

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
6	2	2	1	1	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
2025059	24 Apr 25 1355	Ikarus (Civ FW)	Drone	5245N 00125E 2NM NE Coltishall 1000ft	London FIR (G)	<p><b>The Ikarus pilot</b> reports they were on a local flight, in good visibility, and had just passed Coltishall VRP by approximately 2NM when a drone appeared and quickly disappeared off their left wing approximately 50 to 100ft at level altitude of 1000ft on Norwich QNH 1023hPa. They further described the drone as a grey and red quadcopter.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 0ft V/50ft H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> High</p> <p><b>The Norwich controller</b> reported that at approximately 1350 [the Ikarus pilot] transiting from [point to point], reported an Airprox with a drone. They reported that it had happened about 60sec previously and was at a similar level (1000ft). They acknowledged the Airprox and asked the pilot to call once landed safely to pass any further details. They continued without any further incident. On landing, the pilot reported that the drone appeared to be a regular size, with red and grey colourings. It occurred approximately 2-3 miles after Coltishall, with [the Ikarus] on an easterly track.</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, 2, 4, 5</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C
2025061	20 Apr 25 1814	ATR72 (CAT)	Drone	5551N 00429W 1.5NM SW Glasgow 500ft	Glasgow CTR (D)	<p><b>The ATR72 pilot</b> reports that a white and black drone was spotted [when] at 1.5NM [DME] and 500ft during the ILS approach to RW05 at Glasgow. No evasive manoeuvre was required or executed. Glasgow Tower was informed and the local police were debriefed on arrival at the gate.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> NR <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> NR</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, 2, 3, 4, 5</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> The Board considered that there was insufficient information to make a sound judgement of risk.</p>	D

<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
						<p><b>The Glasgow Tower controller</b> reports that [the pilot of the ATR72] landed on RW05 and reported that a drone was sighted when they had been at 1.5DME.</p> <p><b>Glasgow Unit Investigation:</b> [The pilot of the ATR72] reported the drone to ADC as they vacated RW05. They reported the drone as black and white in colour, on their left hand side when on a 1.5NM final and at 500ft. They did not state an intention to file an Airprox [at that time] and the controller replied with “<i>thanks for that</i>”. The controller then took appropriate action and reported to the ATC Watch manager and the Airport and [the pilots of] subsequent aircraft were warned, but there were no further sightings.</p> <p>The radar screens visible to the radar controller have been checked and there were no unknown returns in the area and ATC was not working anything in that vicinity. The primary radar recordings were reviewed but there was nothing shown in the area. The Tower controller did not observe anything visually from the VCR window and there was nothing visible on the ATM recording. As the intention to file an Airprox was not communicated to ATC, it was filed as an MOR Drone report.</p>		
2025066	26 Apr 25 1537	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5151N 00017W 3NM ESE Luton 8000ft	London TMA (A)	<p><b>The B787 pilot</b> reports that on climb for the ULTIB 1J SID, but on a heading under positive radar control, when passing 8000-8300ft and abeam Luton, a red/black object passed above and to the right of the aircraft, approximately 200ft above and 100ft to the right of the aircraft. The object was travelling at speed and, although they were climbing, it appeared to climb also. The object was approximately 1m in diameter and of mechanical structure with possible arms attached.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 200ft V/ 100ft H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> NR</p> <p><b>The TC GS Midlands controller</b> reports that at 1537 [B787 C/S] outbound from Heathrow 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, 2, 3, 4, 7</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> The Board considered that safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.</p>	B

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
						sighting a drone approx 1M in size at FL80 as they passed Luton.		
2025068	29 Apr 25 1024	B777 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00030W 1.2NM west of RW09L at LHR 350ft	London CTR (D)	<p><b>The B777 pilot</b> reports that at 1.2 ILS DME 09L LHR a small white 4 propeller drone passed to the right of them co-altitude and close proximity to their right wing tip.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 0ft V/NR H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> NR</p> <p><b>The LHR VCR Supervisor</b> reports that the B777 had been on finals for RW09L and the pilot reported a white toy drone on the right hand side of the aircraft at 1.2NM DME. No further reports were received by the following landing aircraft.</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, 7</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2025070	2 May 25 1006	F15 (Foreign Mil)	Unk Obj	5306N 00015W ivo Coningsby FL120	London FIR (G)	<p><b>The F15 pilot</b> reports leading a pair on RTB over Conningsby at FL120 in the process of a handoff between Swanwick and Approach. Behind them was a 3-ship formation along the same route. The pilot gained tally of what looked like a basketball-sized drone with a flashing blue light. They acquired the drone at the moment they flew past it, assessing a miss distance of approximately 50ft. There were no prior indications on radar. They advised their operating authority of the incident and requested notification to Swanwick. Additionally, they advised the 3-ship in trail. None of the trail formation crew observed anything on radar or visually as they passed.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 0ft V/50ft H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> High</p> <p><b>The Swanwick controller</b> reports an F15 formation was RTB, underneath Y70 at FL120 and under a Traffic Service. They allocated the Lakenheath squawk and proceeded to handover. On completion of the handover they instructed the formation to contact Lakenheath Approach but was answered with a 'stand by'. Shortly afterwards the pilot returned to frequency and then proceeded with Lakenheath. The controller was not informed about an Airprox or</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><b>Applicable Contributory Factors:</b> 4, 6</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A

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
						drone sighting. The watch log did not reflect a call at any point from Lakenheath regarding the incident.		
2025072	27 Apr 25 1603	A220 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5053N 00003W 2NM NE of Brighton FL310	London UIR (C)	<p><b>The A220 pilot</b> reports that during cruise at FL310 approximately 10NM before SFD VORDME on airway Y803, both pilots saw a white object with a rectangular shape that they believed to be a UAV. The Airprox was transmitted to London ACC and to Paris ACC. The encounter lasted for a maximum of 2sec.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> Very close, just in front of the aircraft and below.</p> <p><b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> Low</p> <p><b>The Swanwick ACC</b> controller reports 'at 1615 [the A220 pilot] reported seeing a drone slightly below them in the vicinity of SFD'. The aircraft was at FL310. Sussex police were informed.</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><b>Applicable Contributory Factors:</b> 4, 6</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> The Board considered that 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	ECCAIRS Amplification	UKAB Amplification
	<b>Flight Elements</b>			
	<b>• Regulations, Processes, Procedures and Compliance</b>			
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
	<b>• Tactical Planning and Execution</b>			
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.
	<b>• Situational Awareness of the Conflicting Aircraft and Action</b>			
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
	<b>• See and Avoid</b>			
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
	<b>• Outcome Events</b>			
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)	