

From: [UKAB Press Office](#)

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 12:28 PM

Subject: Airprox data 2010 - press release

News Release

30 November 2011

NO CHANGE IN NUMBERS OF AIRPROX INCIDENTS INVOLVING COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT

The number of airprox incidents involving commercial passenger aircraft remained static in 2010, the body charged with their investigation said today (an airprox is a situation where a pilot or air traffic controller feels a loss of separation or conflicting flight paths between aircraft may have compromised safety).

There were 35 incidents involving passenger aircraft in 2010, the same number as 2009. The majority of these incidents involved the airliner conflicting with a military or general aviation light aircraft. However, for the first time in over 10 years none of these incidents were regarded as 'risk-bearing'.

As it published its 2010 data analysis, the UK Airprox Board (UKAB) said that year-on-year airspace conflicts involving *two* commercial aircraft had halved, with only 5 incidents in 2010 compared to 11 in 2009. The steady decline in these types of incidents from the early 2000s (in 2002 there were 39 such incidents) is due a combination of factors including the airline industry's adoption of sophisticated collision avoidance systems and the combined efforts of operators and air traffic controllers tackling the issue.

Overall, however, the total numbers of incidents increased on 2009, with 167 incidents in 2010, compared to 147 the previous year, largely as a result of an upturn in conflicts involving military and general aviation aircraft.

Commenting on the figures, the Director of UKAB, Ian Dugmore, said: "The continuous downward trend in airprox incidents involving passenger aircraft is very welcome news indeed. The increase in the number of occurrences involving military and/or general aviation aircraft is not such good news but is offset somewhat by the increased percentage of these airprox in which there was assessed to be no risk of collision. If this reflects an increased willingness to report relatively minor incidents, it is a very welcome trend since even benign occurrences may contain useful lessons".

UKAB reports, produced jointly for the Chairman of the Civil Aviation Authority and the Chief of the Air Staff, Royal Air Force, are principally aimed at UK pilots and air traffic controllers, both civil and military. Their purpose is to promote air safety awareness and understanding by identifying and sharing the lessons arising from UK Airprox incidents.

The bi-annual UKAB reports are distributed in hardcopy and CD format. The latest report, Book 25, as well as previous reports are also downloadable from the UKAB website www.airproxboard.org.uk

Individual Airprox reports are also published on the UKAB website some six to eight weeks after assessment by the Airprox Board.

UKAB also published today its latest batch of reports, as assessed in October 2011. See www.airproxboard.org.uk

For more information contact the UKAB Press Office on tel.020 7453 6025; press.office@airproxboard.org.uk

Notes to Editors:

An Airprox is defined as: a situation in which, in the opinion of a pilot or controller, the distance between aircraft, as well as their relative positions and speed, have been such that the safety of the aircraft was, or may have been, compromised.

The UKAB is made up predominantly of pilots and controllers. It comprises a Chairman (the Director) and a mix of civil and military Members, all acknowledged experts within their fields of aviation. