

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 8th October 2025

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
10	4	1	4	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
2025159	29 Jul 25 1016	Phenom (HQ (Air Trg))	Unk Obj	5309N 00031W 1NM SE Waddington 1500ft	ATZ (G)	<p>The Phenom pilot reports on the climbout from a training instrument approach into RAF Waddington when the mission aircrew in the rear of the aircraft reported that they had seen a white object, believed to be a drone about 40cm in diameter, pass the left wing about 100ft below. At the time, the PF (in the left seat) was heads-in, flying on instruments. Neither they or the instructor saw the object as they flew past it. It flew under the wing so quickly it wasn't possible to identify but it could have been a quadcopter. No lights were seen on it. The drone was reported to ATC and declared as an Airprox on landing.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/NK H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p> <p>Waddington Tower controller reports acting as instructor for a trainee Tower controller. Following the Phenom's instrument approach they received a call from [Radar] informing them of the incident details. No drone activity was notified within the area and nothing was seen from the tower.</p> <p>Waddington Radar controller reports being the radar supervisor at the time of the incident. [The Phenom crew were] flying a [military SID] on departure when they reported a drone had been seen at approx 1500ft. At no stage [did it] paint on the radar. It was not reported as an Airprox on the radio. The details were immediately passed to the [Tower controller] who confirmed that no drone activity had been notified to them.</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, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.</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
						DDH reports this Airprox occurred during a period of flight with the Phenom on the climb out from a training instrument approach. Of note, Mission Aircrew in the rear cabin spotted the drone as neither the trainee (heads in on instruments) or the QFI (monitoring) were aware of it. Indeed, ATC could not provide any warning to the Phenom crew as the drone was not visible on radar or visual from Waddington tower. Similarly, the absence of a suitable transponder on the drone rendered the Phenom electronic conspicuity systems redundant. Finally, with no notification of any drone activity in the area it is likely that this operator was either not aware of the regulations or chose to ignore them and it is this aspect which causes the greatest concern.		
2025165	12 Jul 25 1404	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5129N 00035W 8NM W Heathrow 2500ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The B787 pilot reports that a white, 4 propellor, DJI-style drone was spotted 20ft below them at 2500ft when 8NM west of Heathrow on final approach to RW09L.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 20ft V/NR H Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Heathrow Tower controller reports that the pilot of the B787 reported that a drone was spotted 20ft below them on approach to RW09L.</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, 3, 4, 7</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2025167	10 Jul 25 0946	B777 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5129N 00032W 2NM W Heathrow 1500ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The B777 pilot reports that, on passing approximately 1500ft on climbout from RW27R, a drone was observed to pass down the aircraft's right side at the same level as the aircraft and very close to, or over, the right-hand wing.</p> <p>Reported Separation: NR Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The Heathrow Controller reports that the B777 pilot reported seeing a drone on climbout from RW27R, on their right-hand-side, at approximately 1500ft. The pilot in the aircraft following reported that it may have been a balloon.</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 providence had played a major part in the incident and/or a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2025172	1 Aug 25 1608	B787 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5127N 00022W 4NM ESE Heathrow 1800ft	London CTR (D)	The B787 pilot reports that, on departure from RW09R, just before 'D5.0 LON' on the GASGU 2J departure, the Captain noticed what they thought	In the Board's opinion the reported altitude and/or description of the object were such that	D

