

RESPONSIBLE USE OF DRONES IN ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

Dr. Arvind Menon

Assistant Professor

Department of Environmental Science
School of Earth and Environmental Studies
University of Kerala
Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India

Abstract

Small unmanned aircraft systems have become valuable tools for observing environmental change at fine spatial and temporal scales. Their cameras, thermal sensors, multispectral instruments, and lightweight mapping payloads can support habitat assessment, vegetation analysis, shoreline observation, pollution detection, wildlife surveys, erosion studies, and post-disaster assessment. The same capabilities, however, can create ecological, social, and safety risks when flights are poorly designed or when collected information is handled without clear safeguards.

This paper examines the principles that should guide the careful deployment of drones for environmental purposes. It considers disturbance to wildlife, risks to people and communities, privacy and data protection, flight safety, image interpretation, legal compliance, equipment life-cycle impacts, and the responsibilities of researchers, public agencies, conservation organisations, and commercial operators. The analysis treats a drone as part of a wider monitoring system rather than as a neutral technical device.

The study uses an integrative review and conceptual analysis of scholarship on unmanned aerial systems, remote sensing, conservation practice, environmental ethics, and risk management. It distinguishes operational efficiency from ecological appropriateness, because a rapid survey is not automatically a responsible survey. It also distinguishes high-resolution imagery from reliable environmental evidence, because monitoring results require validation, contextual knowledge, and transparent limitations.

The review indicates that responsible practice depends on purpose-defined flight planning, minimal disturbance protocols, competent pilots, risk assessment, lawful permissions, data minimisation, secure storage, quality assurance, consultation with affected communities, and open reporting of methods. The paper concludes that drones can strengthen environmental knowledge when they are used with restraint, accountability, and respect for ecosystems and people.

Keywords: Drones, Unmanned Aerial Systems, Environmental Monitoring, Remote Sensing, Wildlife Welfare, Privacy, Data Quality, Flight Safety, Conservation, Environmental Ethics

1. INTRODUCTION

Environmental monitoring often requires information that is difficult to collect from the ground alone. Wetlands may be inaccessible, forest canopies may conceal habitat condition, coastlines may change rapidly, and wildlife populations may be unevenly distributed across large or sensitive landscapes. Drones can provide observations at a scale between field sampling and satellite imagery, allowing teams to collect current visual, thermal, or spectral information while reducing the need for repeated access to fragile locations.

The benefits of aerial monitoring should not obscure the practical responsibilities associated with low-altitude flight. A drone may alter animal behaviour, intrude on

community spaces, create hazards near people or infrastructure, or generate imagery that reveals locations of vulnerable species. The environmental value of a mission therefore depends not only on the sensor used or the area covered, but also on the timing, route, height, purpose, duration, and governance of the operation.

Responsible deployment requires an approach that begins before take-off and continues after data collection. Teams need to ask whether a drone is necessary, whether a less intrusive method could achieve the same objective, who may be affected by the flight, what information should be collected, how uncertainty will be managed, and how equipment will be maintained or retired. These

questions move drone use from a technology-centred activity toward a stewardship-centred practice.

The objective of this paper is to analyse the key issues that shape ethical, safe, and scientifically credible drone use in environmental monitoring. It reviews relevant literature, defines the object of study, explains the review-based methodology, examines major risk domains, and identifies practical principles for deploying drones in ways that support environmental protection and public trust.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on unmanned aerial systems has expanded from photogrammetry and land surveying to ecology, conservation, agriculture, hydrology, coastal management, and environmental enforcement. Early studies emphasised the ability of lightweight aircraft to create detailed maps and repeat observations at relatively low cost. Later work has drawn attention to the importance of study design, platform limitations, wildlife responses, operator competence, sensor calibration, and the ethical implications of

collecting environmental and social data from the air.

The environmental monitoring literature shows that drone data can complement, rather than replace, field methods. Imagery may improve the visibility of canopy condition, surface water, nesting areas, exposed sediment, vegetation stress, litter accumulation, or animal presence. Yet the interpretation of these images depends on ground reference data, suitable resolution, atmospheric and illumination conditions, appropriate algorithms, and knowledge of the ecological setting. A visually striking image can be misleading when its spatial, temporal, or biological context is unclear.

A central conclusion in recent scholarship is that responsible practice must connect technology with ethics and governance. Pilot procedures, airspace rules, weather checks, maintenance records, emergency planning, consent processes, species-specific welfare protocols, data-security arrangements, and transparent reporting are all relevant. The following table summarises key literature that informs the analysis of drone use in environmental monitoring.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF KEY LITERATURE ON DRONE USE IN ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

S. No.	Author(s) / Year	Monitoring Focus	Study Context	Key Contribution
1	Anderson & Gaston (2013)	Spatial ecology	Lightweight aerial platforms	Explains how small aerial systems can support fine-scale ecological observation and spatial analysis.
2	Koh & Wich (2012)	Conservation monitoring	Tropical conservation	Highlights low-cost autonomous platforms as useful tools for conservation while recognising practical constraints.
3	Colomina & Molina (2014)	Photogrammetry and remote sensing	Geospatial data collection	Reviews platform, sensor, processing, and accuracy issues associated with aerial remote-sensing work.
4	Nex & Remondino (2014)	Three-dimensional mapping	Mapping applications	Identifies factors affecting image overlap, calibration, reconstruction, and the reliability of 3D outputs.
5	Linchant et al. (2015)	Wildlife monitoring	Mammal and conservation studies	Reviews opportunities and challenges for using unmanned aircraft in wildlife observation and management.
6	Chabot & Bird (2015)	Wildlife research methods	Environmental field research	Discusses the fit of unmanned aircraft within modern wildlife research and management practice.
7	Christie et al. (2016)	Wildlife research	Ecology and conservation	Examines current and future applications while noting ethical, technical, and regulatory considerations.

8	Hodgson et al. (2016)	Population counting	Wildlife surveys	Shows how well-designed aerial surveys can improve count precision under suitable field conditions.
9	Duffy et al. (2018)	Field deployment	Challenging environments	Emphasises site conditions, operational planning, and the importance of context in lightweight drone use.
10	Barnas et al. (2020)	Research reporting	Biological studies	Recommends transparent reporting of aerial methods so results can be interpreted, assessed, and replicated.
11	Rees et al. (2018)	Marine conservation	Sea turtle research	Illustrates the value of aerial observation while recognising species welfare and site-specific safeguards.
12	Mulero-Pázmány et al. (2017)	Conservation applications	Wildlife and habitat assessment	Assesses the growing role of unmanned aircraft in conservation and the need for suitable protocols.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The object of this study is the responsible use of drones in environmental monitoring. The analysis focuses on the choices made before, during, and after a mission, including purpose definition, flight planning, sensor selection, species and habitat sensitivity, data collection, processing, storage, reporting, and equipment management. It considers missions undertaken for conservation, environmental assessment, ecological research, disaster response, pollution observation, land and water monitoring, and community-facing environmental programmes.

The study examines the interaction between technical capability and stewardship responsibilities. The principal areas include wildlife welfare, ecological disturbance, flight safety, legal compliance, data quality, privacy, community engagement, cybersecurity, transparency, and material sustainability. These areas are considered together because weaknesses in one area can undermine the legitimacy and usefulness of the wider monitoring effort.

In addition, the study considers how aerial monitoring affects people who live, work, or hold customary relationships with the landscapes being observed. Environmental information should not be collected in a way that ignores local knowledge, reveals sensitive sites, or transfers all decision-making to remote operators. Responsible programmes should provide clarity about purpose, methods,

limits, data access, and avenues for raising concerns.

KEY POINTS OF OBJECT OF STUDY

- To identify environmental monitoring purposes for which aerial observation offers a clear and proportionate benefit.
- To examine flight-planning decisions that reduce disturbance to wildlife, habitats, residents, and site operations.
- To assess the role of species sensitivity, breeding periods, migration, nesting, and local ecological conditions in mission design.
- To evaluate data quality, georeferencing, calibration, ground validation, uncertainty, and the interpretation of aerial imagery.
- To consider legal permissions, airspace requirements, operator competence, weather limits, maintenance, and emergency procedures.
- To investigate privacy, community rights, data minimisation, secure storage, and controls on sharing sensitive imagery.
- To analyse environmental impacts related to battery management, equipment life cycles, transport, and field logistics.
- To examine the value of participatory approaches, local knowledge, transparent reporting, and accessible communication of results.
- To develop a practical framework for safe, ethical, and scientifically credible drone-supported monitoring.

