



MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT INTERNATIONAL

DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE DE L'ADMINISTRATION  
ET DE LA MODERNISATION

DIRECTION DES RESSOURCES HUMAINES

Sous-direction de la Formation et des Concours

Bureau des Concours et Examens professionnels

RH4B

---

**CONCOURS EXTERNE ET INTERNE POUR L'ACCÈS À L'EMPLOI DE  
SECRÉTAIRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES  
(CADRE GÉNÉRAL ET CADRE D'ORIENT)  
AU TITRE DE L'ANNÉE 2015**

---

**ÉPREUVES ÉCRITES D'ADMISSIBILITÉ**

**Du 15 au 19 septembre 2014**

**ANGLAIS**

Durée totale de l'épreuve : 3 heures

Coefficient : 2

Toute note inférieure à 10 sur 20 est éliminatoire

Barème de notation : note en anglais 12 points ; note en français 8 points

---

**Note en français :**

*Rédaction en français d'une note (450 mots avec une tolérance de plus ou moins 10 %) à partir de documents en anglais.*

Ce dossier comporte 10 pages (page de garde et sommaire non compris)

**SUJET :**

" À l'aide des documents joints, exposez la problématique des drones dans le contexte international actuel et la position de la France sur le sujet. "

**\* DRONES \***

**Composition du dossier**

**(10 pages)**

**Document n° 1:** "Use of armed drones" (1 pg)

**Document n° 2:** "Seven EU states create military drone 'club'" (2 pages)

**Document n° 3:** "Increased US drone use 'may create slippery slope to wider war', report says" (2 pages)

**Document n° 4:** "Ukrainians crowdfund to raise cash for 'people's drone' to help outgunned army" (2 pages)

**Document n° 5:** "Medals for drone pilots?" (2 pages)

**Document n° 6:** "Worried about spying? Maybe you need a personal drone detection system" (1 page)

## **Use of armed drones**

POSTED BY EPRS AUTHOR · FEBRUARY 21, 2014 – *European Parliamentary Research Service*  
<http://epthinktank.eu/2014/02/21/use-of-armed-drones/>

Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or remotely piloted aerial systems (RPAS) – commonly known as drones – are designed for diverse uses: civilian, commercial and military. While military forces are increasingly acquiring armed drones, their use raises many ethical, political and legal concerns.

### **The global spread of drones**

UAVs are spreading globally. Around 80 states, as well as non-state groups, private actors and the United Nations (UN), possess drones. Most military drones are used for intelligence gathering, surveillance and reconnaissance, as well as target acquisition, while armed drones carry explosive weaponry or precision-guided munitions. Less than 20 states are thought to have armed drones. Although only the United States, Israel and the United Kingdom have used them operationally, analysts warn against proliferation.

### **Legal and ethical considerations**

Armed drones are not considered illegal weapons; cheaper, but more precise, they are said to reduce casualties and collateral damage in war. Nonetheless, their use has raised ethical, political and legal concerns. Because armed drones reduce risks for soldiers, they may make war more likely. Also, operators far from the battlefield may have less inhibition to kill ("PlayStation mentality"). There is no consensus on how international law applies to lethal drone strikes. Many denounce US drone use against Al-Qaeda and affiliated terrorists in targeted killings and "signature strikes" (based on profiling, not identification) outside armed conflict situations as a dangerous precedent. US drone strikes have taken place both in armed conflicts (Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya), and outside (Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia). In Pakistan, CIA drone strikes have reportedly killed 2 500 to 3 650 people (of which 416 to 951 civilians).

These practices challenge current interpretations of international law. Arbitrary killing is prohibited both within and out of armed conflict. Only if an armed conflict exists can drone strikes legally be used on "legitimate targets". The US justifies strikes outside such situations through its "global war on terror" concept. Moreover, US claims of a right to act extra-territorially in self-defence against Al-Qaeda go against the International Court of Justice's view that use of force against a non-state armed group in another state violates that state's sovereignty, unless the group's actions are imputable to it. Anticipatory self-defence is also still contentious. Two recent UN reports assess the use of drones in counter-terrorism and the implications for the protection of the right to life. They find that international law on the use of force forms a holistic system protecting the right to life, warn against flexible interpretation, and advise states to increase transparency and accountability. In May 2013, the US Government set out policy for drone use.

