

## Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Report Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2020

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

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location <sup>1</sup> Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2020024	5 Feb 20 1645	Saab340B (CAT)	Drone	N5558 W00320 1nm Final Edinburgh 300ft	Edinburgh CTR (D)	<p><b>The Saab 340 pilot</b> reports that a drone was observed on the starboard side at 1NM from touchdown and 300ft agl. The drone was parallel to the aircraft's track, was medium sized and was red, white and blue in colour.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 50-100ft V/15ft H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> 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><b>Applicable Contributory Factors:</b> 1, 3, 4, 6</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2020028	12 Mar 20 1657	Pilatus (MOD ATEC)	Drone	5110N 00143W Boscombe Down 800ft	Boscombe Down MATZ (G)	<p><b>The Pilatus pilot</b> reports that whilst conducting a PFL and about to roll out onto the final leg, he saw a drone co-altitude passing an estimated 30ft down the right-hand side of his aircraft. The drone was silver/aluminium and discus shaped, but he could not distinguish any legs or propulsion. Both pilots saw it.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 0ft V/ 30ft H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> Low</p> <p><b>The Boscombe Runway Caravan Controller</b> reports that the Pilatus turned finals and was cleared to touch and go. He completed a gear check and then scanned the approach, as was normal practice. The pilot reported going around and he observed a large black drone in the approach, it seemed to be close to the airfield boundary at approximately 300ft. The drone was larger than a stereotypical image, with a raised middle and four propellers on each side. He tracked the movement of the drone and reported its location to the Tower controller via intercom. The drone tracked east, at some speed, remaining at the same height until it disappeared out of sight.</p> <p><b>The Boscombe Tower Controller</b> reports that the Pilatus joined the visual circuit on a PFL, he called low-key with gear down and was cleared for a touch-and-go. When on short finals he reported going around due to a drone being in the approach, nothing was seen from the tower, however the Caravan controller reported seeing the drone. An A109 pilot operating on the south-side of the airfield reported a white van on the disused railway line and believed the drone it could have been connected to it, although there was no evidence to prove it.</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the descriptions of the object were sufficient to indicate that it could have been a drone.</p> <p><b>Applicable Contributory Factors:</b> 1, 3, 4, 6</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> 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

## Relevant Contributory Factor (CF) Table

CF	Factor	Description	Amplification
	<b>Flight Elements</b>		
	<b>• Regulations, Processes, Procedures and Compliance</b>		
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
	<b>• Tactical Planning and Execution</b>		
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.
	<b>• Situational Awareness of the Conflicting Aircraft and Action</b>		
4	Contextual	• Situational Awareness and Sensory Events	Pilot had no, or only generic, or late Situational Awareness
	<b>• See and Avoid</b>		
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