

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of

Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of  
Certain Foreign-Produced Military-Grade  
UAS and UAS Critical Components

PS Docket No. 26-189

**ORDER**

**Adopted: August 28, 2026**

**Released: August 28, 2026**

By the Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau and the Chief, Office of Engineering & Technology:

1. In this Order, the Federal Communications Commission’s (Commission) Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (PSHSB) and Office of Engineering and Technology (OET) deny three requests filed by American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers (AFPM),<sup>1</sup> DRONERESPONDERS (DR),<sup>2</sup> and Commercial Drone Alliance (CDA) (Petitioners)<sup>3</sup> for an extension of time to submit public comment in response to a Public Notice that was recently released in the above-captioned docket.

2. On July 21, 2026, PSHSB and OET jointly released a Public Notice seeking comment on a proposal to prohibit the continued importation and marketing of certain previously authorized foreign-produced uncrewed aircraft systems (UAS) and UAS components that are both on the Covered List and meet any of the listed definitions of “military-grade UAS and UAS critical components” as defined in the Public Notice.<sup>4</sup> The Public Notice was published in the Federal Register on August 3, 2026, and comments are due on or before September 2, 2026.<sup>5</sup>

3. On August 4, 2026, AFPM filed a request seeking an extension of the comment deadline “by at least thirty days,” because “[t]he current comment period creates practical challenges for meaningful stakeholder comment.”<sup>6</sup> AFPM “need[s] time to survey our members and assess the extent to which they rely on equipment that could be impacted by the proposal.”<sup>7</sup> In addition, the AFPM contends,

---

<sup>1</sup> American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, Request for an Extension the Comment Filing Period, PS Docket No. 26-189, (filed Aug. 4, 2026), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/search-filings/filing/26110069475> (AFPM Request).

<sup>2</sup> DRONERESPONDERS, Motion for Extension of Time to File Comments, PS Docket No. 26-189, (filed Aug. 24, 2026), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/26110072920/1> (DR Motion).

<sup>3</sup> Commercial Drone Alliance, Motion for Extension of Time to File Comments, PS Docket No. 26-189, (filed, Aug. 26, 2026), <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/26110073332/1> (CDA Motion).

<sup>4</sup> *FCC Seeks Comment on Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Certain Foreign-Produced Military Uncrewed Aircraft Systems (UAS) and UAS Critical Components for Non-U.S. Government, Including Those with Swarming Capabilities*, Public Notice, DA 26-758, PS Docket No. 26-189, 5-6 (PSHSB/OET July 21, 2026), 91 Fed. Reg. 48870 (Aug. 3, 2026).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*; see also 47 CFR § 2.939(e)(3).

<sup>6</sup> AFPM Request at 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

“[t]he proposal raises complex technical questions that require careful analysis.”<sup>8</sup> Finally, AFPM argues that “meaningful assessment of these impacts requires consultation across operating facilities, technical personnel, procurement teams, and UAS managers.”<sup>9</sup>

4. On August 24, 2026, DR filed a motion for extension of time to file comments “from September 2 to September 30, 2026”<sup>10</sup> to “allow stakeholders, including in the public safety community, to coordinate operational and technical input and develop a more complete factual record, while causing no material delay to the proceeding.”<sup>11</sup> DR contends that “[a]dditional time is needed for DR to consult affected organizations, gather information, and present the Commission with a well-founded and complete comment.”<sup>12</sup> DR also argues that “[a] meaningful response will require thinking through equipment supply chains, cybersecurity mitigations, public safety needs, and national security considerations.”<sup>13</sup> Finally, according to DR the comment period occurs during a time that “may make it challenging for public safety agencies and emergency response personnel to coordinate and contribute, particularly during a period when personnel may be unavailable.”<sup>14</sup> On August 26, 2026, CDA filed a motion for extension of time, supporting the DR motion for a 28-day extension of the time to file comments.<sup>15</sup>

5. National security concerns require us to act as expeditiously as possible when deciding on such an important public interest matter and it is the Commission’s policy that “extensions of time shall not be routinely granted.”<sup>16</sup> We have considered the arguments raised in the Petitioners’ requests under these standards and we do not find that they warrant an extension in this case. Rather, we believe that the public interest lies in maintaining the present schedule because the current deadline ensures timely consideration of the merits of the proposal found in the underlying *Public Notice*. In the *EA Security 2nd R&O and FNPRM*, the Commission noted that, “so as to promote regulatory certainty and the continued confidence of the public in our efforts to secure the communications equipment supply chain, OET and PSHSB should take reasonable steps to conclude these proceedings expeditiously after the end of the relevant comment period.”<sup>17</sup>

6. Based on these considerations, we find that it is in the public interest to deny all three requests for an extension of time to submit public comments. We conclude that the national security considerations undergirding the proposal require that public comment be provided to the Commission as

---

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> *DR Motion* at 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 2-3.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>15</sup> CDA raised four arguments in their filing, which largely echo arguments raised by AFPM and DR: 1) the proposed extension would allow affected parties to address the Commission’s proposals with specificity; 2) more time would help to ensure that the Commission receives practical input from all affected parties; 3) additional time would allow stakeholders to collect up-to-date information and develop more precise, evidence-based recommendations; and 4) more time would materially improve the Commission’s ability to evaluate the proposals in light of operational, technical, and commercial realities of the UAS marketplace. *CDA Motion* at 1-3.

<sup>16</sup> See 47 CFR § 1.46(a).

<sup>17</sup> *Protecting Against National Security Threats to the Communications Supply Chain through the Equipment Authorization Program*, Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, ET Docket No. 21-232, 40 FCC Rcd 8430, 8455, para. 47 (2025) (*EA Security 2nd R&O and FNPRM*).

soon as possible. Therefore, we find it is in the public interest to deny the Petitioners' requests. Public comment remains due by the current deadline on or before September 2, 2026.

7. For further information, please contact Greg Haledjian, Legal Advisor, Operations and Emergency Management Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, at 202-418-7440 or [Gregory.Haledjian@fcc.gov](mailto:Gregory.Haledjian@fcc.gov).

8. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), 5(c) and 303(r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 155(c) and 303(r), and sections 0.191, 1.46, and 2.939 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.191, 1.46, and 2.939, the requests for an extension of time to submit public comment filed by American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, by DRONEREponders, and by Commercial Drone Alliance ARE DENIED.

9. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to section 1.102(b)(1) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.102(b)(1), this Order SHALL BE EFFECTIVE upon release.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND HOMELAND SECURITY  
BUREAU

Zenji Nakazawa  
Chief

OFFICE OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY

Andrew C. Hendrickson  
Chief