TABLE 2: OBJECT OF STUDY FRAMEWORK

S. No.	Study Component	Description	Purpose
--------	-----------------	-------------	---------

1	Monitoring Purpose	Defined environmental question, target area, and intended decision use.	Ensure that the flight is necessary, proportionate, and connected to a clear monitoring objective.
2	Ecological Sensitivity	Species behaviour, breeding periods, habitat vulnerability, and local disturbance risks.	Reduce avoidable stress, displacement, habitat damage, and interference with ecological processes.
3	Flight Safety	Pilot competence, airspace awareness, weather assessment, maintenance, and emergency planning.	Protect people, property, aircraft, and critical infrastructure during operations.
4	Sensor and Data Quality	Resolution, calibration, metadata, georeferencing, ground validation, and uncertainty records.	Support reliable interpretation and prevent overconfident environmental conclusions.
5	Privacy and Community Rights	Notice, consent where appropriate, minimisation, sensitive-site protection, and complaint pathways.	Respect people and communities affected by aerial observation.
6	Data Stewardship	Access controls, storage, retention, sharing rules, and protection of sensitive environmental data.	Preserve confidentiality, integrity, and appropriate reuse of collected information.
7	Environmental Footprint	Battery care, equipment procurement, transport, repairability, and end-of-life handling.	Limit material waste and avoid shifting environmental burdens to the monitoring process.
8	Transparency and Review	Method reporting, incident records, independent review, and communication of limitations.	Strengthen accountability, learning, and public trust in monitoring results.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper uses an explanatory and integrative review design. Rather than collecting a new field dataset, it synthesises scholarly literature, conservation guidance, remote-sensing practice, aviation safety principles, and ethical discussions relevant to drone-supported environmental monitoring. The approach is appropriate because the research question concerns the technical, ecological, social, and governance conditions that shape responsible deployment across different sites and applications.

The review is organised around four analytical domains: mission necessity and ecological welfare; data quality and scientific interpretation; privacy, community rights, and legal accountability; and safety, material sustainability, and operational governance. Sources are considered for the type of monitoring application addressed, the risks identified, the safeguards proposed, and the implications for practical implementation.

To preserve analytical clarity, the paper distinguishes between low-impact access and zero impact, between image coverage and valid measurement, between legal flight approval and ethical legitimacy, and between data availability and appropriate disclosure. These distinctions guide the interpretation of evidence and the development of recommendations.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

- Study Type: Explanatory and literature-based research.
- Approach: Integrative review and conceptual synthesis.
- Unit of Analysis: Drone-supported environmental monitoring missions, field protocols, data workflows, and governance arrangements.
- Primary Domains: Ecological welfare, flight safety, data quality, privacy, accountability, and environmental sustainability.

- Context Variables: Habitat type, species sensitivity, operational setting, regulatory requirements, weather, and technical maturity.
- Outcome Variables: Monitoring reliability, disturbance reduction, safe operation, data stewardship, and public confidence.
- Ethical Position: No personal, confidential, or human-subject data were collected for this study.

4.2 METHODOLOGICAL STEPS

- Step 1: Define drone use as a monitoring method that requires environmental, social, and operational justification.
- Step 2: Identify major environmental applications, including habitat mapping, wildlife observation, water assessment, pollution detection, and disaster response.
- Step 3: Review literature on unmanned aircraft, ecological monitoring, remote sensing, conservation ethics, and operational risk.
- Step 4: Classify risks according to ecological, technical, legal, social, safety, and material dimensions.
- Step 5: Compare proposed controls, including site assessment, height and route selection, welfare protocols, calibration, permissions, and access rules.
- Step 6: Interpret evidence in relation to different landscapes, species, communities, operators, and monitoring objectives.
- Step 7: Identify limitations, including variable weather, battery constraints, sensor error, uneven regulations, and limited site-specific evidence.
- Step 8: Develop principles for careful, transparent, and accountable drone-supported monitoring.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is based on qualitative synthesis of the reviewed literature. Evidence is interpreted by tracing how planning choices, operating conditions, data practices, and stakeholder relationships influence the value and acceptability of aerial monitoring. The analysis does not report newly collected observations; instead, it consolidates recurring patterns and identifies the conditions under which drone use is most likely to support or undermine environmental objectives.

