

Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Report Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 12 September 2018

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
13	3	4	6	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
2018115	20 May 18 1525	A319 (CAT)	Drone	5134N 00015W ivo Brent Reservoir 6000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The A319 pilot reports maintaining level flight on departure when the crew saw a 'small drone' pass directly above them.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 3-600ft V/ 0m H Reported Risk of Collision: None</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in an airfield departure 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 A319.</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
2018133	16 Jun 18 2151	AW169 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5107N 00010W Crawley 1200ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The AW169 pilot reports returning from a HEMS tasking, operating on NVG, for a Gatwick overhead crossing. He was cleared to cross RW26L threshold when a drone was seen at a similar level. It passed down the right hand side of the aircraft, at or slightly below their level.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 200ft V/200m H Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown in the vicinity of an airfield 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 AW169.</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
2018134	19 Jun 18 1114	A330 (CAT)	Drone	5322N 00213W Manchester Airport 500ft	Manchester CTR (D)	<p>The A330 pilot reports that at exactly 1.5 DME on the RW23R ILS at Manchester, all three pilots observed a drone hovering. It passed slightly above, to the left-hand side of the aircraft, less than 100ft away. It was medium to large, dark coloured and shaped like a balloon. It was reported to ATC and video of the event was captured by a plane-spotter.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 10ft V/25m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Having viewed the video, there was a degree of uncertainty with regard to the nature of the object. On balance the Board concluded it was a drone, which appeared to be at a greater separation than that perceived by the A330 pilot.</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 A330.</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
2018138	17 Jun 18 1711	A319 (CAT)	Drone	5127N 00019W 4nm E Heathrow 1300ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The A319 pilot reports that he was 4DME on final approach to Heathrow RW27L when the crew spotted a drone just below their flight path, on the extended centreline. The vertical distance was hard to judge, but they estimated 50ft below them, it was close enough to see that it was white, had 4 propellers and had blinking filaments.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 50ft V/ 0m H</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 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
2018144	27 Jun 18 1708	Nanchang CJ6 (Civ FW)	Drone	5112N 00115W 2nm W Popham 2200ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The CJ6 pilot reports in straight and level cruise when he noticed a white stationary drone to the right and below him.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 200ft V/300ft H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the VLOS limit and at an altitude such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as the drone was flown into conflict with the CJ6.</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
2018146	26 Jun 18 1655	C404 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5146N 00025E 8nm SE Stansted 1800ft	London FIR (G)	<p>The C404 pilot reports having just been identified under a Radar Control Service, and entering a note in his PLOG, as he climbed towards the Stansted CTA when the rear crew and second pilot reported an orange drone off the right wing. He saw the drone as it had already passed the wing.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 0ft V/100m H Reported Risk of Collision: Medium</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown at or about the practical VLOS limit but was an entitled user of Class G airspace. The Board agreed that the incident was therefore best described as a conflict in Class G.</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
2018148	1 Jul 18 1008	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5139N 00023W Bushey FL070	London TMA (A)	<p>The B787 pilot reports north abeam Heathrow when the non-handling pilot saw a drone to the left and below at about ¼nm which passed down the left side. The drone had angular 'arms' extending from the main body and remained in sight for about 3sec.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 200ft V/60m H Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown above the VLOS limit and at an altitude such that it was endangering other aircraft at that location. 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 safety had been much reduced below the norm to the extent that safety had not been assured.</p>	B
