

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2025

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
6	5	0	1	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
2025042	5 Apr 25 1456	Dynamic WT9 (Civ FW)	Drone	5537N 00434W 1NM W Kilmarnock 2700ft	Scottish FIR (G)	<p><b>The WT9 pilot</b> reports flying through the Kilmarnock corridor at 2700ft west-to-east approaching Kilmarnock when they spotted an object ahead in the 11 o'clock which they initially thought was a helium party balloon. They had no time to react and as the object passed under the left wing they realised it was a small white drone less than 1m across. They saw the drone pass under the wing and saw it again as it passed behind less than 20ft below. They immediately informed Scottish Information of the occurrence.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> &lt;20ft V/0m H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> High</p> <p><b>The Scottish Information FISO</b> reports [WT9 C/S] was on FISO frequency routeing through the Kilmarnock corridor between Glasgow's and Prestwick's airspace (Class G). At 1457 the pilot reported sighting a drone 1NM west of Kilmarnock at altitude 2700ft, missing them by approx. 50ft. The pilot advised that they would file an Airprox report on landing. No description of the drone was given. Scottish Information advised the Police and AAIB and contacted Prestwick Tower to advise of the occurrence. Analysis of the radar by Safety Investigations indicated that there were no primary or secondary contacts associated with the drone report visible on radar at the approximate time of the Airprox.</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, 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

<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
2025045	3 Apr 25 1030	PC12 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5118N 00001E IVO Biggin Hill 1500ft	Biggin Hill ATZ (G)	<p><b>The PC12 pilot</b> reports that after an ILS approach to RW21 followed by a circle to land [for RW03] in the circuit, they met a drone at an altitude of 1500ft. As the aircraft was turning left on final approach the co-pilot, pilot flying, spotted the drone first and pointed it out to the captain. At first, the captain thought it was a bird, but it seemed to be a 4-rotor grey/yellow drone located to the left of the aircraft, no more than 50m from the left wing, slightly above it. The crew reported the incident to the Tower controller. After landing, the crew were informed that they would be called by the police. On arrival at the ramp, the police called the captain, who gave full details.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> NR V/ 50m H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> Minor</p> <p><b>The Biggin Hill Tower controller</b> reports that [the Pilatus operator presented their report, as above]. They commented that one drone case was received per annum, and this was the first for 2025. They assessed the risk as 'Minor' as there was no damage to the aircraft and the crew managed the situation well.</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 although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C