### **The European Union and armed drones**

Some Member States possess, use or are developing armed drones, and several cooperation projects are under way, e.g. France and the UK's Future Combat Air System (FCAS). At EU level, the European Council welcomed preparations for a next-generation European medium altitude long endurance RPAS by 2020-25. Many denounce the EU's silence on the US drone strikes, calling on it to define a common position and engage with the US. The EU High Representative has stated that drone strikes must conform to international law; the EU and its Member States are conducting informal dialogue with the US on the issue.

## **Seven EU states create military drone 'club'**

20.11.13 - <http://euobserver.com/defence/122167>

BRUSSELS - Seven EU countries have formed what France calls a "club" to produce military drones from 2020 onward.

The scheme was agreed in Brussels on Tuesday (19 November) at a meeting of the European Defence Agency (EDA), the EU's defence think tank, by France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain.

The group-of-seven's defence ministers signed a "letter of intent" tasking the EDA to draw up a study on joint production of Medium Altitude Long Endurance (Male) craft, which can be used to strike military targets or for surveillance of migrant boats in the Mediterranean Sea.

The EDA said in a press release that "the objective of this community is to exchange information as well as to identify and facilitate co-operation among member states which currently operate or plan to operate RPAS [Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems]."

The think tank's director, Claude-France Arnould, noted: "In view of today's constrained financial situation, this effort for defence must be fully efficient which implies co-operation and searching for synergies."

Another EDA official, Peter Round, told media: "This is the starting pistol for us to be able to start work on a European RPAS."

The French defence minister, Jean-Yves Le Drian, said: "If Europe hopes to maintain a strategic capability, countries must pool their capacities and actions in a pragmatic way."

He called the group of seven a "club of drone-using countries."

The EDA decision comes ahead of an EU summit on defence in December.

It also comes amid a raft of existing European drone projects.

Three European arms firms - France's Dassault, Franco-German firm Eads and Italy's Finmeccanica - agreed in June to launch their own European drone programme.

France, Greece, Italy, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland are working on what they call a "euro-Ucav," or unmanned combat air vehicle, the Neuron, which made a test flight in December 2012.

France and the UK are working on a "stealth" drone called Telemos to fly in 2018.

On the civilian side, the European Commission is also developing drones to be used for surveillance in EU civilian airspace with Israel Aerospace Industries and with the Austrian-based firm, Diamond Airborne Sensing.

The EDA meeting on Tuesday saw eight EU states - Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK - sign up to a second scheme, the "Joint Investment Programme on RPAS for Air Traffic Insertion," to enable drones to fly alongside civilian planes.

Meanwhile, the EU's new Male programme is designed to compete with Israeli and US arms firms.

Israel and the US make the vast majority of the world's military drones and sell them to allies such as Germany, France, Italy and the UK.

Britain, according to a report filed by the UK defence ministry to the British parliament last month, used US-made "Reapers" to strike targets in Afghanistan 418 times since 2007.

The UN and robotics experts have voiced concerns about drone proliferation.

Noel Sharkey, a British scientist who advises the UK military, told this website last year that China has also developed a Male, the Pterodactyl, which it intends to sell worldwide.

But the concern has had little impact on a global drone market said by the US-based consultancy, the Teal Group, to be worth €5 billion a year and forecast to hit €9 billion by 2018.

The EDA meeting on Tuesday also called for "increased co-operation" by EU states on air-to-air refuelling, satellite communications and cyber defence.

Its press release noted, referring to EU states' reliance on the US airforce in the Libya and Mali conflicts, that: "Recent operations have demonstrated an important European capability gap in this area [air refuelling]."

## **Increased US drone use 'may create slippery slope to wider war', report says**

*Report released by Stimson Center does not reject drone strikes but says increasing use 'risks escalating conflicts'*

**Spencer Ackerman** in New York - theguardian.com, Thursday 26 June 2014

A new report written by former Obama administration officials and military officers warns that the US reliance on drone strikes for counter-terrorism "risks increasing instability and escalating conflicts".

The report, released on Thursday from the Stimson Center, does not reject drone strikes and is notable primarily for its authors, almost all of whom have served in senior government, military and intelligence posts.

Rather than the typical drone critics, the skepticism over what the Obama administration calls "targeted killing" – usually accomplished through drone strikes – comes from, among others, a former US military commander for the Middle East; a former commander of the Afghanistan war; a former FBI and CIA senior officer; and two senior Pentagon policy officials from Obama's first term, when drone strikes became the signature US counterterrorism weapon.

