

“FLYING WITHOUT SOULS” A Comparative Analysis of Laws Governing Drones in Sri Lanka and the European Union

AKS De Silva^{1#}

¹Sri Lanka Air Force, Colombo, Sri Lanka

[#]kapilaaf@gmail.com

Abstract: *This research evaluates whether the degree of consistency and relevancy of drone and UAV laws existing in the Sri Lankan legal regime is sufficient to cater for society's needs compared to the laws governing in the European Union. To reach the objective of the research, it adopted a qualitative research method that includes personnel interviews, a library-based black letter approach, and a comparative analysis of international materials. In the inception of the discussion, this research highlights the challenge of formulating a viable and normative law in character pertaining to drones, which is an inevitably necessary and integral task. In the research, both the European Union Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/947 of 2019 and the Civil Aviation Authority of Sri Lanka's regulation UAS-IS-2022 on Implementing Standards Requirements for the Operation of Pilotless Aircraft were extensively examined to identify the credentials for the operation of unmanned aircraft in the two regimes. In the analysis of EU Regulation (EU) 2019/947, it was found and appreciated that higher consistency prevailed in the regulations governing drones on the regulations affecting registration, certification, privacy rights, assessing operator competency, and commercial utilisation compared to the SL regime. The research concludes that the SL regulation for Implementing Standards UAS-IS-2022, Requirements for the Operation of Pilotless Aircraft, entails significant legal flaws in the areas of registration, certification, privacy rights, assessing operator competency, and commercial utilisation. Finally, the research proposed six recommendations based on its findings to rectify the existing defaults in the prevailing drone regulations in SL.*

Keywords: Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, Drone, European Union, Regulation (EU) 2019/947, Regulation UAS-IS-2022

I. INTRODUCTION

An **unmanned aerial vehicle or system (UAV or UAS)**, commonly known as a **drone**, is an aircraft without any human pilot, crew, or passengers on board. UAVs and UAS use aerodynamic forces to provide vehicle lift, can fly autonomously, can be expendable or recoverable, and

can carry a lethal or nonlethal payload (Free Dictionary.com 2015). Autonomously or remotely controlled devices were once the exclusive province of science fiction writers and conspiracy theorists. But, over the course of the last several decades, that fiction became a reality, and drone operations are now poised to be a cornerstone of society in the 21st century. As a result, the world is on the verge of a technological revolution in aviation, with the number of unmanned aircraft operations expected to surpass manned aircraft operations within the next 20 years (Hodgkinson and Johnston 2020). UAVs and UASs were initially only used for military applications (Meltzer 2008). Today, they can be utilised for a variety of tasks and can work in a variety of settings, including those that are difficult or pose significant risks to people (Clarke 2014). They may fly in proximity to the targets, enabling more precise measurements and better-targeted operations like observing traffic and people, the environment, ensuring public security, and delivering goods (Amazon 2018). Drone and UAV activities in Sri Lanka (SL) date back to the Elam War. At that time, drones and UAVs were only used for military surveillance and security information collection during military operations. A decade later, however, smaller, portable drones are already being employed by numerous segments in this country, including media, live coverage, disaster assistance, recreation, and so on. Despite these advantages, the diverse capabilities of drones constitute a possible threat to people's liberty and national security. UAVs and drones can be used by opposing forces to carry out terrorist attacks, surprise strikes on significant and sensitive targets (Meltzer 2008), and the unlawful collection of video recordings, resulting in a violation of privacy (Cavoukian 2012). Further launches and releases of UAVs near airfields where civil and military aircraft operate may endanger flight safety and result in an aviation tragedy. As such, it is of utmost importance to identify and demarcate the limits and scope of the use of drone technology in any jurisdiction by establishing a credible legal regime in those areas. Thus, the authorities of this country have the challenge of addressing the concerns and formulating credible, timely laws and privacy regulations regarding the use of drones in SL. In addition, it should be

considered that future development-focused drone operation regulations must comply with the international obligation to act with due regard to international safety and navigation standards. As a result, the purpose of this research is to assess the current legal system governing drone use in SL in order to identify its developments and lacunae in comparison to the European Union's (EU) regulation governing drone use. In addition, based on research findings, the research proposes recommendations to improve the current legal regime in SL governing drone laws.

