Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Report Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 18th March 2020

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
4	0	0	3	0	1

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location[1] Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2020011	29 Jan 20 1100	A319 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5110N 00015W 5nm W Gatwick 2000ft	Gatwick CTR (D)	**The A319 pilot** reports that they were at a busy phase of the flight, configuring for landing, the Captain was flying and the NHP spotted the drone. There was NOTAM'd drone activity, and this was broadcast on the ATIS, so the Captain first thought that was what had been spotted. However, this drone was positioned on the centreline for RW26L and passed overhead the aircraft. They reported it to ATC. The drone was square in shape and he was unable to identify if it had propellers, it was white with a black underbelly and looked plastic because the sun was reflecting from it. **Reported Separation:** 1000ftV/ 0m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Medium **A Gatwick Investigation reports** that the A319 pilot reported seeing a drone when on 5.5nm finals. There was known drone activity operating at 2nm south-east at the time and this information was broadcast on the ATIS. Drone command investigated and found no evidence of a drone in that area.	In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were such that they were unable to determine the nature of the unknown object. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C

[1] Latitude and Longitude are usually only estimates that are based on the reported time of occurrence mapped against any available radar data for the aircraft's position at that time. Because such reported times may be inaccurate, the associated latitudes and longitudes should therefore not be relied upon as precise locations of the event.

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location[1] Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2020012	2 Feb 20 1354	EMB 190 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5132N 00036E Southend-on-Sea FL85	London TMA (A)	**The EMB 190 pilot** reports that a drone was sighted to the south of SODVU whilst on a heading instructed by ATC. Having been cleared to climb to FL110 from FL80, while passing FL85 the First Officer spotted a 'grey' drone to the right-hand side of the aircraft. The drone was reported to ATC and the crew continued as per ATC's initial instruction. **Reported Separation:** 500ft V/<0.5nm H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Low **The NATS Swanwick Investigation** reports that the EMB 190 pilot reported passing a drone when passing FL85 in the climb, grey in colour, 5nm south of SODVU. The pilot subsequently reported this as an Airprox. The controller attempted to obtain further information relating to the sighting. Subsequent aircraft in the vicinity were advised of the report, however there were no other sightings. Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot of the EMB 190 reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts were visible.	In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were such that they were unable to determine the nature of the unknown object. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C
2020021	17 Feb 20 1832	B757 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5348N 00134W SE Leeds Bradford 2300ft	Leeds CTR (D)	**The B757 pilot** reports that he was on final approach to RW32 at Leeds Bradford, it was dark and there was a 34kt crosswind and showers in the vicinity. They were underneath a main cloud layer when it became apparent that there was an event taking place in Leeds city centre. It was to the right of the aircraft as they made their approach and he could make out a Ferris wheel and lots of bright lights. Focusing on monitoring the approach there appeared to be fireworks or bright flashing lights to his right where the event was taking place. He looked right and noticed a single red light hovering above the event, which he believed to be a drone. It was hovering at an altitude of somewhere between 500ft and 1000ft. He estimated that it was between 500-1000ft away from his aircraft. On landing he reported the drone sighting to ATC. **Reported Separation:** 500-1000ft H	In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were such that they were unable to determine the nature of the unknown object. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 8 **Risk:** The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where normal procedures and/or safety standards had applied.	E

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location[1] Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2020023	23 Feb 20 1239	Q400 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5321N 00156W 12nm E Manchester 5000ft	Daventry CTA (D)	**The Q400 pilot** reports on first contacting Manchester, they were given information about a drone report from another pilot, in a different location. A short time later a red metallic drone was sighted to the left and below the aircraft, on a reciprocal heading. The sighting was over in a very short space of time and although it was very obvious all he could identify was that it was a red metallic drone, he couldn't see any distinguishing features. **Reported Separation:** 300ft V/ 150m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** None	In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were such that they were unable to determine the nature of the unknown object. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	C

Relevant Contributory Factor (CF) Table

CF	Factor	Description	Amplification
	Flight Elements		
	• Regulations, Processes, Procedures and Compliance		
1	Human Factors	• Flight Crew ATM Procedure Deviation	The drone operator did not comply with regulations due to flying above 400ft and/or in controlled airspace/FRZ without clearance
	• Tactical Planning and Execution		
2	Human Factors	• Action Performed Incorrectly	The drone operator was flying above 400ft without clearance.
3	Human Factors	• Airspace Infringement	The drone pilot was flying in controlled airspace/FRZ without clearance.
	• Situational Awareness of the Conflicting Aircraft and Action		
4	Contextual	• Situational Awareness and Sensory Events	Pilot had no, or only generic, or late Situational Awareness
	• See and Avoid		
5	Contextual	• Near Airborne Collision with Other Airborne Object	An Airprox involving an unknown object or balloon.
6	Contextual	• Near Airborne Collision with RPAS	An Airprox involving a drone or model aircraft.
7	Human Factors	• Perception of Visual Information	Pilot was concerned by the proximity of the other aircraft
8	Human Factors	• Monitoring of Other Aircraft	Sighting report