

Submission 21 – OzFaxFlyer

The definition of a 'drone' is used interchangeably with the term 'UAV' throughout the Discussion Paper, and the existing legislation.

I can only presume that you intend the proposed restrictions to bind both quadcopters ('drones') and other fixed and rotary winged radio controlled aircraft (powered and un-powered) equally.

I have been safely flying radio-controlled (model) aircraft for over 45 years under the Model Aeronautical Association of Australia, and associated FAA International guidelines, owning and operating powered and un-powered fixed wing aircraft (mostly self-built), and a few small quadcopters.

Our organised hobby has a demonstrated history, and formal record of this regime adequately addressing all of the ostensible reasons you have presented for needing 'Remote ID'.

Why do you consider it necessary to inflict substantial cost, inconvenience and additional legislation on a hobby that does not warrant it, to 'solve' a problem that does not exist within the organised radio-controlled hobby?

I presume that the individual cost of retro fitting each of my aircraft will be borne by me - potentially, the cost of a mobile phone per aircraft if NRID is adopted. Can you deny this is your policy intention?

Further, the Paper does not address who is intended to pay for the presumed enforcement costs - what are your policy intentions in those regards?

Do you intend yet another example of where those persons that choose to obey the legislation, get to pay for those that never will?