

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Report Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 25th April 2018

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
6	2	1	2	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
2018041	26 Mar 18 0930	DA2000 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5137N 00012W 9nm ENE Northolt 2600ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The DA2000 pilot reports on final vector to intercept the RW25 localiser when the PM called 'bird!' after sighting what looked like a black bird in the 11 o'clock, passing left to right, slightly above and crossing their path. The PF looked up and identified the 'bird' as a black quadrotor drone with a flashing blue strobe light. There was no time to take avoiding action. The incident was reported to the police.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 10 to 100ft V/10m 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 DA2000.</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
2018042	25 Mar 18 1800	A321 (CAT)	Drone	5312N 00159W 10nm SE Manchester FL080	Manchester TMA (A)	<p>The A321 pilot reports that he was level at FL080 when he saw a drone moving slowly below and to the left of the aircraft. The drone was a black quadcopter with strobe lights. No avoiding action was taken.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 250ftV/100m 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 A321.</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
2018043	1 Apr 18 1806	B747 (CAT)	Drone	5129N 00004W 16nm E Heathrow 4300ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The B747 pilot reports on an intercept heading for the LHR localiser RW27R. PM in the right seat noticed what appeared to be a drone below them in the 3 o'clock position. The drone was not an immediate threat but the sighting was reported on R/T so that other aircraft in trail could be warned. The pilot also later spoke with Heathrow police to report the event.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 500ft V/500m 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 B747.</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
2018044	25 Mar 18 1434	E190 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5115N 00038W 4nm SE Farnborough 3400ft	London FIR G	<p>The E190 pilot reports that he had departed from Farnborough on a radar heading of 220°, there were several TCAS contacts on the screen, all indicating below. Whilst searching for traffic in the 10 o'clock position the Captain saw a drone or model aircraft at the same altitude passing down the left-hand side. No avoiding action was possible. The drone was a flying wing shape and bright green and red.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/12-15m 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 E190.</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 a definite risk of collision had existed.</p>	A
2018047	1 Feb 18 1810 Night	A321 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5306N 00150W 22nm SE Manchester FL100	Manchester TMA (A)	<p>The A321 pilot reports descending through FL100 at night in VMC when his eye was caught by a greyish thin-profiled 'something' which passed by very close at the same level down the left-hand side at great speed. His initial reaction was that he had seen an internal reflection in his glasses or the windshield but it was immediately apparent that the First Officer and another person on the flight deck had also seen it. None of them had a clear view because it was in the landing-light beam for a split second. The pilot noted that having seen balloons in flight before, this object did not fit that profile.</p>	<p>Cause: The Board decided there was insufficient information to determine a cause.</p> <p>Risk: The Board considered that the pilot's overall account of the incident portrayed a situation where there was insufficient information to make a sound judgement of risk.</p>	D
2018048	5 Apr 18 1335	S92 (SAR)	Drone	5034N 00455W Padstow 70ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The S92 pilot reports that they were conducting wet winch training in the vicinity of the coastline. They had a winchman on the wire in the surf, when they saw a small drone, just outside the rotor disc, in the 10 o'clock position. The drone remained in close proximity while the winchman was recovered and then flew away towards the shore.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 20ft V/ 30-50ft H</p>	<p>Cause: ANO 2016 Article 240 states that '<i>A person must not recklessly or negligently act in a manner likely to endanger an aircraft, or any person in an aircraft.</i>' Additionally, Article 95 states that drones should not be flown within 50m of any person, vessel, vehicle, or structure. Therefore, the Board agreed that the incident was best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the S92.</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