II. METHODOLOGY

This research adopted a qualitative research method that includes personnel interviews, a library-based black letter approach, and a comparative analysis of international materials. An interview is a qualitative research technique used by forwarding open-ended questions to converse with respondents and collect elicited data. It is a purely conversational method that invites opportunities to get in-depth details from the respondent. The rest of the data collection was conducted through primary resources such as relevant legislation, international conventions, and judicial decisions and secondary resources such as research articles, books with critical analysis, journal articles, other electronic resources, and empirical data available at both libraries and electronic databases. This research was carried out as a comparative analysis by comparing the Sri Lankan legal framework with EU laws. EU standards were selected due to their comprehensiveness and well-structured analysis based on their long application on the continent, thus enabling them to be adapted and improvised in the SL legal framework.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. *INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK REGULATING DRONES*

There is no provision in international law specifically referring to the use of drones. Instead, the provisions of the Chicago Convention of 1944 and the principles of the Four Geneva Conventions of 1949 governing international humanitarian law (IHL) during war are considered primary legal sources. The Chicago Convention Article 8 regulates 'pilotless aircraft. According to Article 8, in order for a pilotless aircraft to fly over a contracting state under the Chicago Convention, special authorization from that state will be required. As drones are a species of 'aircraft', many other Articles of the Chicago Convention may apply to them; for example, Article 36, which allows contracting states to 'prohibit or regulate the use of photographic apparatus in aircraft over their territory, may apply to drones. As per Article 12, as a type of aircraft, drones must also follow the 'rules of the air'. In addition, articles that may apply to drones are 3, 15, 31, 29, 32, and 33. Meantime as per Article 37, drones

are also capable of being regulated by the ICAO, which is mandated to regulate matters concerned with the safety, regularity, and efficiency of air navigation.

Indeed, UAVs and drones are resourceful weapons in the modern battlefield. Therefore, UAVs that support or use force are not prohibited; international law clearly circumscribes their use. In armed conflict, it is expected that their use to support or carry out attacks must conform to IHL rules of distinction, proportionality, and precautions. Article 36 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 (AP I), which requires that each state party determine whether the employment of any new weapon, means, or method of warfare. Thus, every state should ensure that the new weapons it develops or acquires, like UAVs and drones, are used in accordance with its international legal obligations. One of the fundamental rules of IHL requires AP I, Articles 48, 51(2), and 52(2), that parties to an armed conflict distinguish between civilian persons and civilian objects in an armed conflict. Hence, for any use of UAVs in armed conflict, operators are responsible for providing general protection to civilian individuals, populations, and objects.

B. *LEGAL CHALLENGES IN REGULARISING DRONE OPERATIONS*

It is apparent that modern technological developments occur at such a pace nowadays as to leave those responsible for devising fair and workable rules to govern the use of the products face a challenge. This is more apparent than it is in relation to the proliferation of unmanned aerial vehicles, remotely piloted aircraft, or, as they have conveniently come to be known, drones. Hence, as said, one of the main challenges faced by lawmakers in regulating drones is their sociolegal effects due to the rapid pace of development in drone technology and the diversity of drone use (Stöcker et al. 2017). This research found that domestic legislation and international treaties take significant lengths of time to negotiate, draft, and enter into force to address such matters. This is particularly true for multilateral treaties, presenting significant challenges for consensus-building that may be required to create uniform laws, especially for drones (Weizmann 2013). Thus, lawmakers and regulators have often dealt with these issues by retrofitting old laws to overcome new technology domestically. One of the areas in which retrofitting the law is most evident are privacy, national security, safety, and sovereignty (Ewers et al 2017). Especially in the SL context, there are many possible societal challenges and corresponding policy issues for UAVs. A very recent incident relating to drones is that the Director General of Civil Aviation (DGCA), complying with the powers vested in him banned the operation of drones until further notice due to the prevailing security conditions in the country after the Easter Sunday attack. In such scenarios, the violators of the regulation were subjected to arrest under Section 107