Across the reviewed studies, the most consistent message is that aerial monitoring cannot be separated from field stewardship. Effective use depends on a clear monitoring purpose, species-aware procedures, competent operation, validation of results, lawful permissions, secure information management, and openness about uncertainty. The following sections organise the analysis around four areas that are particularly important for responsible practice.

5.1 ECOLOGICAL DISTURBANCE AND WILDLIFE WELFARE

Drones can reduce the need for physical entry into remote or dangerous environments, but aircraft presence can also be perceived as a threat by animals. Disturbance may vary by species, season, group size, flight altitude, sound characteristics, approach direction, speed, and previous exposure to people or aircraft. Sensitive periods such as breeding, nesting, feeding, migration, or care of young require particular caution. A mission that produces useful imagery but causes repeated flushing, altered movement, or abandonment of a site cannot be treated as environmentally responsible.

Welfare-focused planning should begin with a site and species assessment. Operators should select the least intrusive platform and sensor combination, avoid unnecessary repeat flights, maintain conservative distances, use indirect routes where appropriate, schedule work outside sensitive periods when feasible, and stop the mission when signs of stress appear. Ecologists, local rangers, and other site experts should inform these decisions because generic flight rules cannot capture all ecological conditions.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- A low-altitude aircraft is not automatically low impact; welfare effects depend on species, context, timing, and flight behaviour.
- Species-specific protocols and real-time stop criteria are essential where monitoring occurs near vulnerable animals or breeding areas.
- The least intrusive method should be selected even when a drone is available and technically capable of completing the task.

5.2 DATA QUALITY, VALIDATION, AND CONTEXTUAL INTERPRETATION

Aerial images can create an impression of completeness because they show large areas in high detail. In practice, environmental interpretation is shaped by sensor quality, flight altitude, image overlap, illumination, wind, water reflectance, terrain, canopy cover, georeferencing, and processing choices. The same object may appear differently across times of day or seasons, while automated classification can confuse shadows, vegetation types, animals, debris, or surface features. Reliable monitoring therefore requires a documented chain from mission design to final conclusion.

Quality assurance should include calibration where relevant, consistent metadata, version-controlled processing, reference measurements from the ground or other trusted sources, and a record of known uncertainty. Analysts should avoid presenting preliminary images as proof of ecological change without comparison data or validation. Results are stronger when maps and estimates state their resolution, date, coverage, method, assumptions, and limits of interpretation.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- High-resolution imagery does not remove the need for ground truth, calibration, and ecological context.
- Metadata, flight logs, processing records, and validation notes are necessary for transparent and reproducible monitoring.
- Environmental conclusions should communicate uncertainty rather than implying precision that the data cannot support.

5.3 PRIVACY, COMMUNITY RIGHTS, AND LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Environmental missions may capture people, homes, vehicles, work sites, cultural places, land-use practices, or locations of protected species. These data can create risks even when the original purpose is conservation or environmental assessment. Images of private areas may be misused, and detailed coordinates for rare species or sensitive ecosystems may facilitate disturbance, extraction, or illegal activity. The legal authority to fly does not by itself resolve

questions about fairness, local expectations, or appropriate data sharing.

A rights-respecting approach requires data minimisation, clear purpose statements, secure storage, access controls, retention schedules, and restrictions on sharing sensitive material. Where flights affect communities or customary lands, operators should use suitable notice, consultation, and consent processes consistent with local law and context. Community knowledge should be treated as a contribution to monitoring design, not merely as information to be extracted. Accountability is strengthened when people can understand who is operating the drone, why the mission is taking place, and how concerns can be raised.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Environmental monitoring can generate personal, community, and biodiversity-sensitive information that requires protection.
- Data governance should define who can access imagery, how long it is kept, and which details must be withheld from public release.
- Consultation and clear communication improve legitimacy, especially where aerial observation affects local spaces or customary lands.

