



Ethics meeting #4 UAS Coordination Technical Working Group

27 January. 2021

Tour de table

Organization	Contact
Independent	Faine Greenwood
ICRC	Halid Kayhan
MINUSMA	Christina Wachira
Red Cross	Joachim Ramakers
MSF	Raphael Brechard
WFP	Christos Panayi
WFP	Patrick McKay
WFP	Masa Sabbah
WFP	Jean Claude Atassa Laouwayi
WFP	Helle Falkjakobsen

Opening remarks by Christos welcoming everyone to fourth session of the Ethics group, and giving the floor to co-chair Faine:

Starting off, final review on the Ethics TORs:

- Implementation mechanism; discussion to disseminate or distribute documents that this group will produce where different subgroups of some of the participants can work on or take ownership of specific tasks. ** Christos - not needed in TOR, rather complex.
- Joachim - looking at scope and focus on data protection and privacy; if the intention is not to do any harm, there should be consideration of the responsible use of the technology and of the data. Other ways you can do harm that are not necessarily with data and not related to privacy or data protection. You can do harm with anonymous data, geographic data, or any other kinds of data. There's also the use of the technology - increasingly gap between people's understanding, maybe the drone operators and the GIS specialists and the people that use the results of this to support their decision-making progress. If tech and data are not sufficiently

understood or communicated by those who would use it...there is a risk that incorrect decisions are made **(focusing mainly on data protection and privacy is too narrow)**

- Jean Claude - providing responsible use of technology as there's regulations and operations; in operations, the responsible use of technology should be covered.
Christos - emphasize better understanding of technology to help people make better/more ethical decisions. In terms of technology operations and regulations, there's another technical TWG that covers it; but that's a valid point, make sure there's a link between understanding of technology and ethical implications.
- Helle Falkjakobsen - before doing a detailed dive into PII considerations, we should consider what is the bigger chapeau in how WFP wants to approach this? Makes sense with this approach but there's a potential risk; we do collect PII of beneficiaries and communities when using drones and that can be fine considering posture of TWG and outcomes. However, there is different kinds of data sets that need to be considered beyond the personal level. *FYI, under OCHA there's a group working on data responsibility and they've just drafted data responsible guidelines for wider community on personal data and non-personal data.*
- Christine Wachira - guidelines concerning raw UAS data and processed data? As well as additional annotations or additions? And metadata?
- Raphael Brechard (MSF) - Cargo considerations? What about drugs or other risks coming from cargo?

Implement changes for final draft of the TOR with Christos then distribute for everyone's agreement by email.

Moving on to the UAViators Code of Conduct:

- Halid Kayhan – the document has value but is not very practical due to its length. Makes sense as a whole but practitioners would need an executive summary with references to certain points and infographics with reference to specific parts; otherwise not sure if anyone will really use it, probably will be used as a reference if needed, but won't be practical in my opinion. Moreover, the document refers to consent as the most prominent legal basis but won't be the case in most humanitarian crises. In the case of any crisis occurring, there drones will be used without the data collecting consent in emergencies. The language of the document needs to be nuanced a bit. Also, there are some parts which are drafted well but do not really considering special case humanitarian organizations like ICRC and WFP, others with special mandates. The distinction between collecting consent prior to collecting personal data and accountability is not very clear in some parts of the document.
- Faine Greenwood: it says that UAS operators always need to adhere to the missions' scope but what happens if the mission scope needs to change to some degrees during the course of disaster? Moreover, the documents use of the term UAViators to refer to Humanitarian drone pilots can be confusing and should be changed in favor for a language that refer to humanitarian drone pilots and operators.

There is also references in the document to training current standard of practice, which can be tricky as the sector is not well defined as it should be in regard to that, so there should be more language to clarify that training standard are not standardized across the humanitarian sector.

Christos Panayi – should the language be more specific or broad in the Code of Conduct? How do we weigh transparency against need to protect privacy and secure data?

Joachim Ramakers - call that depends on context of the situation, can't give clear yes or no guidance.

Patrick McKay - adding a statement that says to share the data where it's appropriate.

Faine - there is some language around that, but the problem is how do we define appropriate?

Raphael - seems clear enough as it is, at MSF there is more experience with geospatial data, if you don't share some data you won't protect your teams. For me, it's clear enough just adding "appropriate depending on the context" is my input, otherwise, wouldn't make any more changes.

Joachim – it's very important to add local knowledge in the assessment of whether something will do harm or not.

- Faine: another point is in point 13, structuring data management processes interoperable with partners; there should be language that clearly emphasis cases where your partners want to use or share data in ways that are not in line with your own principals.

In terms of a local point, there should be more emphasis on working communities that are not UAV operators, there should be priority to locals that could provide these services.

There may be scenarios where it won't be possible to hold a pre-mission meeting with the communities, so the document should suggest more solutions in that terms like having a WhatsApp group and hold meeting calls on that rather than in person to accommodate that sometimes due to difficulty in travel it is not possible for community members to make it to the in person meeting.

Another thing to add to the document is the possibility of inviting at least one members of the communities to accompany or observe UAS flight missions when it's possible.

Christos - PV4 issues? Bias issues with choosing one person? Who do you choose?

Wrapping up

Christos- for any member who was not able to attend the meeting, please send any input you have on what was discussed. Suggestions on how we should take these inputs forward and what should be the next steps are very much welcomed and encouraged.

Faine- suggestion to take the inputs and comments on the UAViators Code of Conduct as a consolidated feedback from the group either as a link or a document to HHI (The deadline is February the 2nd)

Next TWG meeting is on **3rd of March 2021.**