of Civil Aviation Act No. 14 of 2010. Thus, the operation of drones poses significant sociolegal challenges in the present context. A full discussion of all the societal implications of UAVs is beyond the scope of this study. Thus, this study made a comparative analysis of the EU and SL prospects, mainly focusing on national security, privacy, personal safety, and private UAV certification procedures of the two regimes.

C. CURRENT REGULATIONS ON UAVS IN SRILANKA

Drones have historically been used most often for military purposes in SL. Nowadays, in addition to military purposes, smaller, portable drones are being used by many civil segments in this country that involve media, live coverage, disaster relief, recreation, etc. The laws and rules governing drone operations are governed by two major legislations in SL: the Civil Aviation Authority of Sri Lanka (CAASL) Act No. 34 of 2002 and the Civil Aviation Act (CAA) No. 14 of 2010. The CAASL Act provides for the establishment of the CAASL. The DGCA of CAASL has empowered and introduced regulations governing drones in the form of Section 103 of Civil Aviation Act No. 14 of 2010. The first regulations were published in 2015. Then these regulations have been updated every year since then. According to the CAASL, the existing Implementing Standards (IS) Regulations UAS-IS-2022 were issued on 06.01.2022 which supersedes IS-053 dated 10th January 2017 which is subjected to present discussion.

1) *Approved Drone categories and operations*-According to UAS-IS-2022 regulations, drones are categorised into four categories based on their mass. Drones weighing 25 kg and above are known as **category A**. **Category B** comprises drones of mass ranging from 1kg to 25kg. Drones weighing 200g to 1kg are included in **category C**. **Category D** includes drones with a mass of less than 200g. As per regulation, drones in Category A require explicit approval from the DGCA, and such permission should comply with personnel licencing, aircraft operations, and airworthiness applicable to manned aircraft. Category B drones must be operated under the authority of the DGCA. Category C drones without any data-capturing tools or any payload that may be a threat to safety or infringe on privacy may be operated with the registration of a vendor who is certified for the purpose by the DGCA. Category D drones can be operated below 150 feet without permission.

2) *Safety, insurance, and accidents procedure*-The existing regulations, UAS-IS-2022, serial No. 13, provide that any drone is prohibited from operating at speeds above 87 knots (100 mph). It further provides that they also cannot be operated under unsuitable weather conditions or when visibility is reduced to below 5 km. Operators are not allowed to operate more than one drone

at once or from a moving vehicle. The drone operator or drone owner is required to contact the nearest police station in the event of an accident or injury, and the incident report must also be sent to the CAASL within 48 hours. Further, operators' sense of social responsibility and physical and mental health conditions are also addressed in the regulation in literal terms; however, the regulation is silent in demarcating and assessing the physical and mental health conditions that it allows to be assessed under general law. UAS-IS-2022 regulations, serial No. 29, state that no pilotless aircraft of mass category A, B, or C shall be operated without valid insurance coverage, at least in respect of third-party injury and/or damage. However, no particular insurance standard is mentioned in the regulation. In addition, it states, a person who remotely operates pilotless aircraft shall comply with all other applicable public laws that govern such operations.