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
						<p>looked like a drone pass down the left-hand side of the aircraft. The drone sighting was immediately reported to Heathrow Tower.</p> <p>Reported Separation: NR Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Heathrow Tower controller reports that [the pilot of the B787] reported seeing a drone at around 1000ft 2NM east of Heathrow on the 09R climbout.</p>	<p>they were unable to determine the nature of the unknown object.</p> <p>Applicable Contributory Factors: 4, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that there was insufficient information to make a sound judgement of risk.</p>	
2025177	10 Aug 25 1352	B737 (CAT)	Drone	5602N 00304W 10NM to RW24 3200ft	Edinburgh CTR (D)	<p>The B737 pilot reports that on approach into Edinburgh RW24 at approximately 10 DME and 3200ft a possible drone passed the aircraft down the left-hand side at their level, tracking horizontally. The object appeared to be a large commercial drone with twin propellers and blue in colour passing within approximately 50m.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/50m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The Edinburgh INT controller reports that whilst working as the INT controller, the B737 had been cleared for the approach for RW24. At 1352, when the aircraft had been at approximately 10NM, the crew reported a blue drone with two propellers to the left of the aircraft at 3200ft. The crew confirmed that they would be filing an Airprox. Subsequent aircraft were informed of the drone details; both [following aircraft] crews reported that they did not see a drone. The Assistant was phoned and asked to contact the Police with the details.</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, 3, 4, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C
2025182	16 Aug 25 1508	B737 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5555N 00421W 4NM NE of Glasgow 3000ft	Glasgow CTR (D)	<p>The B737 pilot reports that at approximately 4NM on departure from RW05 at Glasgow both crew noticed a fast moving round black object pass at eye level past the right-hand side of the aircraft and over the right wing. The aircraft was passing through 3000ft and accelerating to bug-up speed which was approximately 220kt. [They were climbing on a] NORBO1J departure. No avoiding action was taken as the crew had no time to react. The object appeared to have a smooth black outline but the closure speed was too high to clearly make an</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 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 ¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
						<p>identification. Air traffic control was informed of the sighting. No evident damage to the aircraft</p> <p>Reported Separation: 6ft V/ 10m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The Glasgow ADC Controller reports that they were in the process of transferring the departure [of the 737] to Scottish Control when the pilot reported that possibly a drone passed over their right wing at 30ft when on a 4DME climb-out from RW05. When queried further the pilot stated that it did not look like a bird. This information was passed to the senior controller on duty. The controller informed the traffic on final regarding the drone report, and requested the pilots to state their intentions. All departures were stopped for approximately 7min while the SCOD liaised with the AODM.</p> <p>When it was confirmed that all parties were happy for operations to continue at crew discretion as long as details were passed, departures were recommenced. The information was put on the ATIS and passed to all subsequent departures as well as the Police. No further delays were caused and there were no further sightings. Although not advised as such at the time, the pilot subsequently filed an Airprox.</p> <p>The B737 had departed RW05 on a NORBO1H departure. At about 5NM the Tower controller transferred the aircraft to Scottish control. The pilot read back the frequency but then reported a drone had passed them at about 4.5NM on the climbout over their right wing by about 30ft.</p> <p>The report was acknowledged and the controller advised the pilot they would inform the appropriate authorities. The pilot then changed frequency. Departures were stopped for approximately 7min while the ATC WM consulted with the airport authority, before restarting with a warning of drone activity.</p> <p>Investigation. Radar, R/T and telephone recordings were reviewed. Traffic was medium with a number of both arrivals and departures. Tower was operating bandboxed. When the pilot reported the drone they</p>		