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
2025046	8 Apr 24 1247	Texan (HQ Air (Trg))	Drone	5315N 00433W IVO RAF Valley 1100ft	Valley FRZ (G)	<p><b>The Texan pilot</b> reports that they were on a VFR departure from RW31, upon passing 1000ft and changing to Valley Radar they noticed a drone in their flightpath and took avoiding action by bunting down. The drone passed approximately 20ft from them on the left-hand side of the aircraft, slightly further than the wing and 6-8ft above. The drone appeared to be a quadcopter the size of a helmet, white with an orange colour on it. As the rear seat QFI, they took control and relayed the approximate position, height and description of the drone to Valley Radar while continuing the climbout away from the last known position.</p> <p>From HUD and tape replay, the closest point of approach was at N5315.64 W00433.49, altitude 1100ft QNH.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 8ft V/ 20ft H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> Medium</p> <p><b>The Valley ATC Supervisor</b> reports that approximately 1247Z a drone was reported in the climbout lane at Valley. At 1248Z it was reported to Valley Ops who informed Civ Police and RAF Police. All pilots in the circuit were told to orbit at circuit altitude (1000ft) or land off their next approach. Following liaison with the Duty Pilot all other airborne aircraft were advised to make a straight-in or IFR approach to land.</p> <p>Once spotted, the drone was easily visible to the naked eye and when using binoculars it appeared to be a large black hexacopter. They were able to follow the drone's flightpath from the climb out lane, descent towards the southwest of the airfield, before flying southeast descending below the hill. It disappeared at approximately 1257Z.</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, although the pilot had reported that they had taken avoiding action, providence had played a major part in the incident and 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
2025051	11 Apr 25 0810	B777 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00026W Battersea 3600ft	London TMA (A)	<p><b>The B777 pilot</b> reports that on final approach to RW27R and established on the ILS at 10.6NM at approximately 3600ft they had a drone pass over the left side of the aircraft with approximately 100ft separation. The only distinguishing feature on the drone was what looked like some red on the part of the drone that they could see. No avoiding action was taken</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 0ft V/100ft H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> N/R</p> <p><b>The Swanwick controller</b> reports that they had been sat on Heathrow FIN when the B777 pilot reported that they had just had a drone overfly them on the final approach, about 100ft above. The B777 had been around an 11NM final at the time and the controller asked the B777 pilot for more details of the drone but they had been unable to provide them. Shortly afterwards the controller had asked the pilot of the following aircraft who had been around 4NM behind if they had copied the details about the drone to which they replied that the drone had just flown past them indicating that it was very fast moving. The controller told the GS airports and coordinated with Thames Radar as the direction of travel had been towards London City airport.</p> <p><b>NATS Safety Investigation</b> The B777 pilot submitted an Airprox report in response to the sighting of drone whilst approximately 10.6NM east of Heathrow at 3800ft. It has been estimated that the UAS was at 3900ft. Safety Investigations reviewed the radar at the time the pilot reported the sighting, however, no radar contacts associated with the drone were visible</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 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
2025053	7 Apr 25 1040	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5137N 00020W 2NM S Elstree FL70	London TMA (A)	<p><b>The A320 pilot</b> reports that they were on intermediate approach into LHR and under a Radar Control Service by LHR Director. Three pilots were on the flight deck as it was a training flight for a new First Officer, the third pilot acting as a safety pilot.</p> <p>[The pilot of the A320] was the operating Captain and the first to observe the drone. They announced the sighting to the other pilots and called its position. It was just right of the nose initially, passing to the left. On initial contact, it was approximately 50-70m ahead. The drone was observed by the other pilots. [It was a] four motor drone with blades in each corner, dark, possibly black in colour, similar to those seen in drone swarms.</p> <p>No avoiding action was taken as the drone had already passed below and to the left of the aircraft. The sighting was reported to ATC who passed it to following traffic. After landing, they were contacted by [company] security and advised that the Met Police Aviation Policing division would be in touch. A report was subsequently filed with the Met Police.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 50ft V/15m H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> High</p> <p><b>Heathrow INT North controller</b> reports that the landing runway was RW09L. [The pilot of the A320] was on a heading downwind from LAM at FL70 when they reported a drone off the left wing, about 50ft below. The colour was reported as black/gold. The location was about 3 miles south of Elstree. This information was reported to the Supervisor and subsequent traffic was informed.</p> <p><b>NATS Safety Investigations</b> Analysis of the radar by NATS Safety Investigations indicated that there were no associated primary or secondary contacts visible on radar at the approximate time of the event.</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 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
2025055	12 Apr 25 1518	A319 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5124N 00038W Sunningdale 5000ft	London TMA (A)	<p><b>The A319 pilot</b> reports departing Heathrow RW27R when, at 5000ft in a left turn, a white object was seen passing down the left side, slightly below but very close, within 5m. There was no sign of damage to visible areas of the wing and engine and other system indications indicated normal immediately after the incident and for the remainder of the flight. The aircraft was in clean configuration with gear up at the time. They were unable to positively identify the object due to closure rate but it was possibly a drone and reported to ATC as such.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 'below' V/&lt;5m H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> NR</p> <p><b>The Swanwick controller</b> reports [A319 C/S] reported passing a drone on departure from EGLL when passing 5000ft altitude. When asked they said the drone was white in colour but could not give an indication of the size.</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

**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)	