While most thinktank reports command little attention in Washington, the Stimson Center report, released Thursday, indicates a shift in elite consensus in national security circles around drones. It challenges some of the central premises behind the embrace of drone strikes – typically that they provide an asset for killing suspected terrorists in remote or diplomatically inaccessible terrain, short of a potentially costly raid or even outright invasion.

Yet the Stimson Center report, spearheaded by retired General John Abizaid and former Pentagon official Rosa Brooks, portrays drone strikes as a potential facilitator of perpetual war, rather than the alternative to it that the Obama administration contends.

"The increasing use of lethal UAVs may create a slippery slope leading to continual or wider war," the report warns, lending official recognition to a point made for years by leftwing critics of Obama's drone attacks. UAV is a military acronym for unmanned aerial vehicle, one of the more formal terms for drones.

Echoing a criticism from United Nations drone investigator Ben Emmerson, the report finds that "despite the undoubted good faith of US decision-makers, it would be difficult to conclude that US targeted strikes are consistent with core rule of law norms."

The administration itself has recently acknowledged the concern. In a widely heralded May 2013 speech, Barack Obama imposed new restrictions on drone strikes after acknowledging killing four Americans – three of them, to include a 16-year-old boy, allegedly accidentally. The subsequent months saw a reduction in drone-induced killings in Yemen and especially Pakistan.

Yet the presentation of targets of opportunity and the pressure to react in a seemingly cost-free way to terrorist attacks have kept the drones aloft. While US secretary of state John Kerry pledged in August to end drone strikes in Pakistan "very soon," and a pause kept the drones from flying over tribal Pakistan for much of the year, several strikes there took place in the wake of the deadly assault on the Karachi airport earlier this month.

Abizaid, Brooks and their fellows on the Stimson Center's drone "task force" call attention to a "lack of strategic analysis" about drone strikes within the Obama administration, despite the administration turning armed Predators and Reapers into its weapon of choice. Earlier this week, a Justice Department memo from 2010 became public, shedding light on internal administration deliberations about taking the fateful step to kill a US citizen with a drone strike and without trial.

"A serious counterterrorism strategy needs to consider carefully, and constantly reassess, the balance

between kinetic action and other counterterrorism tools, and the potential unintended consequences of increased reliance on lethal UAVs," the Stimson report contends. "Kinetic action" is a military euphemism for the use of force.

But the report stops far short of rejecting drone strikes.

The Stimson experts reject a flat determination of the illegality of "targeted killing," and does not use the far more controversial term "assassination." It recommends shifting operation of the strikes from the CIA to the US military, rather than ending them, and although the report urges greater transparency around drones, it elides a recognition that a military-run drone campaign is likely to entail fewer congressional notifications than the CIA's. That, along with a recommendation to establish "appropriate international norms," tacitly recognizes the entrenchment of drone strikes within the national security firmware.

The report also has little to say about the still-unknown tally of civilians on multiple continents killed in US drone strikes, beyond rejecting that strikes "cause disproportionate civilian casualties" as a perception "with little basis in fact."

Yet the report spends little time grappling with the issue and evinces little effort at distinguishing the facts from the fictions of drone-related deaths. Nor does it significantly address the administration practice of killing people based solely on a determination that their patterns of behavior fit terrorist profiles.

But the Stimson report acknowledges that even in cases where only "terrorists" are killed, the strikes "can cause great resentment, particularly in contexts in which terrorist recruiting efforts rely on tribal loyalties or on an economically desperate population." In Yemen, activists have testified that a fear of the drones has become part of the culture, as parents use the threat of drone strikes to usher unruly children to bed.

Right as the Stimson Center released its drone report, three Democratic senators on the intelligence committee wrote to the White House requesting greater transparency over drone strikes.

"We believe every American has the right to know when their government believes it is allowed to kill them," wrote Ron Wyden, Mark Udall and Martin Heinrich, who highlighted a lack of White House response to a similar November letter.

Caitlin Hayden, the chief spokesperson for the National Security Council, said that the White House "look[s] forward to reviewing" the Stimson report.

"The President has repeatedly emphasized the extraordinary care taken to ensure that our counterterrorism actions are carried out in accordance with all applicable domestic and international law and consistent with U.S. values and policy. He has also specifically highlighted the importance of transparency," Hayden said.

