

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Report Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 18th July 2018

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
13	4	4	4	1	0

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2018114	28 May 18 1848	A319 (CAT)	Drone	5125N 00022W 3nm SE Heathrow 2500ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The A319 pilot reports departing LHR RW09, passing 2500ft on a weather avoidance heading of 130°, a large drone passed 10m above the left wing. It was about 70cm in diameter, white with yellow markings. There was no time to taking any avoiding action and there was a very high risk of collision.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 10m V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond practical VLOS limits such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A319.</p> <p>Risk: 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
2018116	13 May 18 1559	C56X (Civ Comm)	Drone	5113N 00036W 8nm ESE Farnborough 2400ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The C56X pilot reports that whilst being vectored by Farnborough in uncontrolled airspace, a drone appeared about 100-200ft below and 200m off the left wing. The drone was orange but it's size was difficult to estimate because there was no size reference to judge it against. They reported it to ATC, who in turn reported it to the Surrey police.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100-200ftV/200m H</p> <p>The Farnborough Approach Controller reports that he had vectored the C56X onto a downwind heading for an ILS approach to RW24. The aircraft was descending to 2400ft when the pilot reported that he had seen a drone very close to him and about 200ft below.</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown at the practical VLOS limit and it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the C56X.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2018117	28 May 18 1825	DHC8 (CAT)	Drone	5250N 00129W 6nm W EMA 2000ft	EMA CTR (D)	<p>The DHC8 pilot reports established on the ILS for RW09 at EMA, at about 175kts. It was a beautiful summer evening, no clouds, light wind, and the sun behind them. He noticed what he thought at first was a bird, but it's flight path was too straight and level. As they got closer he recognised it as a drone. It's rough heading was west, travelling slowly at around 50kts, it did not change altitude or heading as it passed down the left side of the aircraft. The distance was hard to judge, but it was close enough for him to see that it was a quadcopter drone as they passed. It did not present an immediate collision risk and no avoiding action was taken. He reported the occurrence to ATC in the belief that someone might be filming at Donnington Park race track and had lost control of their drone.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 500ft V/200m H Reported Risk of Collision: None</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown at the practical VLOS limit and in proximity to the runway approach path such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the DHC8.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C
2018119	2 Jun 18 1700	Van's RV8 (Civ FW)	Drone	5119N 00046W VRP M3 J4 1850ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The RV8 pilot reports that both he and the passenger saw a grey and white drone at the same time. It appeared to be of twin ducted-fan design. No avoiding action was possible as the small size and colour scheme, combined with its position just below the horizon, rendered it almost impossible to see in time at their closure speed.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 10ft V/45m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown at the practical VLOS limit such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the RV8.</p> <p>Risk: 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

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2018120	11 Jun 18 1245	PA31 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5132N 00026W 1nm W Northolt 350ft	London CTZ (D)	<p>The PA31 pilot reports that he was on final approach to Northolt when he saw what he thought initially was a helium balloon floating up toward the aircraft. He lost sight of it under the nose and looked down at the wing root and identified it as a small white drone of the lightweight hobbyist type, it was about 20ft below the aircraft as he passed over it. He reported that he had no doubt that it was being deliberately flown under the flight path in an attempt to collide with an aircraft.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 25ft V/0m H</p> <p>The Northolt Tower controller reports that the PA31 was on finals to RW07 at a range of 1nm and had been cleared to land when he reported that a drone had just passed close by, down his right-hand-side. The controller acknowledged and waited for the PA31 to land, and when taxiing the pilot passed further details. He reported that the drone had passed close to his right wing and that it was possibly launched from a park situated on his right-hand-side. The local police and the RAF police were informed.</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in an airfield approach lane such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location and altitude. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the PA31.</p> <p>Risk: 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
2018122	3 Jun 18 1406	A321 (CAT)	Drone	5320N 00106W 10nm SW Doncaster Airport 15500ft	L603 (A)	<p>The A321 pilot reports that he was passing 15500ft in the climb when he saw a drone pass very close down the left-hand-side of the aircraft. It was within 100ft and at the same level as it passed.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/100ft H Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond practical VLOS limits such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A321.</p> <p>Risk: 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

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2018125	6 Jun 18 0931	Saab 2000 (CAT)	Drone	5133N 00006E 14nm SE BPK VOR 4200ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The Saab 2000 pilot reports conducting the Brookmans Park 5U SID from London/City when a drone was seen to pass 'below on the starboard wing'.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/NK H Reported Risk of Collision: NK</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond VLOS limits such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the Saab 2000.</p> <p>Risk: 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
2018126	10 May 18 1050	A380 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00009W 12nm E Heathrow 4000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A380 pilot reports that he was at 4000ft turning onto a vectored ILS approach to Heathrow when a drone was seen slightly to the left and below the aircraft. It passed below, although vertical separation was difficult to judge because the size of the drone was unknown. There was no time to take avoiding action.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 500ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond practical VLOS limits such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A380.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident was such that there was insufficient certainty of separation with which to make a sound judgement of risk.</p>	D
2018127	3 Jun 18 1605	B737 (CAT)	Drone	5319N 00224W 3nm W Manchester Airport 2000ft	Manchester CTR (D)	<p>The B737 pilot reports conducting a SONEX 1Y SID, in a right turn, when the F/O (PF) saw a drone below and to the right of the aircraft. The pilot noted that an event was being held at Tatton Park, which was immediately below the aircraft at the time of the Airprox.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 200ft V/ 250m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond practical VLOS limits and in a promulgated departure path such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the B737.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2018128	14 Jun 18 1835	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5136N 00020W 9nm NE Heathrow 6000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that he was inbound to Heathrow, passing 6000ft when he spotted a drone in front of his aircraft. Its flight path was assessed as close, but because collision was unlikely no avoiding action was taken. The drone passed down the right-hand-side. It was reported to ATC and to the police.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 500ft V/100m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p> <p>The Heathrow controller reports that the A320 was in the Harrow area, at about 6000ft when the pilot reported a white or grey drone in his vicinity.</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond practical VLOS limits such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A320.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where although safety had been reduced, there had been no risk of collision.</p>	C
2018129	14 Jun 18 1900	B767 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00020W 4nm E LHR 1200ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The B767 pilot reports that a drone was encountered whilst at 4nm on the approach to RW27L. The incident was reported to LHR Tower.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/ 30ft H Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in a promulgated arrival path such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the B767.</p> <p>Risk: 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
2018130	15 Jun 18 1755	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5127N 00009W 12nm E Heathrow 3400ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that he was at 12.5nm final for RW27L at LHR, a drone appeared on the right-hand side approximately 100-200ft from the aircraft. It was red and black in colour and reported to LHR Tower, they advised other aircraft of the situation. Avoiding action was not required as it was seen whilst passing.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/100-200ft H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond practical VLOS limits such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude and position. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A320.</p> <p>Risk: 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

Airprox Number	Date Time (UTC)	Aircraft (Operator)	Object	Location Description Altitude	Airspace (Class)	Pilot/Controller Report Reported Separation Reported Risk	Cause/Risk Statement	ICAO Risk
2018131	17 Jun 18 1705	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5127N 00021W 3nm E Heathrow 900ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that the previous aircraft had reported a drone sighting which was reported by Tower. At 1000ft the PM (FO) clearly saw a drone pass close down the right-hand side of the aircraft. It was a small white drone with 4 rotors that resembled a DJI phantom. A report was passed to Tower.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 40ft V/30m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in the vicinity of an airfield approach lane such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location and altitude. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the A320.</p> <p>Risk: 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