2018153	28 Jun 18 1639	EMB 145 (Civ Comm)	Drone	5109N 00047W Frensham Great Pond VRP 3900ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The EMB145 pilot reports that they were being vectored for an ILS for RW06 at Farnborough and were on a southerly heading at about 3500ft. They saw a yellow drone pass down the left-hand-side of the aircraft, 500ft below. The drone was seen by both the pilot and a passenger.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 500ftV/500m H Reported Risk of Collision: None</p> <p>The Farnborough Controller reports that the frequency had been very busy with a complex traffic situation. The EMB145 had been given a delayed descent and wide vectoring to the south of Farnborough. The pilot reported a drone whilst in the descent.</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 EMB145.</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
2018154	25 Jun 18 1556	B787 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00010W Clapham Common 3200ft	London CTR (D)	<p>The B787 pilot reports on approach to Heathrow RW27L when a drone-like object was seen to pass just below the right wing, avoiding impact with the engine by an estimated 10ft.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 10ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: High</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond VLOS limits and on an airfield 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 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
2018155	13 May 18 1122	A320 (CAT)	Balloons	5448N 00250W 8nm S Carlisle FL240	London UIR (A)	<p>The A320 pilot reports that during descent on passing FL250-240 they spotted a large object which appeared to be made up of 3 red oval shapes joined together. They suspected it might be some sort of balloons but couldn't be sure. The object appeared stationary. Each oval was about 6ft across and it passed 300ft below the aircraft.</p> <p>A NATS Investigation reported that the A320 pilot contacted Talla sector at Prestwick and was given descent to FL200. At 1123 the pilot reported passing something that looked like three red balloons, the aircraft's Mode C indicated FL240 in the descent. There was nothing showing on the radar in the vicinity of the A320 at the time. Subsequent aircraft passing the area 10 and 14 minutes later did not report the object. Given that Met balloons are white with a suspended package beneath, the NATS report thought it unlikely to be a Met Balloon.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 300ftV/ 20m H Reported Risk of Collision: None</p>	<p>Cause: The Board agreed that the object was most likely 3 balloons tied together and therefore the Board agreed that the incident was best described as a conflict in Class A.</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
2018161	7 Jul 18 1310	B777 (CAT)	Drone	5127N 00007W 11nm E Heathrow 4000ft	London TMA (A)	<p>The B777 pilot reports that on initial contact with Heathrow Director an aircraft ahead reported the sighting of a drone on the approach path to RW27L. Heathrow Director took action by holding aircraft at 4000ft until passing 11DME to avoid. Once established on the localiser the Captain saw the drone to his left, about 2-300ft below. No action was taken because by the time the drone was seen, it had already passed beneath the aircraft.</p> <p>Reported Separation: 200ftV/ 30mH Reported Risk of Collision: Not reported</p> <p>The Heathrow Director reports that an aircraft had reported seeing a drone at 2700ft on a 13nm final. Following aircraft were therefore kept at 4500ft to overfly the reported area until clear. This meant aircraft were high on approach, but the spacing was adjusted to accommodate different speeds to meet the descent profiles.</p>	<p>Cause: The drone was being flown beyond practical VLOS limits and on an airfield 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 B777.</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
2018166	5 Jul 18 0930	BE90 (Civ Comm)	Unk Obj	5234N 00135W 10nm NE Birmingham FL160	Daventry CTA (A)	<p>The BE90 pilot reports he was in the cruise at FL160, about 10nm north of Birmingham when he saw a rectangle or elliptical object pass 500-1000ft below. He estimated it to be 50-100cm long, although he only saw it for about 2 seconds before it passed underneath the aircraft. It was either hovering or travelling in the opposite direction, there was no time to take any avoiding action.</p> <p>Reported Separation: ~750ft V/0m H Reported Risk of Collision: Low</p>	<p>Cause: The Board could not conclude what the object was and therefore, being an unknown object, the Board agreed that the incident was best described as a conflict in Class A.</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
2018169	8 Jul 18 1721	FA7X (Civ Comm)	Drone	5106N 00046W Frensham Pond 4000ft	LTMA (A)	<p>The FA7X pilot reports he was under radar vectors for Farnborough at 4000ft when they saw a drone pass down the left side, in extremely close proximity. The drone was red; they reported it to ATC who advised that there had been numerous reports of drones in that area.</p> <p>The Farnborough Controller reports that the FA7X was inbound to Farnborough and was about 12nm south at 4000ft when the pilot reported an Airprox with a red drone.</p> <p>Reported Separation: ~6ft V/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 FA7X.</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