3) *registration and competency of UAV operators*-The regulations, UAS-IS-2022, Serial No. 7 A, state that anyone who operates any UAV or drone of category A, B, or C needs to register at the CAASL. The registration requirement for Category-A aircraft shall be the same as for any other powered aircraft. Category A, B, and C drones all need an identification stamp on them while operating, and their registration certificate is valid for a period of two years and is renewable. Regulations, Serial No. 8, further say that after completing a competency check, the operator will be given a 'Remote Pilot Authorization Certificate' (RPAC) on payment of a fee. The operator must be over 18 years of age to qualify for RPAC and must complete the exams for Unmanned Aircraft Basic Training (UABT) and Unmanned Aircraft Training and Assessment (UAT) explained in the Unmanned Aircraft Training Organisation Manual of CAASL. Anyhow, if the user wants to complete the exams without taking the training, that option is also available. Hence, no consistency prevails in the SL regulation on the competency assessment method of drone operators.

4) *Commercial utilization* -As per existing regulations, UAS-IS-2022, serial number 10, commercial operations of drones are not permitted regardless of the mass category without special authorization from the DGCA. Thus, the use of drones for commercial functions is not permitted under this regulation. As a result, there is no immediate expectation of drone technology contributing to economic development in SL.

5) *Privacy and Prohibited operations*-The regulation UAS-IS-2022, serial number 15, is important because it discusses the civil rights of third parties that entail privacy protection. It embedded that when operating a pilotless aircraft equipped with telemetry devices, the remote pilot must always keep in mind that only the **planned and intended objects are being captured**. Further, they must also make sure that the privacy, civil rights, and civil

liberties of third parties are never infringed upon. However, the regulation does not specify how to identify the planned and intended objects being captured. In addition, it was mentioned that privacy was never infringed and that no demarcation was available in the regulation for persevering limit of privacy. In addition, regulations UAS-IS-2022 serial numbers 19 to 26 elaborate exclusively prohibited acts pursuant to drone operations, such as the dropping of objects or banners, towing carriage of any foreign object, air competition, modifications, radio interference, and off-shore operations and aerial work.

D. CURRENT REGULATIONS ON UAVS IN THE EU

The European Union (EU) has two bodies that are particularly involved in UAVs: the European Commission (EC) and the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). The most important action taken by the EASA is the development of the new E.U. drone regulation, which came into effect on December 31, 2020, titled "Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/947 of 24th May 2019 on the Rules and Procedures for the Operation of Unmanned Aircraft 2019/947. Under this Regulation (EU) 2019/947 articles 4,5 and 6 UAVs are grouped into three categories: **open** (flights with low risk), **specific** (medium risk), and **certified** (high risk, larger size or dangerous cargo). The categories are defined based on the weight, size, and type of good that is being carried (i.e., dangerous goods such as explosives, gases, flammable liquids, or solids etc.). There are subcategories, which further break down the open and specific categories into groups depending on weight and size.

1) Open category- **According to IRs EU 2019/947 Article 4, operations in the open category** do not require prior authorizations or pilot licences. However, they are limited to operations in visual line of sight (VLOS), below 120 m altitude, and performed with a privately built drone or a drone compliant with the technical requirements defined in the regulation. In this category, the maximum take-off mass is less than 25 kg (55 lbs) if the aircraft will not carry any dangerous goods or drop any material. According to the regulation Annex, Part A, the open category is segregated into three additional subcategories, A1, A2, and A3. Further, all subcategories are assigned a class identification label of 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4.

*2) Specific Category -***According to IRs EU 2019/947— Article 5, the Specific Category** is reserved for drones that do not meet the requirements laid out above within the Open Category due to their increased level of operational risk. Only high-risk operations require compliance with classical aviation rules under the "certified" category (like operating in controlled airspace), according to Article 13 in Regulation (EU) 2019/947. Operations involving drones weighing more than 25 kg and/or operated beyond the visual line of sight will

typically fall under the "specific" category. Before starting an operation in the specific category, operators must either perform a risk assessment (using a standardised operation risk assess method, that will be provided by EASA). The operational risk assessment shall include, but is not limited to "(a) description of UAS operation, (b) proposal for maintaining operational safety, (c) identification of ground and air risks to, for example, uninvolved persons, objects, etc., (d) measures for risk mitigation, (e) technical characteristics of the UAS and (f) competencies of the personnel. The EU regulation further states that the remote pilot should operate under a standard scenario issued by EASA or their National Aviation Authority (NAA).