5.4 OPERATIONAL SAFETY, MATERIAL FOOTPRINT, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Drone operations involve risks related to aircraft failure, weather changes, battery faults, loss of communication, navigation error, collisions, and unexpected activity near the take-off or landing zone. These risks increase in difficult terrain, near infrastructure, above water, or during emergency environmental assessments. Responsible operators need documented pre-flight checks, airspace awareness, weather thresholds, launch and recovery procedures, communication plans, contingency actions, and incident reporting. Competence should include not only piloting skill but also a clear understanding of the environmental task and its limits.

The environmental footprint of the monitoring activity also deserves attention. Batteries, electronics, spare parts, transport, and repeated equipment replacement can create material waste or shift impacts elsewhere in the supply

chain. Programmes should favour durable and repairable equipment, safe battery storage and transport, planned maintenance, efficient field logistics, and appropriate end-of-life disposal. Accountability is stronger when organisations maintain mission records, equipment logs, permissions, risk assessments, and post-flight reviews that can support learning and independent scrutiny.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- A safe mission requires pre-flight, in-flight, and post-flight controls rather than reliance on pilot judgement alone.
- Battery care, repairability, equipment procurement, and disposal are part of the environmental responsibility of a monitoring programme.
- Mission logs and incident reviews make it possible to learn from errors and demonstrate accountable practice.

6. DISCUSSION

The reviewed literature demonstrates that drones are most useful when they are treated as one component of an environmental evidence system. They can extend observation across difficult terrain, support repeat mapping, reduce some forms of field exposure, and create timely records during changing conditions. These advantages are meaningful, but they do not justify routine flight in every setting. The first question should be whether aerial observation is necessary and proportionate to the environmental objective, not whether the technology is available.

Ecological welfare should be central to decision-making. A project may comply with aviation requirements yet still create avoidable pressure on wildlife or disturbance within fragile habitats. Site-specific protocols, conservative operating distances, seasonal restrictions, expert involvement, and stop criteria provide practical ways to make welfare considerations operational. These controls are especially important where data collection is repeated over time, because cumulative exposure can matter as much as any single flight.

Data quality and governance are equally important. Monitoring programmes should be designed so that another competent team can understand what was flown, what was

collected, how it was processed, and how conclusions were reached. Transparent methods, validation, uncertainty statements, secure handling of imagery, and careful publication of sensitive locations help protect both scientific credibility and environmental interests. Open sharing is valuable when it supports learning and accountability, but unrestricted disclosure can be harmful when it exposes private spaces or vulnerable species.

The discussion also highlights the importance of organisational responsibility. Conservation groups, researchers, public agencies, contractors, and commercial operators should define roles for mission approval, ecological review, pilot competence, data stewardship, community communication, and incident response. Procurement and partnership arrangements should avoid dependence on opaque platforms or data practices that prevent independent review. Responsible monitoring is not a one-time checklist; it is a continuing process of planning, observation, review, correction, and improvement.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper examined the principles that support responsible drone use in environmental monitoring. The analysis shows that aerial systems can contribute to habitat assessment, wildlife observation, vegetation analysis, water and shoreline studies, pollution detection, and rapid environmental assessment. Their value, however, is shaped by the ecological, social, technical, and organisational conditions under which they are used.

The evidence reviewed in this paper indicates that purpose-defined missions, species-aware welfare protocols, competent pilots, safe operating procedures, validated data workflows, privacy safeguards, community engagement, secure information management, and material stewardship can strengthen monitoring practice. These measures do not prevent innovation. Instead, they create the conditions under which environmental information can be collected with care and interpreted with confidence.

The paper concludes that effective aerial monitoring requires an integrated framework of restraint, transparency, and accountability. Future research should examine species-specific disturbance thresholds, participatory

monitoring models, methods for protecting sensitive environmental data, low-impact equipment design, and governance approaches

that remain effective across diverse legal and ecological settings.