## **Ukrainians crowdfund to raise cash for 'people's drone' to help outgunned army**

*With Ukrainian soldiers buying their own uniforms, volunteers are now stepping in to equip the troops facing rebels in the east*

**Oksana Grytsenko** in Kiev and **Luke Harding** - The Guardian, Sunday 29 June 2014

It has been used to raise money for films, rock bands and aspiring performance artists. Now Ukrainians have taken the concept of online crowdfunding to a new and giddy level, raising enough money to buy the country's first "people's drone".

With Ukraine's army battling pro-Russian militants in the east, ordinary citizens have launched a new initiative to supply Kiev's beleaguered and badly equipped troops. Over the past three months volunteers have provided uniforms and bulletproof vests for government soldiers whose army-issue fatigues have fallen apart. Villagers have offered food, bottles of water and bags of crisps. Then, last week, Ukraine's crowdfunding site The People's Project said that it had received enough donations to fund a drone. It will be used for reconnaissance in the skies above the rebel Donetsk and Luhansk provinces, and on the border with Russia, the scene of numerous recent shootouts between troops and separatists.

The organisers had originally hoped to buy a state-of-the-art Israeli drone – for \$165,000 (£97,000) – or a cheaper American one costing \$120,000. In the end, however, they managed to build the drone for just \$35,000. A designer and other volunteers built the airframe, with a Ukrainian military institute chipping in technical equipment. The hope is that with enough drones the army will be able to stop the infiltration of men and material from neighbouring Russia. Kiev says there is overwhelming evidence that the Kremlin has supplied heavy weapons and even old tanks to the rebels. Moscow denies this.

"If we get 20 drones we will definitely ensure the security of our border," said David Arakhania, an IT executive from Kiev who founded the site in March. No photos of the "people's drone" have been released, since that might help the enemy, he added.

Arakhania said he felt compelled to do something after seeing the plight of Ukrainian soldiers serving on the new frontline with Crimea. After Russian troops overran the Black Sea peninsula in February, Arakhania said he visited forward positions at Chonar, in Kherson province, where paratroopers from his home town of Mykolaiv were serving.

"We found them in bad shape. They were wearing torn bulletproof vests and camouflage gear. So we decided to collect money and buy new outfits for them," he said. In the first two or three weeks, his crowdfunding initiative raised £20,000, with £35,000 the next week, and then a £37,000 donation from three MPs he met in Kiev. "After that we bought everything the boys needed," he said. The crowdfunding appeal was called the "first people's infantry battalion".

A ceasefire deal was agreed last week between both sides, though few are confident it will last.

As well as the drone, Arakhania's group is now collecting for a second "people's battalion", as well as for a new sniper unit. "Snipers are very efficient in an anti-terrorist zone as they help to prevent big losses. That's why we started equipping them," he said.

Seven volunteers run the website, including a former paratrooper who negotiates with arms dealers. Other volunteers promote the site via Facebook and Twitter. There are daily updates, with breakdowns of how the cash is spent. Donations vary from £1 to £2,500. The biggest, \$10,000, came from Kiev, he said.

In the two decades since independence, Ukraine's army has largely fallen apart. In 1991, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, it had up to 900,000 servicemen. It now has only about 90,000 soldiers. The military decline accelerated under Ukraine's former president Viktor Yanukovich. It was his decision last November to reject an association agreement with the EU and accept a Kremlin bailout that triggered mass street protests against



his rule. In February he fled to Russia. "Yanukovych funded the police well because it was there to protect him. He didn't give a damn about the army," said Andrew Wilson of the European Council on Foreign Relations.

The army's equipment is now so poor that soldiers typically buy their own uniforms and most military equipment, or rely on private benefactors. Ukraine's Soviet-era weaponry is in bad repair, with Soviet-era stockpiles stolen or sold off, defence analysts say. Russia, by contrast, has lavished money on its armed forces since its 2008 war against Georgia, with defence spending up 85%. Russia has twice as many tanks as Ukraine and five times more warplanes.

One officer, Serhiy, speaking at a Ukraine army checkpoint in the Luhansk region, said he had bought his own kit from a military shop. He had purchased a British-made uniform, he said, because his army-issue one was old and worn out. "Of what I'm wearing, the army gave me only my Kalashnikov and bulletproof vest," he said. The vest, he added, had been bought thanks to private sponsors in the Chernivtsi region.