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
						<p>stated initially that it passed their right wing, but it was then updated to passed over the right wing about 30ft above. The pilot described the object as round and not a bird. The controller asked the pilot if they had been required to take any avoiding action and the pilot reported they had not.</p> <p>The radar recording shows no returns in the area that were not associated with an aircraft. The controller did not observe any object from the VCR window. ATC telephoned the police with the details and police incident number obtained.</p> <p>The pilot did not report their intention to file an Airprox with ATC at the time of the event. The event was initially raised as a drone report but upgraded by ATC when the Airprox was notified to them some time later.</p> <p>Departures were initially stopped by the Tower Controller in order to receive clarification as to the airport's intentions. The airport operations duty manager in consultation with ATC allowed departures to recommence provided Traffic Information was issued.</p> <p>Inbound aircraft were informed of the possible drone activity and asked their intentions. ATC reported the drone activity for a period of 30min as per unit instructions.</p>		
2025184	14 Aug 25 0907	EC175 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5729N 00132W 9NM ESE Peterhead 1000ft	Scottish FIR (G)	<p>The EC175 pilot reports flying back from offshore, inbound ATSIB at 1000ft, [when] a drone was spotted on an opposite track, approximately 200ft below. It was seen for only a few seconds so it was difficult to observe details. It was a multiple rotor drone, not a fixed wing one with a green LED shining through one of the rotors. Uncertain about the size, maybe 50cm across. They estimated it to be about 200ft below and it flew on an opposite track, disappearing under the nose of the helicopter. They could not assess the risk, as they only saw it for a few seconds. They did not have to manoeuvre to avoid it. ATC was informed. Drones were not NOTAM'd for that area. An MOR was raised and the crew provided statements to the police.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 200ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: NK</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, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that 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
						<p>The Aberdeen HELS controller reports the [EC175 pilot] reported that they had seen a drone go underneath them by approximately 200ft. The aircraft was offshore abeam Peterhead by around 10 miles, ADN 066/26 at 1000ft. No contact was seen on radar with regards to the drone.</p> <p>Analysis At 0907 the crew of the EC175, inbound to Aberdeen at 1000ft, reported sighting a UAV (Drone) passing beneath them on an opposite track. The HELS controller requested any further information and the crew reported that they estimated the drone to have been about 200ft below them. The crew reported the drone as being 'relatively small' in size. The controller took a note of the position of the aircraft at the time (ADN 066°, 25.9NM) and informed the watch manager. The ATDO provided information pertaining to the sighting to subsequent inbound aircraft. The next aircraft elected to take a later descent as a result. On viewing the workstation recording, no primary contacts were seen in the vicinity, but about 3min later, a solitary primary return was seen on the surveillance display at approx 066/28NM from the ADN. It was seen for 2 subsequent display updates, and then faded. During this time it was assessed to be tracking south east.</p>		
2025187	17 Aug 25 1826	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00036W IVO Windsor 1600ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that they were on arrival into LHR, ILS RW09L. The approach was uneventful until approx 6NM-5.5NM final. A white drone passed very close, almost directly underneath their nose while they were on the ILS glideslope. They estimated a distance of no more than 100ft below. The drone was close enough to make out that it had some sort of "underneath" - potentially a camera or landing legs. Navigation lights were noticed on it as well - it appeared to be stationary, however, this was of course difficult to tell for certain. The drone did not appear on TCAS. The aircraft was still flying with the autopilot engaged at the time. Evasive action was not taken. If the drone had been at their altitude, they estimate it would have hit the FO's windscreen, so it was slightly laterally offset right of the localiser centreline by maybe a few metres. ATC was</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, 3, 4, 7</p> <p>Risk: 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 ¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
						<p>immediately notified of the drone and location etc. and they continued for a normal landing.</p> <p>For further info - the geolocation provided was based on a Google Maps estimate of their position. They knew they were at exactly 5.5NM when they passed overhead the drone, just before Windsor castle, at approximately 1600ft on the altimeter. They calculated that 5.5NM was about 6.3 statute miles so used this to estimate their location. They had already passed Dorney Lake off their left hand side. Given the immediate proximity to the aircraft and the drone's location within the ILS area at relatively high altitude and the drone's size, they believed this was a high risk event.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/ 0m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The NATS controller reports that, when conducting a RW09L approach and approximately 6NM final, the A320 pilot reported a white drone 100ft below. Details were passed to the VCR Supervisor and Heathrow FIN. ATIS message was broadcast and subsequent arrivals warned. About 10min later, having issued the caution to another pilot on first contact with them, they remarked they had just encountered the drone at 8.3NM final 100ft above them. Details again were passed to the VCR Supervisor and Heathrow FIN. There were no other reports of sightings of the drone(s).</p>		
2025189	19 Aug 25 1805	A320 (CAT)	Unk obj	5117N 00010E IVO Sevenoaks FL80	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that whilst in the Biggin Hill holding pattern at FL080 a large drone was seen to pass in very close proximity to the front of the aircraft nose and then to pass close to the right hand engine and wing. Passing distance was judged to be less than 5m.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/5m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p> <p>The Swanwick controller reports that the pilot of the A320 reported that they had a "possible drone sighting in the BIG hold, just after Biggin Hill at FL082. The controller asked for a description to</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 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 ¹ Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Comments/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
						<p>which the pilot responded that it had been “white in colour but we couldn’t tell if it was a large bird or a drone, it was very difficult, saw it at the last minute”, before adding “just for awareness. I subsequently broadcast the possible drone sighting to other aircraft on frequency.’</p> <p>NATS Safety Investigation reports that analysis of the radar indicated that there were no associated primary or secondary contacts associated with the drone report, visible on radar at the approximate time of the event.</p>		
2025193	12 Aug 25 1133	ERJ175 (CAT)	Drone	5235N 00154W 9NM Final RW15 Birmingham 3300ft	Birmingham CTA (D)	<p>The ERJ175 pilot reports that on the approach [to Birmingham] RW15, established on the ILS, the First Officer spotted an object along their flightpath. At first it was unclear if it was a large bird of prey or something else, but eventually they were able to positively identify it as a large drone. The drone did not seem to be on a collision course but if it were they believed it would not have been possible to make an appropriate avoiding action. The drone was at approximately 9-10NM from the threshold and altitude approximately 3200ft-3400ft. The First Officer's judgement was that they passed the drone at level and with a separation of approximately 100m. They informed Birmingham Tower straight away and liaised with the ground controller after parking for follow up. [ATC] informed them that the police had been informed and were investigating but no further action would be required from their side.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/ 100m H Reported Risk of Collision: NR</p> <p>The Birmingham controller reports that [the ERJ175 pilot] on the ILS approach to RW15 reported a “<i>massive drone</i>” on their right hand side at 9.3 DME and 3300ft. The ACC was notified and subsequent inbounds were informed with no further reports. At approximately 1150, when the aircraft was on stand, the pilot called ‘AIR’ to advise they will be filing a report and provided further information that the drone was approximately 100-200m on their right-hand side.</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, 3, 4, 5</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C

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)	