

Response ID ANON-G42Q-ERYC-H

Submitted to **Charge proposal for the UK Drone Registration Scheme**

Submitted on **2019-05-09 13:45:10**

Online Response

1 What is your name?

Name:

Phil Green

2 What is your email address?

Email:

philg@talk21.com

3 Which option best describes your interest in responding to this consultation?

Model aircraft

If other please specify:

I fly model aircraft and multi-rotors as a hobby. I also design and construct control systems as a hobby.

4 Do you already own a drone?

Yes

5 What is your view on the CAA's proposed charge, in terms of the level and structure of the charge?

Please add your comments here::

My lifetime career has been with British Telecom in IT beginning years before the arrival of the first PCs in 1980. I retired as Senior Networks and Security Designer but still maintain links with my network design colleagues. My job entailed designing datacentres such as Bletchley Park, Cardiff, and Edinburgh, and the design, costing and supervision of platform implementations. I personally designed two iterations of BT.com. I can therefore state with some authority that your stated figures of 2.8M pa for the installation and operation of such a tiny database, are absolutely ludicrous to the point that one senses criminal appropriation of public money.

The proposed charge is based on a wildly optimistic view of 170k registrations. Everyone except the CAA knows this is utterly ridiculous and will be unlikely to exceed a few tens of thousands.

Another serious concern is the deliberate exclusion of youngsters into aeromodelling.

Ours is a noble, honourable and rewarding hobby from which youngsters benefit greatly. It teaches the safe use of tools and principles of engineering, and electronics, and also traits such as dexterity, patience and pride. This will be taken away completely by CAP1775 when under-18s are barred from legally owning a model aircraft. I am a strong advocate of STEM in schools (stem emphasises the practical application of science, technology, engineering & maths) and previously youngsters could take up aeromodelling as a practical and enjoyable extension of their STEM learning. CAP1775 prevents this, and for no good reason. In the entire history of aviation no child with a model aeroplane has caused the CAA any concern.

I am concerned that this online form cannot provide sufficient data on which to formulate new laws. Question 3 implies that 'drone flying as a hobby' and 'model aircraft' are two separate activities. In CAA documentation elsewhere you state that they are all the same thing. Many hobbyists do both yet we are only allowed one answer. This is poor form design.

6 Do you have alternative ideas about how the CAA could cover the costs of running the registration scheme?

Yes

If Yes, please add your comments here::

Those who benefit from the proposed scheme should pay for it. Hobbyist model flyers and aeromodellers are not beneficiaries, in fact the opposite is the case.

7 Are the CAA's estimated volumes appropriate for the make-up of drone operators in the UK, based on existing sources of data and your own observations?

No

Please add your comments here::

The proposed charge is based on a wildly optimistic view of 170k registrations. Everyone except the CAA knows this is utterly ridiculous and will be unlikely to exceed a few tens of thousands. It is based on a misguided premise and will not achieve its stated aims.

If you planned to hold up a Post Office, would you register your shotgun first?

Model flyers have an excellent safety record and the BMFA has offered the use of its own very efficient database of the majority of model flyers in the UK. The BMFA as an umbrella organisation for model flyers is in a far stronger position to manage these records on behalf of the CAA.