

From: Tupper, Stephen
To: UASrfc2015@ntia.doc.gov
Subject: Docket No. 150224183-5183-01
Date: Monday, April 20, 2015 5:38:29 PM

The University of Missouri has worked with the AAU and APLU and agrees with their recommendations to NTIA on Privacy, Transparency, and Accountability Regarding Commercial and Private Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems.

We agree with AAU-APLU that universities and commercial entities are differently situated with varying motives for data collection, and should therefore be treated separately as part of any UAS policymaking regime, including the NTIA multi-stakeholder process. Our four campuses are inherently different from commercial users in a few significant ways.

First, we focus on research and instructional use of UAS for the benefit of society, whereas commercial entities are motivated by profit margins. This is relevant because financial motivations for invasions of individual privacy are not present in the university context.

Second, we operate under different legal and policy frameworks commercial firms. We operate under a comprehensive web of laws, rules, regulations, policies and guidance that already regulate the behavior of faculty, staff and students on campus. These rules protect against privacy harms and other violations on campus—including any violations associated with the use of UAS. As an example of this, universities utilize an Institutional Review Board ("IRB") process to review and approve research by faculty involving human subjects. The IRB process includes established protections to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of data collected by researchers, including that collected by UAS. In addition, universities have technology-neutral and platform-neutral data retention and electronic privacy policies that apply to the collection of data by UAS. Universities have procedures in place for reporting suspected cases of misuse or abuse of university equipment, including UAS. Moreover, universities maintain policies and procedures that provide oversight of individuals who have access to sensitive information collected using UAS.

We are very supportive of NTIA's effort to craft privacy, transparency and accountability best practices to prevent against harms associated with commercial use of UAS. We share the American public's concern about potential privacy issues associated with UAS operation by others. Universities take the privacy and security of our students, faculty, and employees very seriously. In particular, the commercial use of UAS poses risks associated with the collection of commercially-valuable information on consumers' habits, preferences, choices, behaviors, or patterns, as well as student activity images and intercollegiate athletics, by others on university campuses. Therefore, we look forward to monitoring the NTIA multi-stakeholder process and applaud efforts to develop protections against the abuse of this new technology in the commercial setting.

We believe that the NTIA Working Groups should include all relevant stakeholders, including most particularly academic researchers with particular interest in the subject matter. Academic researchers and faculty can offer unique and objective perspectives that will be very useful for all stakeholders to consider. Moreover, university faculty include subject matter experts on the First Amendment, privacy and aviation—all of whom have knowledge and experience that could substantially bolster the NTIA multi-stakeholder

process.

The NTIA multi-stakeholder process should keep in mind that UAS are just a platform for a camera, or other technology. Some of the privacy concerns they present are unique to UAS, but others are not. Often, broadly applicable laws or rules already cover the harm in question. Universities believe it is important to focus the policymaking process on privacy harms the multi-stakeholder participants determines are unique to UAS.

As policymakers consider best practices for UAS, it is worth noting that micro, small and large UAS platforms offer different capabilities, and consequently, the multi-stakeholder process should discuss whether they should be treated differently. Larger UAS can carry larger payloads that are often more sophisticated, with higher resolutions. Smaller UAS are more likely to be broadly available, since they are more affordable. Consequently, smaller UAS arguably pose a greater risk of invasions of individual privacy. In distinguishing between various sizes of UAS platforms, policymakers should strive to develop precise definitions of different UAS in order to avoid ambiguity.

The University of Missouri recognizes that transparency is essential to educating the public and building trust associated with UAS. As such, our universities support transparency best practices that would require commercial entities to publicly disclose data retention and other privacy policies.

And University of Missouri agrees with the NTIA that accountability is important to prevent abuse and encourage responsible use of UAS. As mentioned above, universities have extensive accountability protocols already in place, including rules of conduct, training, audits and assessments. Perhaps these accountability protocols could provide a model for best practices in the commercial context.

The University of Missouri joins the AAU and APLU to commend the Federal Government and the NTIA for pursuing a multi-stakeholder process to establish privacy, transparency, and accountability best practices for the commercial use of UAS. There are significant economic benefits associated with the commercial and private use of UAS, but universities understand that this emerging technology raises privacy concerns. Therefore, this multi-stakeholder process will play an important role to foster public confidence, and to establish privacy, transparency and accountability protocols for commercial users of UAS.

Respectfully,

S. H. Tupper, F. SAME; Missouri University of Science and Technology; tuppers@mst.edu
Fort Leonard Wood office (573) 329 – 8515; Rolla office (573) 341-6756