Katya Gorchinskaya, deputy editor of the Kyiv Post, said that after years of corruption and budget starvation, Ukraine's army resembled a "withered muscle". As well as dilapidated equipment, the country's military and police suffered a serious problem of infiltration, with some officers helping the separatists. "We never thought we would have to fight a war," she said. "Nobody expected our neighbour to attack us."

The drone initiative is one of many patriotic projects to have sprung up in Ukraine, where, unlike in Russia, civil society is traditionally robust. During the anti-Yanukovych protests, a group of women sewed bulletproof vests for those who were protesting on the Maidan, Kiev's central square.

The women were nicknamed the "sewing hundred", a reference to the "heavenly hundred", the 100 or so protesters shot dead in Kiev by riot police. The women, led by a former journalist, Diana Makarova, also bought British uniforms for demonstrators from secondhand shops.

Makarova is now supplying troops fighting in the east. Her foundation recently sent two cars to Slavyansk, the separatist-controlled town north of Donetsk, loaded with everything "from trousers to night-vision devices". These were the ninth and 10th cars sent there in the past two months, she said.

She said her team had recently stopped making flak jackets because they had been unable to source plates made from high-quality steel or Kevlar. She added that Ukraine's customs service had created huge problems for her work. It had banned the import of military equipment, meaning that her volunteers couldn't bring in military boots or secondhand uniforms from abroad, she said.

"British MultiCam [camouflage clothing] is very popular with our soldiers because it is made of high-quality material. It's very rugged," Makarova said, adding that its colours were ideal for the landscape of Ukraine's south-east.

## Lexington Medals for drone pilots?

*The fraught debate over how to honour cyber-warriors*

Mar 29th 2014 | From the Economist print edition

SOME time soon, it is possible to imagine, an American cyber-warrior will end a conflict, almost single-handed. With the right acts of digital sabotage, attack aircraft will be grounded, infrastructure disrupted and communications severed, reducing the enemy to a state of raging, pre-modern impotence. Yet if such a virtual victory were pulled off tomorrow, Pentagon chiefs would not know how to honour it. Even more workaday acts of remote warfare—such as when drone operators shoot missiles or spy on enemies—confound today's commanders, who are unsure how to rank them alongside acts involving physical risk.

With this in mind, the defence secretary, Chuck Hagel, has launched a year-long review of military awards and decorations. The panel will start work in June. Its hardest task involves weighing the work of drone pilots, cyber-warriors and all those who fight at a distance, taking life-and-death decisions from bases that may be thousands of miles from the cacophony of battle.

The review does not start out with a blank slate. Members of Congress, veterans' groups and (more quietly) serving troops are still seething about the Distinguished Warfare Medal (DWM), an award unveiled in February 2013 to honour actions with an "extraordinary" impact on combat operations, not involving personal valour or even proximity to a theatre of war. Proposed by Mr Hagel's predecessor, Leon Panetta, the DWM managed to unite hawks and peaceniks in protest. Two months after the medal was announced, Mr Hagel scrapped it.

Hawks were angry that the DWM was to outrank such battlefield medals as the Bronze Star or the Purple Heart. This, they thought, would cheapen the sacrifices made by troops in battle. "Boneheaded," thundered a spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars. A "disservice" to those wounded or killed in combat, jointly declared 25 Republican and 14 Democratic members of the House of Representatives. As for drone critics, they saw a bid to make the killing of far-off foreigners feel antiseptic and respectable. Both sides seemed to see something dishonourable in the safety enjoyed by "armchair warriors" who commute home to their families in suburban Nevada each night.

The DWM is not coming back. But Mr Hagel's review cannot avoid the conundrum that the medal sought to solve. Today's medals are based on a "kinetic" concept of warfare in which troops close with each other and fight. But fewer battles will involve such combat in the future, says Fred Borch, a military historian. At root, those who want medals for drone operators are saying that modern America needs to recognise exceptionally important acts, even when they require no physical courage. That is a big departure from traditional ideas about war.