3) certified category- **According to IRs EU 2019/947— Article 6, the operation of UAS missions is considered in the certified operation category** if the UAS is certified pursuant to Article 40 of DRs EU 2019/945. Drone activities that involve a high degree of risk fall under the certified category. Large drones, which pose an inherent risk if something goes wrong, fall under this category. According to points (a), (b), and (c) of Article 40's first paragraph of Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/945, all drones in this category should possess certification. The "certified" category will be subject to the same regulations as manned aviation. Operations under this should be classified as UAS operations in the Certified Category based on the risk assessment provided in Article 11 of EU 2019/947, which considers the risk of the operation. The operation of drones under this category is expected to be conducted over large groups of people and involves the transport of humans and dangerous goods.

E. COMPARISON BETWEEN SL AND EU REGULATIONS

According to UAS-IS-2022 regulations, drones are categorised into four categories: A, B, C, and D based on their mass. Similarly, as per IRs EU 2019/947, UAVs are grouped into three categories: open (flights with low risk), specific (medium risk), and certified (high risk, larger size, or dangerous cargo).

As per SL UAS-IS-2022 regulations, Serial No. 7 A person who operates any drone in categories A, B, or C needs to register at the CAASL. The registration requirement for Category-A aircraft shall be the same as for any other powered aircraft. However, the CAASL's current registration systems are identified as orthodox and out-of-date since authorization of registration involves other external entities. For instance, final approval of the CAASL is determined by the scrutiny of SLAF and OCD. Thus, the CAASL registration system is not independent and moreover complex. Despite the fact that regulation mandates that one register a drone and possess a valid licence in order

to fly, the CAASL itself does not appear to be working on a way to streamline this procedure for the general public. Meantime according to IRs EU 2019/947 Article 14, a registration a UAS is required when flying in the open category if the UAS meets any of the following conditions: (a) Maximum takeoff mass (MTOM) is 250 g or more; (b) the UAS is integrated with a payload, like, for instance, a sensor that could be used for personal data collection. In contrast, when it is to fly in a specific category, the registration of UAS is mandatory. To this end, the rules have clearly addressed who should register and when, but implementing the aforementioned registration system in a practical way is still a key challenge. This is due to the fact that each EU member state has to create an online platform for the registration process, which does not yet exist in many EU countries. However, the steps and procedures for complying with registration clearly entailed IRs EU 2019/947 Article 14.

It is perceived from those SL regulations that the mere issuing of directives is of concern to the DGCA, which has not evaluated future concerns to address the societal challenges that come with adopting new cyber physical systems. Hence The frustration over this has inevitably resulted in drone flight that contravenes these regulations, even by those who are interested in lawful flight. Further excessive government control over the majority of aspects of drone operations is enabled by present regulations. Therefore, the likelihood of resorting to unauthorised drone flights is great and encourages unlawful pathways, neglecting the pragmatism of imposition in controlling every aspect of the law.

Meantime The EU legal framework applies to all sorts of present and prospective drone operations, encouraging the development of novel applications and the establishment of a European market for unmanned aircraft services (de Miguel and Segarra 2018). These efforts complemented and laid the way for a less restrictive European Roadmap for the integration of Civil Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems into the European Aviation System (Cifaldi et al. 2018). However, while the regulation's primary goal is to ensure the safe operation of drones, articles 4, 5, and 6 include a section on safety. The flying range is the most recognised and often used guideline. Regulation states UAVs must fly lower than 120 metres in the open category; higher than 120 metres in the specified category; and a special permission is necessary in the certified category. Further, the European regulatory framework will also facilitate the enforcement of citizens' privacy rights and address concerns for the benefit of EU citizens. In order to protect privacy, it mandates that if the UAV has sensors that can breach privacy, it must be registered. Moreover, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) has become a mandatory regulatory approach for managing privacy in drone operations instead. Thus,

UAS, drones, and drone operations are subject to the privacy principles outlined in GDPR Article 5.1-2 (seven protection and accountability principles) in EU states.

