water too often. In the transport sector, cameras are mounted above the driver's seat in lorries and pointed at the driver's face, which raises serious privacy concerns. The Swedish Authority for Privacy Protection (IMY) has criticised the way the GDPR is being applied and is calling for an EU review of the rules in force. Since April of 2025, businesses have no longer needed to apply for a permit from the IMY: they decide for themselves whether the camera surveillance is legal.

Sweden has chosen not to allow trade unions to file complaints with the IMY. This undermines the protection of employees' privacy. Employees of the same firm should enjoy an equivalent level of privacy protection, no matter which EU country they work in.

1. How does the Commission assess the compatibility of real-time surveillance with the GDPR requirements on legality, transparency and proportionality?

2. What risks does the Commission see in allowing operators to assess the legality of camera surveillance themselves, and is there a need to tighten up the rules in force?

3. What view does the Commission take of the Swedish model under which trade unions are not entitled to represent employees or to file complaints against employers with IMY, even though this significantly undermines workers' privacy?

Submitted: 3.11.2025