

## Consolidated Drone/Balloon/Model/Unknown Object Summary Sheet for UKAB Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021

Total	Risk A	Risk B	Risk C	Risk D	Risk E
3	1	1	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
2021066	31 May 21 1718	A319 (CAT)	Unk Obj	5134N 00009W 12NM NE Heathrow FL095	London TMA (A)	<p><b>The A319 pilot</b> reports that the aircraft was climbing through FL095 and was roughly 8NM SE Brookmans Park, when a drone was spotted. It was black and orange in colour and about 50cm in size. It went from the left to pass down the right-hand-side of the aircraft some tens of metres below.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 20-50m V/&lt;100m H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> Low</p> <p><b>A NATS Investigation</b> reported that on reaching FL150 the A319 pilot reported to the TC North controller that they had had a drone sighting when passing FL080 in the climb, approximately 12NM north-east of Heathrow. The pilot reported that the drone passed beneath the right-hand-side of the aircraft and was black and orange. The event was reported to the police. A review of the radar confirmed that there were no associated primary or secondary contacts visible on the 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 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 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

<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
2021071	3 Jun 21 0811	BE200 (Civ Comm)	Balloon	5153N 00014E Stansted Airport 1000ft	Stansted CTR (D)	<p><b>The BE200 pilot</b> reports that they departed from Stansted RW22 on the UTAVA1R SID. At approximately 1000ft AMSL, they noticed what appeared to be an elongated silver and sparkly party balloon. With no time to react, the balloon just missed the port wing, passing slightly underneath. The Acting First Officer called the near miss to ATC and the flight was continued to its destination without further incident. Upon reaching the destination, the Approach controller informed them of a message from ATC at Stansted: <i>"Just to let you know the party balloon turned out to be a number 7 and landed on the runway just after you departed"</i>.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> NR <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> NR</p>	<p>In the Board's opinion the reported altitude or description of the object, and the confirmation provided by ATC at Stansted, were sufficient to indicate that it was a balloon.</p> <p><b>Applicable Contributory Factors:</b> 4, 6</p> <p><b>Risk:</b> 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
2021075	3 Jun 21 1647	A220 (CAT)	Drone	5128N 00006W 12NM E Heathrow 4000ft	London TMA (A)	<p><b>The A220 pilot</b> reports that they were on the Heathrow RW27R ILS at around 12NM final and 4000ft when the First Officer noticed a drone on their right-hand side. At first, they thought it was a balloon but, when the object passed by, they could clearly identify that it was a drone. It was slightly above their aircraft and was black with a prominent red horizontal line. It was a large drone with 4 big propellers on the corners. It was difficult to estimate the separation and when reported to the police they gave an optical estimate, which the police officer photographed.</p> <p><b>Reported Separation:</b> 100ft V/ 0.5NM H <b>Reported Risk of Collision:</b> NR</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 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

## 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	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	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	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)	