

Submission 155 – Paul Radford

Remote ID Consultation group - Drones
Department of Infrastructure and Transport

drones@infrastructure.gov.au

Introduction of Remote-ID - will infringe people's rights

Dear Sirs,

I write to express my concern and dismay at events currently unfolding within the Australian aviation industry, in particular the issue of the proposed introduction of Remote ID for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles UAV's or Radio controlled aircraft including drones.

The activity of Radio Controlled aircraft has been one in existence in this country for over 5 decades. It has been conducted in a safe manner with little or no recorded incidents. Today's RC Pilot (many of whom are children), are tomorrows Pilots, Airframe mechanics, Air traffic controllers and the list goes on. This is grassroots aviation at its finest. It is vital to encourage young people to participate in this highly valued and important pastime. Notwithstanding that, there are many older RC and UAV pilots that make up this hobby and in some instances profession and industry. Many of whom are mentors to younger pilots wishing to participate.

The Department of Transport and Infrastructure recently issued a so-called invitation for public consultation for a proposed introduction of Remote-ID that is planned for all RC aircraft. I was only aware of this after the expiry date for submissions. The proposal suggests that the concept is to ensure that those flying these aircraft are held responsible for the control and safe operation of them. In principle I have no issue with this as safe operation has been conducted for decades, why do we need remote ID?

The so called public consultation document issued by the department, is vailed as an attempt to be seen as consulting on this issue, where in fact it has already made

the assumption that remote-ID is a given. Rather, the document should seek to ask the question why we should implement this proposal. The length of time given to the so called public consultation was both inadequate and not widely publicized.

With the evaluation prior to introducing new legislation of this nature, one would think the department has done research into the "Why". I have read through the document and can not find any links to substantive data collected with regard to what is being proposed. In essence the proposal of remote ID is seeking to solve a safety issue that clearly does not exist. It would appear that the Department of Transport and Infrastructure is seeking to mimic the recent ham-fisted introduction of remote ID by the FAA in the United States. This legislation is receiving a large push back because of the basic rights it infringes. I won't go into the many reasons why most believe it is doomed to fail, but suffice to say they are countless.

The aviation community in the USA is strong and well funded and has a huge political clout. Sadly not so in Australia. Australia's aviation industry is in a dismal state, one of the primary reasons is due to the regulator CASA. That is another lengthy letter entirely .

The aviation industry in the USA works well at all levels and is hugely inclusive. It seeks at all times to engender the love of Aviation and to protect its industry moving into the future. There is no better example of this than "Kid Venture" at the Oshkosh airshow in the USA. held only a week or so ago. It is almost too hard to describe how big this show is and the impact it has on young people to encourage them to participate.

I attended a seminar a few years back at Oshkosh 2019. The question was asked amongst the Pilot attendees, at least one thousand at this one seminar of many, "hands up who started out flying model aircraft"? 90% of hands were raised. That's how important it is.

Conversely it pains me to see how obstructed aviation is in this country.

We need to encourage, not discourage people from participating in this grass roots hobby. To do so would be of further detriment to our already fragile Aviation Industry's future.

The FAA's response to critics of remote ID is to fob it off, with the reply It's just like a license plate on a car. Far from it in my opinion, this is more akin to an ankle bracelet attached to a criminal. The proposed legislation is just that, assuming someone is guilty and treating them as a criminal before any supposed wrongdoing. It is a violation of basic rights. As the great Kerry Packer said during a senate inquiry "everytime you people introduce a new law you take away someone's privileges". The rest of his address is legendary.

I believe there should be questions raised in the parliament about this proposal and to look at this entire process and ask the following questions:

- Why should we automatically introduce Remote-ID
- What incidents have occurred in Australian Airspace in at least the past 5 years that would warrant putting up this idea.
- How many UAV's have strayed into controlled airspace, when and where
- How many UAV's have collided with other aircraft?, when and where
- How many UAV's have caused death or serious injury to persons and property, when and where.

What research has been conducted that would suggest Remote-ID would fix any of these things if in fact they actually existed. I would suggest none.

It stuns me that the government would spend taxpayers money to put up a proposal to solve a problem that does not exist.

I am calling on you to halt this ridiculous piece of proposed legislation and put a stop to it. We do not need it, and the cost of policing it is a further unnecessary tax burden. However the most important reason is to not infringe the rights and privileges of those who participate in this great hobby and have done so safely for decades, without incident.

There are too many rights and privileges being eroded by the government everyday in this country. This piece of legislation is the thin edge of the wedge. What next, remote ID for automobiles ? Can you imagine the outcry if this happened.

Just think about this. There have been many collisions of Aircraft with birds that have caused injury, damage or death, yet the department does not seek to attach Remote-ID to birds. So why attach them to UAV's? The concept is a farce at best.

I would appreciate your consideration of this matter, before it is too far down the track to action. The department of Transport and Infrastructure need to re think this legislation and questions need to be asked by Senate estimates.

I can be contacted on:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

Paul Dadford