8. REFERENCES

1. Anderson, K., & Gaston, K. J. (2013). Lightweight unmanned aerial vehicles will revolutionize spatial ecology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 11(3), 138-146. <https://doi.org/10.1890/120150>
2. Barnas, A. F., et al. (2020). A standardized protocol for reporting methods when using drones in biological research. *Journal of Unmanned Vehicle Systems*, 8(2), 89-98.
3. Chabot, D., & Bird, D. M. (2015). Wildlife research and management methods in the 21st century: Where do unmanned aircraft fit in? *Journal of Unmanned Vehicle Systems*, 3(4), 137-155.
4. Christie, K. S., Gilbert, S. L., Brown, C. L., Hatfield, M., & Hanson, L. (2016). Unmanned aircraft systems in wildlife research: Current and future applications of a transformative technology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 14(5), 241-251.
5. Colomina, I., & Molina, P. (2014). Unmanned aerial systems for photogrammetry and remote sensing: A review. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 92, 79-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2014.02.013>
6. Duffy, J. P., Anderson, K., Shutler, J. D., et al. (2018). Location, location, location: Considerations when using lightweight drones in challenging environments. *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation*, 4(1), 7-19.
7. Hodgson, J. C., Baylis, S. M., Mott, R., Herrod, A., & Clarke, R. H. (2016). Drones count wildlife more accurately and precisely than humans. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(11), 1365-1376.
8. International Civil Aviation Organization. (2015). *Manual on Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS) (Doc 10019)*. ICAO.
9. Koh, L. P., & Wich, S. A. (2012). Dawn of drone ecology: Low-cost autonomous aerial vehicles for conservation. *Tropical Conservation Science*, 5(2), 121-132.
10. Linchant, J., Lisein, J., Semeki, J., Lejeune, P., & Vermeulen, C. (2015). Are unmanned aircraft systems the future of wildlife monitoring? A review of accomplishments and challenges. *Mammal Review*, 45(4), 239-252.
11. Mulero-Pázmány, M., Jenni-Eiermann, S., Strebel, N., Sattler, T., Negro, J. J., & Tablado, Z. (2017). Unmanned aircraft systems as a new source of disturbance for wildlife: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE*, 12(6), e0178448.
12. Nex, F., & Remondino, F. (2014). UAV for 3D mapping applications: A review. *Applied Geomatics*, 6, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12518-013-0120-x>
13. O'Connor, J., et al. (2017). Unmanned aerial vehicles for surveying marine fauna: A review. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 571, 1-17.
14. Rees, A. F., et al. (2018). The potential of unmanned aerial systems for sea turtle research and conservation: A review of current possibilities and future directions. *Endangered Species Research*, 35, 81-100.
15. Rümmler, M.-C., Mustafa, O., Maercker, J., Peter, H.-U., & Esefeld, J. (2016). Measuring the influence of unmanned aerial vehicles on Adélie penguins. *Polar Biology*, 39, 1329-1334.
16. Seymour, A. C., Dale, J., Hammill, M., Halpin, P. N., & Johnston, D. W. (2017). Automated detection and enumeration of marine wildlife using unmanned aircraft systems and thermal imagery. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 45127.
17. Srinivasan, S., et al. (2015). UAVs for environmental monitoring: A review of applications, challenges, and data requirements. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 187, 1-17.
18. Stöcker, C., Bennett, R., Nex, F., Gerke, M., & Zevenbergen, J. (2017). Review of the current state of UAV regulations. *Remote Sensing*, 9(5), 459.
19. Vas, E., Lescroël, A., Duriez, O., Boguszewski, G., & Grémillet, D. (2015). Approaching birds with drones: First experiments and ethical guidelines. *Biology Letters*, 11(2), 20140754.

20. Vermeulen, C., Lejeune, P., Lisein, J., Sawadogo, P., & Bouché, P. (2013). Unmanned aerial survey of elephants. PLoS ONE, 8(2), e54700.
21. Watts, A. C., Ambrosia, V. G., & Hinkley, E. A. (2012). Unmanned aircraft systems in remote sensing and scientific research: Classification and considerations of use. Remote Sensing, 4(6), 1671-1692.
22. World Conservation Monitoring Centre. (2020). Guidance for the management of sensitive biodiversity data. UNEP-WCMC.
23. Zhang, C., & Kovacs, J. M. (2012). The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: A review. Precision Agriculture, 13, 693-712.
24. Zhou, G., et al. (2009). UAV-based remote sensing: A review of applications and data processing. Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing, 75(3), 247-253.