America knows what it thinks about exceptional valour: it honours it very carefully. Its highest award, the Medal of Honour, was awarded 257 times during the Vietnam era, but only 13 Medals of Honour have been granted for combat in Afghanistan and Iraq since 2001. America also knows what it thinks about exceptional suffering and hardship: it honours both freely and noisily. Purple Heart medals are given to all troops killed or wounded while battling foreign foes: well over a million have been awarded since the medal was created in its modern form in 1932. The army reserves another prized honour, the Combat Infantry Badge, for infantry troops who have endured ground combat. Purple Hearts and infantry badges often involve heroism but do not need to: they are awards for hardship. Among America's allies, that is a rare approach, though in 2008 Canada introduced a Sacrifice Medal for wounded troops. Congress has a special fondness for the Purple Heart: members had it bumped up precedence tables in 1985 and often weigh in on who should get it.

History frames this focus on suffering, starting with the American Revolution. The Purple Heart pays homage to a merit badge created by George Washington, at a moment when his Continental army of citizen-soldiers was near mutiny, starved of pay and rations by the Congress of the day, after years of combat against the better-

equipped professionals of the British army. That idea of American soldiers as citizen-volunteers, forsaking their families to fight for liberty, retains great power. "That whole culture of the Continental period is a model. There has to be a cause that Americans believe in. There is a strong understanding of the human element of warfare, and not just the strategic element," says Charles Mugno, director of the Institute of Heraldry, which designs the government's medals, badges and insignia.

### Valuing valour

The civil war and both world wars prompted bursts of medal-creation. Awards were often created to address crises of morale or disruptive technologies—or both, as when the 1942 creation of a medal for airmen prompted grumbles about poor morale among those slogging it out in the mud and dust below, leading to the creation in 1944 of an award for ground combat, the Bronze Star. Now it is drone-pilot morale that worries some. The best drone operators and cyber-warriors can have "outstanding" impacts on national security, and it is "troglodytic" to argue that only those who risk their lives should receive the highest honours, says David Deptula, a fighter pilot and retired air force general who helped shape today's drone policies.

Thoughtful insiders note that manned American Stealth bombers flying at 20,000 feet are barely "in combat"—enemies seldom see them, let alone shoot them down. But still, conventional pilots are regarded very differently from drone operators. Codes of honour do need to evolve. Yet a single-minded focus on results is surely troubling for other reasons. By that logic more medals would go to snipers and assassins than to soldiers who saved comrades' lives. That has not been the American way. Mr Hagel's medal review is actually a debate about the morality of modern war. It comes not a moment too soon.

## **Worried about spying? Maybe you need a personal drone detection system**

*Domestic Drone Countermeasures' Kickstarter project offers a black box which beeps when a drone is snooping within 15m*

**Samuel Gibbs** - theguardian.com, Thursday 19 June 2014 13.24 BST

Privacy in the drone-filled age is going to be more difficult to protect than ever. Competitors, thieves, or even just your neighbours could be spying on your every move using a remote-controlled flying camera.

That's the kind of paranoia Domestic Drone Countermeasures (DDC) is hoping to tap into with its new personal drone detection system (PDDS) Kickstarter project – a black box that promises to go beep when a drone flies within 15m of its sensors.

"Drones are becoming more capable all the time and this is why it's alarming. They fly with payloads like still cameras, video cameras, infrared detectors, thermal detectors, among other things, and they are already being used for surveillance," said Amy Ciesielka, founder of DDC.

"Though there are legitimate uses for domestic drones, there is still concern about invasion of privacy and surveillance by various entities," she said.

In the UK it is illegal to fly a drone within 50m of a structure even for recreation, while commercial use of drones has to be cleared by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). But in the US personal drones are not regulated by the American Federal Aviation Administration and can currently be flown around buildings and built-up areas.

### **Black box goes beep**

Portland, Oregon-based DDC has been working on the technology for more than a year and promises to warn users of personal drone snooping before it's too late. The PDDS kit cannot detect military drones as "they fly too high and are too sophisticated," according to the company.

The kit consists of three boxes – a primary command and control unit that connects via Wi-Fi to the internet, and two sensors which are placed about the home. More sensors can be connected to the primary unit for covering a larger area.

If a drone is detected the command and control unit sends a notification to the user's smartphone, tablet or computer, even while the user is away from home. The PDDS kit does not promise to actually block the drone's invasion of privacy, yet.

In April, Robert Knowles became the first person convicted in the UK for "dangerously" flying a drone. He was fined £800 and ordered to pay £3,500 costs by the Furness and District Magistrate court after being prosecuted by the CAA.

A starter PDDS kit costs \$499 from DDC on Kickstarter, but as ever with crowd-funded projects, the system may not come to fruition.



