

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 7th December 2022

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
3	2	1	0	0	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
2022259	3 Nov 22 1523	Paraglider (Civ Hang)	Drone	5321N 00138W Stanage Edge 1400ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The PARAGLIDER pilot reports that during a top-to-bottom paraglider flight at Stanage Edge, they were approaching the landing field in a right-hand turn and suddenly heard the noise of a drone nearby. Scanning the sky, they saw it heading away from them under their right-hand wing tip. After landing, the drone pilot was found stood in the car park wearing goggles/head up display. Their friend stood nearby was also wearing similar goggles. [The paraglider pilot reports that the drone pilot said] that they had only just taken off and did not see [the paraglider] approaching the landing area. Several other paraglider pilots had seen the incident. The drone had an estimated combined wing/rotor span of about 500mm and weight of about 1.25Kg.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 2ft V/20ft 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: 4, 7</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A

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
2022261	8 Nov 22 1635	AW109 (HEMS)	Drone	5225N 00038W Grafton Underwood 2000ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The AW109 pilot reports that during the cruise at sunset, they saw what they thought was a large bird at 400-500m co-altitude. After 2-3 seconds they realised it was a drone. [Other crew members] saw it too at 3 o'clock around to 5 o'clock as it disappeared behind. They were close enough to identify it as a DJI Phantom type and estimated the distance as 30-80m. No avoiding action was taken due to lack of time. The Airprox was reported to London Info who attempted to get an exact fix via East Midlands Airport radar, but the radar position was unreliable on account that they were on the very limits of their cover. The ACANS (Airborne Command and Navigation System) unit didn't pick up a ground-based operator, suggesting that the drone was not emergency services or a professional operator.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/ 30-80m 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
2022263	16 Nov 22 1302	Atlas (HQ Air (Ops))	Unk Obj	5456N 00151W Currock Hill FL75	Newcastle CTA (D)	<p>The Atlas pilot reports they had just completed instrument approach training at Newcastle and were climbing out to route towards Humberside. After the last approach they had been cleared to climb ahead to FL90. During the climb they received radar vectors from Newcastle ATC before being cleared own navigation to Humberside. During one of the radar vectors, in a left turn passing through about south at FL75, one of the crew on the flight deck alerted the rest of the crew to a drone that was ahead and just to the right of the nose. Other crew members then saw the object as it passed quickly down the right-hand side. There was no time for the crew to react. The drone was assessed to have passed level with the flight deck windows and a few feet outside the wing tip. The drone was circular, had a hollow centre (doughnut shaped), was dark in colour, and approximately 2-3ft in diameter. The incident was reported to Newcastle ATC. It was noted that, had the aircraft not been in a turn at the time, there would have been a very high chance of collision with the drone.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/ 2ft H Reported Risk of Collision: Very High</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 6</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A

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)	