

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Report Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 23rd May 2018

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
10	5	2	3	0	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
2018053	14 Apr 18 1652	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5127N 00024W Feltham 1500ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The B787 pilot reports passing 1500ft on a DET 2Z departure when a large red and white drone was observed at approximately 1600ft, hovering directly on the departure path. LHR tower was informed immediately.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in the vicinity of an airfield SID 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 B787.</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
2018054	15 Mar 18 1330	Chinook (HQ JHC)	Drone	5131N 00014W ivo H3 1000ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The Chinook pilot reports that whilst transiting south at 1000ft London QNH from the Brent reservoir to the Barnes VRP, to establish on H3, the handling pilot spotted 3 drones at 500m on the nose at the same height. At first he saw an object and thought it was a helium balloon, due to its oblong shape and silver colour. A further 2 drones were spotted beyond the first one and were thought to be sea-gulls. He gently rolled right to ensure they passed down his left-hand side. On passing down the side at a distance of 100m the silver oblong drone was seen to manoeuvre away from the aircraft and then back towards it by the crewman. At this point they realised the objects were drones. The next two were some 20m behind the first and at the same height. Again, one was seen to manoeuvre away from the aircraft. They were assessed to be white, circular and dustbin lid sized. The pilot reported the incident to the Heathrow controller.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/100m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The Board noted that the incident took place in the vicinity of Wormwood Scrubs park. The drone operators were entitled to operate in this area (away from a built-up area) and within visual line of sight as long as the drones weighed less than 7kg, or less than 3.5kgs if using FPV. Therefore, the Board agreed that the incident was best described as conflict in Class D resolved by both parties.</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
2018055	19 Apr 18 1355	E195 (CAT)	Drone	5045N 00317W 5nm E Exeter 1800ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The E195 pilot reports on approach to Exeter RW26 when a large black drone passed in front of the aircraft and less than 50ft above the flight path.</p> <p>Reported Separation: '<50ft' Reported Risk of Collision: NK</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown at about 1500ft agl and hence at the limit of practical VLOS 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 E195.</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
2018056	22 Apr 18 1740	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5127N 00006W Heathrow App 4000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports he had just descended below the cloud on the RW27 ILS at approx. 12.5nm range, when the Captain saw a drone passing down the left-hand side. It was approx. 50-70m from the wing-tip and just above their level. The drone appeared to be hovering and at first the Captain thought it was a weather balloon, however it was much more solid and flatter in shape and was about 2ft across. Although spotted relatively late, because they had just descended below the clouds, it was not on a collision course and it was too late to take any avoiding action.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 10ftV/50-70m 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 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
2018059	22 Apr 18 1210	A320 (CAT)	2 x Drone	5137N 00012E 2.5nm SE LAM FL090	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports turning back to LAM to leave the hold at FL090 when a formation of 2 drones was seen about 100m below the aircraft. In the left-hand turn, when passing north, a red and white object was seen on the nose of the aircraft. Within a fraction of a second it was seen to pass down the left side of the aircraft narrowly missing the left wing. Both the First Officer and he were convinced that it would hit the left wing/engine. Although time for identification was minimal, the Captain assessed the object to be similar to the drones that had been seen seconds earlier. Those drones appeared to be commercially available quad-copter machines, with which the Captain was familiar. If this was the type involved then the drone would certainly have passed well within 50m of the flight deck.</p> <p>Reported Separation: <10ft V/15m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the practical VLOS limit such that it was endangering other aircraft at that 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
2018063	20 Apr 18 0821	Q400 (CAT)	Drone	5129N 00034W 3.7nm W Heathrow 2500ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The Q400 pilot reports departing London Heathrow when the Captain saw a white quad-copter drone ahead. It was apparent that the drone would pass underneath but the margin was small. The Captain noted that several factors, such as increased aircraft weight or higher OAT could have resulted in the Q400 being slightly lower.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 100ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: NK</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in the vicinity of an airfield SID and above VLOS limit 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 Q400.</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
2018067	4 May 18 1050	A319 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00023W 2.5nm Final Heathrow 600ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The A319 pilot reports that they were on final approach to Heathrow RW27R and at approx. 2.5DME, when the first officer saw what he at first thought was a bird in front of the aircraft and slightly left and above the nose. As it came past the flight deck, it took avoiding action, pitching away from the aircraft and it became apparent that it was a drone, black and rectangular in shape, and about 1ft on its longest edge. It passed down the left-hand-side of the aircraft with a vertical distance of no more than 30ft and just over the left wing-tip. By the time the first officer had realised what the object was and reported it to the Captain, it had already passed and they were clear.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 30ft V/15m H Reported Risk of Collision: NK</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in the vicinity of an airfield approach path 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 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
2018070	6 May 18 1225	A320 (CAT)	Drone	5149N 00032W 7nm SW Luton FL070	London TMA (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports departing London Luton when the Captain saw a drone in the 2 o'clock position that passed about 10-20ft above and down the right-hand side of the aircraft. The Captain commented that there was insufficient time to manoeuvre out of the way but he also assessed that it would not hit aircraft.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 20ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: Very High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in the vicinity of an airfield SID and above the VLOS limit 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
2018071	4 May 18 0945	B777 (CAT)	Drone	5138N 00009E LAM Hold FL080	London TMA (A)	<p>The B777 pilot reports that they were in the LAM hold at FL080, after turning left over the fix a drone was sighted on the left-hand-side of the aircraft at approx. 1000ft below. It was passing from the left to the right of the aircraft in a northerly direction. It appeared to be square and black and remained in view for 10-15 seconds until it passed beneath the aircraft.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 1000ft V Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the practical VLOS limit such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude. However, given the 1000ft separation described by the B777 pilot, the Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as a sighting report.</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
2018073	9 May 18 1455	EV97 (Civ Pte)	Drone	5120N 00041W 5nm NE Farnborough 2050ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The EV97 pilot reports that he was on a cross-country flight and navigating between Farnborough, Odiham and Blackbushe, SW of the Heathrow CTR and receiving a Traffic Service from Farnborough. The controller was busy and he was told to follow the railway track from J4 of the M3. As he started the turn he saw a black object in his 10 o'clock. It appeared stationary and he took avoiding action to the right. He established that it wasn't an aircraft and thought it could be a balloon or a floating bag, but as he got closer he saw it was a black and green drone.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 50ftV/100m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the practical VLOS limit such that it was endangering other aircraft at that altitude. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the EV97.</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