When it comes to the current regulation UAS-IS-2022 of SL, it seems to remain ignorant of the operation of drones, leading to violations of privacy in many events, especially media coverage and emergency situations, since the preservation limit of privacy is not demarcated within the literal sphere. In SL, based on Roman Dutch law, a breach of privacy would give rise to an action for injury under the *actio iniuriarum*. Though the right to privacy is not recognised as an important fundamental right under the 1978 Constitution, there are certain laws that recognise the right to privacy in SL. These include the Computer Crimes Act (CCA) No. 24 of 2007, the Right to Information Act (RTI) No. 12 of 2016, and the Personal Data Protection Act (PDPA) No. 9 of 2022. Further, the recent cases of *Hewamanna v. Attorney General* (1999) and the Sunday Times defamation case in 2000 have explicitly identified privacy as a fundamental right. However, the present regulation is weak in demarcating privacy obligations in drone operations since it appears to be a general directive and references no specific act or law.

In terms of national security, careful limitation of drone activities is a critical instrument in manoeuvring on this land when examining the difficulties that have arisen in the country's recent history, namely terrorism, extremism, vandalism, and so on. As a result, the current regulation provides strict application instruments for the authority handling drone matters in SL. However, it is recognised that national security issues are not prioritised under EU regulations. However, in terms of national security, the EU rule mandates member states to develop registration systems for UAVs and to preserve a record of UAV operators and producers.

The EU regulation 2019/947 implements that all three categories of drones require operators to have received some training, whether it is an official certification or self-practicum, unless they weigh less than 250 g. In order to achieve competency, there are three standard levels of training and assessment tests for operators outlined: the Basic Operator Registration and Competency Test, the A2 Certificate of Competence (A2 C of C), and the General Visual Line of Sight Operations (VLOS) Certificate of Competence (GVC). However, according to the SL regulations, UAS-IS-2022, serial no. 8 A person who operates any drones in category 'A' after completing a competency check, the operator will be given a 'Remote Pilot Authorization Certificate' on payment of a fee. However, the specificity of the standard of competency rating entity has not been embedded in the SL regulations since it states:

“...completion of a competency check conducted by the CAASL or any other designated person or organisation.”

As per the preceding paragraph, the exclusive authority to conduct the competency check is not vested in CAASL; further, it is allowed to be done for any other designated person. In addition, there was no explanation about the other designated person. Thus, nonconclusiveness carries the regulation on the matter.

As per EU regulation It is a legal requirement embedded in EC 785/2004 to hold public liability insurance if operating a drone for general/ commercial gain. The said insurance standard covers minimum insurance requirements for air carriers and aircraft operators in respect of passengers, baggage, cargo, and third parties. As a result, the insurance requirements for drone operations are spelled out in the EU framework. Under SL regulation UAS-IS-2022, Serial No. 29, it states that no pilotless aircraft of mass category A, B, or C shall be operated without valid insurance coverage, at least in respect of third-party injury and/or damage. However, the regulation is silent on the nature of the insurance coverage. Furthermore, no peculiar insurance formalities exist for drones in SL, and insurers are still in the process of introducing how to insure drones subjected to four categories. Hence, insurance standards have yet to be achieved.

