Drone Privacy

Yang Wang **Syracuse University** ywang@syr.edu



Bystanders have various privacy concerns about drones [1]

Drone controllers felt privacy issues of drones exaggerated [2]

We surveyed people's perceptions of various privacy mechanisms for drones [3]

We found drone owner registration, no-fly-zone, and automatic face blurring promising [3]



Method		Results	
	80%	80%	





Second round of survey about people's perceptions on six privacy mechanisms with 332 bystanders, 98 controllers



No-fly-zone (Zone)

(Blur)

+ Simple and requires little effort (both) + Add control over controller (bystander) + Similar to no call list (both)

-No law enforcement (both)

- -Practical issues due to proximity (both)
- -Large amount of data (controller)

+ Effective hiding people's identity (both) Automatic + Make people fell more secure (bystander) face blurring

- -Conflict with drones' original purpose (both)
- -Inaccurate facial recognition (controller)
- -Can be turned off (both)

Policy Implications

Improve controller-bystander trust

Enforce voluntary mechanisms

Reduce efforts to use privacy mechanisms

Consider privacy of controllers and bystanders

[1] Y. Wang, H. Xia, Yaxing Yao, Y. Huang. Flying Eyes and Hidden Controllers: A Qualitative Study of People's

Privacy Perceptions of Civilian Drones in the US. PETS 2016.

[2] Y. Yao, H. Xia, Y. Huang, Y. Wang. Free to Fly in Public Spaces: Drone Controllers' Privacy Perceptions and

Practices. CHI2017.

[3] Y. Yao, H. Xia, Y. Huang, Y. Wang. Privacy Mechanisms for Drones: Perceptions of Drone Controllers and

Bystanders in the U.S. CHI2017



SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY



salt.ischool.syr.edu