

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 22nd June 2022

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
4	0	1	2	1	0

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
2022076	3 Apr 2022 1456	AW189 (Coast Guard)	Drone	5043N 00133W Milford on Sea 600ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The AW189 pilot reports that during a SAR training sortie transiting to a field landing site on the Isle of Wight, a large white fixed-wing type drone (approx. 5ft wide) was seen flying in the opposite direction 50ft below the aircraft at approximately 550ft agl. It was seen too late to take any avoiding action. The crew was alert having just seen a large hovering quadcopter 100m away at a similar height a few minutes before. The crew discussed the near miss, noted the position and elected to continue with the sortie.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 50ft V/ 0m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 4, 7</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.</p>	B
2022078	4 May 22 1937	A320 (CAT)	Drone	Burgess Park 5129N 00005W 4200ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports established on the ILS for RW27R at Heathrow when the Captain (PF) caught sight of an airborne grey object ahead, slightly to the right and slightly below. The First Officer and supernumerary were asked to see what it was as they went past, and they confirmed it was an unlit drone, about 2ft across and estimated to be 100ft below and 300ft off the end of the right wing tip.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/300ft H Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Heathrow Arrivals controller reports that an inbound A320 reported a drone at 4200ft when passing 14 miles on final approach to 27R. They reported the size to be about 2ft by 2ft. They reported the drone to have gone below the wing down the right-hand side. TC FIN was informed to pass this information to subsequent aircraft.</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported description of the object was sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5</p> <p>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.</p>	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
2022093	27 May 22 1512	Wildcat (RN)	Drone	1NM N Chepstow 5139N 00240W 200ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The Wildcat pilot reports that whilst low flying in the Wye Valley, in the stretch between Woodcroft to Chepstow, the crew noted a flock of birds taking flight from the river but remaining beneath the aircraft. Continuing to look out for additional birds that were flying from the cliffs the observer called visual with a large bird hovering overhead before changing their assessment to a drone. The pilot sighted the drone approximately 100ft above the aircraft and 100m ahead, which was steady in position. Due to the aircraft's position in the valley the pilot elected to continue with a slight descent while the observer maintained eyes on until the drone had passed overhead. The aircraft climbed out of low-level to enter the Bristol Channel and reported the Airprox to London Information with whom they had a service and had contacted prior to entering the valley.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V / 50m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p> <p>The London Information FISO reports that the [Wildcat pilot] reported climbing from low-level and that they had just had an Airprox with an unmanned drone. No avoiding action was taken. The drone was described as a quad rotor, white upper, black lower half. [The Wildcat pilot] reported routing via Bristol Channel and Old Severn Bridge. At the time of the incident [they were] climbing out of the Wye Valley. [The Wildcat] was at 200ft and the drone was reported as being above, at around 300-400ft AGL.</p> <p>NATS Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot of [the Wildcat] reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts were visible.</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 5</p> <p>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.</p>	C

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
2022094	22 May 0946	A319 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00033W ivo Horton 1500ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The A319 pilot reports that on passing 1500ft on the SID, the Captain noticed what appeared to be a stationary 'regular-sized, domestic hobby-type 4-blade drone'. It was estimated to be over the lakes to the south of the village of Horton.</p> <p>Reported Separation: Not reported. Reported Risk of Collision: Not reported.</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 1, 2, 4</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where there was insufficient information to make a sound judgement of risk.</p>	D

Relevant Contributory Factor (CF) Table

CF	Factor	Description	ECCAIRS Amplification	UKAB Amplification
Flight Elements				
• Regulations, Processes, Procedures and Compliance				
1	Human Factors	• Flight Crew ATM Procedure Deviation	An event involving the drone operator deviating from applicable Air Traffic Management procedures	The drone operator did not comply with regulations by flying above 400ft and/or in controlled airspace/FRZ without clearance
• Tactical Planning and Execution				
2	Human Factors	• Action Performed Incorrectly	Events involving the drone operator performing the selected action incorrectly	The drone operator was flying above 400ft without clearance.
3	Human Factors	• Airspace Infringement	An event involving an infringement / unauthorized penetration of a controlled or restricted airspace	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	Events involving a flight crew's awareness and perception of situations	Pilot had no, generic, or late Situational Awareness
• See and Avoid				
5	Human Factors	• Perception of Visual Information	Events involving flight crew incorrectly perceiving a situation visually and then taking the wrong course of action or path of movement	Pilot was concerned by the proximity of the other aircraft
• Outcome Events				
6	Contextual	• Near Airborne Collision with Other Airborne Object	An event involving a near collision by an aircraft with an unpiloted airborne object (unknown object or balloon)	
7	Contextual	• Near Airborne Collision with RPAS	An event involving a near collision with a remotely piloted air vehicle (drone or model aircraft)	