



Drone Alliance Europe Position Paper on the European Parliament's Consideration of the Review of the EASA Basic Regulation

The European Parliament's Committee on Transport and Tourism is currently considering the European Commission's proposal to review the EASA Basic Regulation, presented last December as part of the Aviation Package. In parallel, work is underway in the Council of the European Union. Drone Alliance Europe welcomes MEPs' involvement in the drafting of new provisions on drones. Europe leads the world in the research and development of drone technology and is now working hard on ground breaking applications. Drones have the potential to generate considerable growth for the European economy, not just for the developers of drone technology, but also for users of drones for commercial purposes. Moreover, drones represent a tremendous opportunity for the creation of thousands of new jobs in Europe.

The TRAN Committee's review of the Regulation – which for the first time will see a single European approach to regulating and integrating drones – is a vital step to an exciting future. Consequently, MEPs on the TRAN Committee need to find ways to allow for the drone industry to reach its potential without compromising important issues such as safety, which must always be paramount, privacy and security.

This paper sets out the Drone Alliance Europe's position on the amendments that have been tabled to the drone section of the review of the EASA Basic Regulation, (Articles 45-47 and Annex IX). In general, we support the proposals, and we most certainly appreciate the work done by the TRAN Committee in reviewing the draft text.

We support the proposals to reinforce the focus on data protection, security and implementing a Europe-wide registration system.

One of the features of the proposed revision is to encourage EASA to move towards a performance-based system of safety regulation for Europe. This is a discussion beyond drones, but equally relevant to drones. We support that proposal unreservedly. Safety must always be our driving concern, but that needs to be considered in the context of the risk of any particular mission.

Therefore, we support the proposed amendments that call for a 'high uniform level of safety'.

However, some of the proposed amendments risk impeding the development of a competitive European drone market. We need to acknowledge that forcing compliance by 'box-ticking' is counterproductive. If the drone industry is to grow we need to find a way that focuses not on prescriptive solutions but one that focuses on ensuring that the risks of any particular operation are fully mitigated.

The Alliance is also concerned by amendments that call for only limited EU level harmonisation of the rules, giving Member States the possibility to adopt or maintain stricter, but differing, rules regarding security and safety protection. Whilst this sounds reasonable, it would in fact restrict the European drone industry by creating a patchwork of rules and requirements across the continent. It would introduce a subjective, instead of a harmonised and risk-based approach that provides legal certainty for the industry, a primary objective of the proposal.

Looking at each of the proposed amendments in turn:

Category	Proposed Amendment	DAE Comments	Recommended Action
European vs State-by-State Approach	291; 293; 643	This amendment opens door to only partial harmonisation; creates subjective criteria; risks patchwork approach; contradicts amendments calling for 'high uniform level of safety'.	Reject 293 and 643 Support 291
Highlighting risk-based approach	636	This amendment succinctly puts forward the performance-based approach.	Support as a recital
Enforcing compliance-based regulation	645, 651, 652, 653, 655, 660, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1086, 1103	Introducing specific licensing and other regulations without regard to the particular risk does not enhance safety, but does multiply the compliance burden.	Reject, unless can be made clear that such licences can be risk-based
Operator vs 'Pilot'	414; 1086; 1101	The word 'pilot' fails to understand the means by which drones are operated. The text of the draft regulation uses 'a person operating' and for the sake of consistency this should be regularised. Furthermore, 'pilot' does not allow for the increasingly autonomous nature of these operations.	Reject
Registration	295; 296; 419; 460; 647, 656, 648, 649, 650, 1094	A reliable registration procedure is a fundamental requirement for regulating drone operations. We support a single European database. However, identification should be electronic, not visual.	Reject 295; 296; 460 Support 419, 647, 656, 648, 649, 650, 1094
Elevating the safety threshold from 'adequate' to 'high'	637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 654, 1093	Notwithstanding that a strict adherence to a performance-based regime would not require this change, we support a widespread, high-level, understanding of the risks and responsibilities inherent in the	Support

		operation of drones.	
Elevating the safety knowledge requirement on operators from 'being familiar' to 'adequate'	1084, 1085, 1086	Notwithstanding that a strict adherence to a performance-based regime would not require this change, we support a widespread, high-level, understanding of the risks and responsibilities inherent in the operation of drones.	Support
Adding data protection considerations	1092; 1102	This is a requirement under EU law and we support its inclusion.	Support
Adding security considerations	654; 659 (2 nd part)	Security issues are, without question, vital. However, we should make a clear distinction between a situation where it is linked to the certification process (2 nd part of AM 659) and local allocation (where EASA has no competence).	Reject AM 654 Support the 2 nd part of AM 659
Allowing the Commission to supplement Annex IX	657; 659 (1 st part)	Technology continues to evolve and is not fixed, therefore the Commission should have an ability to refine and supplement the essential requirements set out in Annex IX.	Reject
EASA remit to include personnel	634, 635, 637, 641, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1098, 1099	Notwithstanding that these proposed amendments will increase compliance costs, we agree that including personnel education is important.	Support
Exemptions for very small devices	286; 288; 413; 646; 1100	DAE supports the commercial operation of drones, regardless of size. The issue is what is the mission, not the size of the device.	Reject

About Drone Alliance Europe: DAE was formed earlier this year by Altitude Angel, Amazon Prime Air, Delft Aerial Robotics, Gatewing, ParaZero and Unify. We are a coalition of leading technology and drone companies from across Europe. The goal of the group is to assist European regulators and policymakers as they craft drone legislation and regulations. The Alliance seeks a system with strong public support that allows for safe and flexible beyond visual line of sight autonomous operations across Europe.

Please visit dronealliance.eu, contact andrew@dronealliance.eu, or follow [@DroneAllianceEU](https://twitter.com/DroneAllianceEU) on Twitter.