Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 23rd April 2025

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
6	3	2	1	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
2025022	3 Mar 25 1215	Atlas A400M (HQ Air Ops)	Drone	5205N 00113W 5NM E Banbury 375ft	London FIR (G)	**The Atlas pilot** reports flying a low level sortie when a grey quadcopter type UAS was observed to pass over the top of the aircraft within 50ft. It was estimated to be stationary, around 350-400ft AGL measuring roughly 1m in size. Avoiding action was taken by the PF, electing to pass underneath the UAS given its location to the aircraft when spotted. The location was marked by the PM and the sortie completed without further incident. There were no NOTAMs or CADS entries in the vicinity of the incident during the planning phase and this was subsequently reviewed and confirmed to be the case post landing. **Reported Separation:** 50ft V/0m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Medium	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. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 4, 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	A
2025025	5 Mar 25 1300	Prefect (HQ Air Trg)	Drone	5251N 00023W 6NM N Bourne 7200ft	London FIR (G)	**The Prefect pilot** reports that, on exit from an academic 4-turn spinning demonstration at 7200ft, a drone was observed level with them, 100ft laterally displaced in their 11 o'clock position. The QFI, as handling pilot, avoided the drone with an evasive right turn. It was a large quadcopter drone tethered to a white parachute with a white pennant half way down the tether and approximately 40ft in length from the parachute to drone. They followed the drone down to identify an impact point in a farmer's field 7NM north of Bourne. **Reported Separation:** 0m V/100m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Medium	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. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 1, 2, 4, 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.	B

[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
						The Cranwell Departures controller reports that, the pilot [of the Prefect] reported a near-miss with a parachute carrying a drone at around altitude 5000ft [they recall]. The pilot passed more detailed information a few minutes later and the Supervisor noted the information on a separate console in order to report through the appropriate channels. At no point did the drone paint on radar. When they handed-over the departures position they informed the oncoming controllers about the situation. The Drone sighting was reported to Lincolnshire Police. **3FTS Investigation:** Findings: All sensible precautions were taken [by the Prefect crew] prior to conducting the spinning, including; lookout turns, being under a radar service and examining electronic conspicuity aids. It was unexpected to sight such activity at a high altitude. The operator of the drone is unknown. Despite being able to identify and report the landing site of the drone, the launch/control location was unidentified. The lack of NOTAM and observed flight height might suggest a non-compliant operation, therefore, potentially an unlicensed operator despite the large size of the vehicle indicating commercial use. Furthermore, parachute fitment suggests either a requirement to conform with safety related regulations such as BVLOS operations or that the drone was fitted with expensive equipment which the operator had tried to safeguard from loss. There are online guides to DIY parachutes as well as commercially available systems. Despite being of a large size, the UAV was not detected by the Star-NG nor by any onboard EC aids, therefore, no warning could be provided to the crew. However, it is not possible to rule out that the operator of the drone was ADSB-In capable and therefore the ADSB-out signal of the Prefect [may have] alerted them to the aircraft operating in the locality. Due to the nature of the task, the crew were likely obscured from an earlier sighting of the drone by the body of the aircraft. This, combined with the spinning		

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
						task and recovery, meant there was very little opportunity to have sighted the UAV earlier. Additionally, it is unknown whether the parachute recovery system was triggered automatically or manually by the drone operator and, therefore, how long the more obviously sighted parachute was present versus solely the black quadcopter.		
2025027	10 Mar 25 1759	DHC8 (CAT)	Drone	5126N 00006W IVO Forest Hill 2000ft	London City CTR (D)	**The DHC8 pilot** reports that just before turning overhead waypoint 'TODBI' at 2000ft their aircraft nearly collided with a round-shaped black drone, approximately 0.5-1m in diameter. The drone was headed south-southeast and estimated to be a couple of meters below the aircraft's flight path. **Reported Separation:** 30ft V/ 0m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** High	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. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	A
2025028	12 Mar 25 2125	Chinook (HQ JAC)	Unk Obj	5053N 00051W IVO Chichester 900ft	London FIR (G)	**The Chinook pilot** reports that the aircraft had been in a medium level cruise routeing northbound in the vicinity of Chichester following completion of overwater training south of Selsey. The Captain, who was the NHP at the time, saw a bright light appear in the aircraft's one o'clock and made a threat call to alert the crew to the presence of a possible drone. The HP made a gentle evasive manoeuvre to the left as the No2 crewman continued to patter the drone down the right-hand side of the aircraft. The drone was assessed to be in a hover at approximately 500ft AGL and at co-altitude with the aircraft. ATC was alerted and the sortie was continued without further incident. **Reported Separation:** 0ft V/200m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Low **The Odiham Approach controller** reports that they had been the controller at time of the reported Airprox. The Chinook pilot was on frequency under a Basic Service, operating around the South Downs. They reported an Airprox at 2135, believed to be a drone, roughly 5NM south of their current position. There were no NOTAMs to state drones had been in their operating area and there had been no radar return in the area before [or] after the report to indicate another aircraft. […]. The pilot then passed	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:** 4, 5 **Risk:** The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.	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
						[full] details at 2225 before returning to [destination airfield]. The drone was believed to have been co-altitude, possibly lit, however believed to have turned lights on at the last minute, meaning that the Chinook crew had seen it late. They reported that the drone passed down the right hand side of the aircraft and the pilot had taken avoiding action to the left.		
2025031	12 Mar 25 1720	B777 (CAT)	Drone	5129N 00022W 2.5NM E RW27R LHR 700ft	London CTR (D)	**The B777 pilot** reports that between 700-800ft on the ILS approach for RW27R at LHR, a black drone was observed above and just to the right of their path. No more than 200ft above them, possibly less. The drone was black, with a solid looking body and appeared to be 4-rotored. They further reported that the drone was close enough to see clearly and wondered if it would hit the extremity of the right wing. **Reported Separation:** 200ft V/0m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** High **The Heathrow Approach controller** reports that [the B777 pilot] reported a black drone above them whilst 2.5NM final for RW27R. Police and subsequent arrivals were informed.	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. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.	B
2025035	24 Mar 25 1528	Apache (HQ JAC)	Drone	5339N 00219W Ramsbottom 1800ft	London FIR (G)	**The Apache pilot** reports that Warton ATC alerted them to a potential radar contact in their 12 o'clock at 2NM. As they transmitted to Warton that they were looking for the traffic, they noticed a small unnaturally static black object in their 12 o'clock. It became apparent that this object was close and they stopped communication with ATC and told the HP to 'break left'. They reacted immediately to the call and the object passed down the starboard side at approximately 10m. The HP was unsighted of the object at all times. However, they, the NHP, could clearly identify the object as a small black 'quad-copter' style UAS. They continued their routeing and passed the details of the sighting to Warton ATC. **Reported Separation:** 0ft V/10m H **Reported Risk of Collision:** Medium	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. **Applicable Contributory Factors:** 1, 2, 4, 7 **Risk:** The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.	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	If the reported object was a drone, then 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	If the reported object was a drone, then 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	If the reported object was a drone, then 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)	