As per Regulation (EU) 2019/947 Article 23, it states that it becomes EU law when its provisions become applicable, and its legally binding nature enters into force in member states. The SL regulations, UAS-IS-2022, have been issued by the DGCA under Section 80 read with Section 120 of Civil Aviation Act No. 14 of 2010. Hence, these provisions are merely directives of the executive officer and do not fall under the statutes of laws under the constitution of SL. Thus, the regulation authority of the DGASL would be challenged in court for its legitimacy.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECCOMENDATIONS

This research conducted multiple comparative analyses based on sociotechnical and sociolegal perspectives. The systematic review and comparative analysis provided the basis for the development of recommendations. The research found that the EU regulations set out the framework for the safe operation of civil drones in European skies. They adopt a risk-based approach and, as such, do not distinguish between military, leisure, or commercial civil drone activities. In summary, the new EU regulations provide detailed guidelines on how to define operations, identify risks, and analyse situations prior to the deployment of UAS. From a commercial point

of view, the EU regulations bring a certain level of reliability into liberal economic considerations towards UAV market. In terms of the SL situation, it would appear that current restrictions call for stringent government oversight of drone activities. It might be the reason why government examination of drone concerns is seen as essential to being solely controlled, given prior experience in national security matters. Further, it was discovered that there are several shortcomings and deficits in the current legislation. Particularly, the orthodox and faux registration procedure adopted, the lack of adherence to modern technology for the processing of applications for new drone users, the silence of the regulation on the demarcation of privacy rights, the complete prohibition of certain drone-related acts and operations, and the non-authorization of commercial activities via drones can be identified as key factors that lower the regulation's validity. Finally, based on the findings, this research concludes that several societal challenges exist due to the lacuna in the existing rules governing UAV regulations in SL. Thus, this research presents the following recommendations as next steps in aiding the development of normativity in drone laws to gain public acceptance and be deployed under clear conditions within the specified legal regime.

- Amend Section 80 of Civil Aviation Act No. 14 of 2010, to include Regulation UAS-IS-2022, Serial Nos. 3, 7, and 8 as subsections that contain the categorization and authorisation requirements of UAVs in order to confer complete legal validity for such formalities.
- Amend Section 2 of Personal Data Protection Act No. 9 of 2022 to include a specific provision for data collection through Drone/UAV operations and to specify limitations on any personal data processed purely for personal, domestic, and third-party sharing of data collected by UAVs.
- Amend the penal code to specify Penalties and offences in cases of national security, safety, or privacy violations are exclusive to drone operations.
- Harmonise or standardise the present process of UAV classifications, registration, and certification through the utilisation of electronic methods.
- Introduced unique insurance formalities governing all UAV and drone operations, which are similar to vehicle insurance.

- Establish a monitoring agency to scurtinity the regulations made by the CAA, comprised of the MOD in liaison with SLAF and the CAA, in order to closely supervise, monitor, and enable commercial drone operations to gain economic benefits.

REFERENCES

Legislations and Regulations

The Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, 1978.

The penal code of Sri Lanka, 1883

The Civil Aviation Act No. 14 of 2010.

The Computer Crimes Act No. 24 of 2007

The Right to Information Act No. 12 of 2016

The Personal Data Protection Act No. 9 of 2022.

The Chicago Convention of 1944

The Four Geneva Conventions of 1949

Civil Aviation Authority of Sri Lanka, Implementing Standards, UAS-IS-2022, Requirements for the Operation of Pilotless Aircraft (SLCAIS), 2022

European Union Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/947 of 24 May 2019 on the rules and procedures for the operation of unmanned aircraft, 2019.

European Council Regulation (EC) No 785/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 on insurance requirements for air carriers and aircraft operators, 2004

European Aviation Safety Agency regulation for Concept of Operations for Drones (EASA. 2015a): A Risk Based Approach to Regulation of Unmanned Aircraft. [online] Available at: <https://www.easa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/dfu/204696_EASA_concept_drone_brochure_web.pdf> (accessed on 10 May 2022).

European Commission, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, A New Era for Aviation (2014), Opening the Aviation Market to the Civil Use of Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems in a Safe and Sustainable Manner, [Online]. Available at: <<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0207&from=EN/>> (Accessed: 02 June 2023)

European Union Aviation Safety Administration, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/947 of 24 May 2019 on the

Rules and Procedures for the Operation of Unmanned Aircraft [Online]. Available at: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2019/947/oj/eng (Accessed 14 May 2023).

Books and E-books

Hodgkinson, D., Johnston, R. (2020) ‘Aviation Law and Drones’, *Unmanned Aircraft and the Future of Aviation*. 1st edn, Routledge, pp 07- 28

Meltzer, N., (2008) Targeted killing in international law, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 9

Stöcker et al., (2017). ‘Review of the Current State of UAV Regulations’, *Remote Sensing*, 9 (5), p. 459. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9050459> (Accessed: on 25 May 2023)

De Miguel Molina, B., Segarra Oña, M., (2018). The Drone Sector in Europe. In: de Miguel Molina, M., Santamarina Campos, V. (eds) *Ethics and Civil Drones*. Springer Briefs in Law. Springer, Cham. Available at: < https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71087-7_2> (Accessed: 02 June 2023)

Cifaldi, C., Mascarello, L.N., Quagliotti, F. (2018). Regulations: The European Way. In: Valavanis, K., Vachtsevanos, G. (eds) *Handbook of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles*. Springer, Cham. Available at: < https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32193-6_159-1> (Accessed: 02 June 2023)

Cavoukian, A., (2012) Privacy and Drones: Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, Information and Privacy Commissioner, [Online] Available at: < <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/lbrr/archives/cnmcs-plcng/cn29822-eng.pdf> .> (Accessed: 02 June 2023)

The Free Dictionary.com, ‘unmanned aerial vehicle’, Available at <<https://www.thefreedictionary.com/unmanned+aerial+vehicle>> (Accessed on 24 May 2023)

Web articles and web journals

Roger, C., (2014) ‘Understanding the Drone Epidemic’, *Computer Law & Security Review*, 30(3), pp 230–246. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2014.03.002>> (Accessed: 15 May 2023)

Amazon, (2018) First Prime Air Delivery. *Amazon Prime Air*, [online] Available at: <<https://www.amazon.com/Amazon-Prime-Air/b?ie=>

[UTF8&node=8037720011](#)> (Accessed: on 25 May 2023).

Weizmann, N., (2013) *Remotely Piloted Aircraft and International Law*, Available at: <
<https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/resources/documents/article/other/remotely-piloted-aircraft-ihl-weizmann.htm>> (Accessed: 02 June 2023)

Ewers et al., (2017), Drone Proliferation: Policy Choices for the Trump Administration, CTR. FOR NEW AM. SEC. 2, Available at:
<<http://drones.cnas.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/06/CNASReport-DroneProliferation-Final.pdf>>
(Accessed: 02 June 2023)

ABBREVIATIONS

CAASL -Civil aviation Authority Sri Lanka
DGCA -Director General of Civil Aviation
EASA -European Aviation Safety Agency
EC -Economic Commission
EU -European Union
GDPR -General Data Protection Regulation
IS -Implementing Standard
IHL -International Humanitarian Law
MTM -Maximum takeoff mass
RPAC -Remote Pilot Authorization Certificate
SL -Sri Lanka
UABT -Unmanned Aircraft Basic Training
UAS -Unmanned Aerial System
UAT -Unmanned Aircraft Training and Assessment
UAV -Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
VLOS -Visual Line of Sight Operations

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Author dedicates this writing to his wife and two daughters for their unconditional love.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY



The author is a Commissioned Officer of the SLAF. He obtained his BA (Def Studies) Degree from General Sir John Kotelawala Defence University. He received his LLB from the Open University and his LLM from the General Sir John Kotelawala Defence University.

His research interests are in Aviation law, Religious extremism, and Commercial law.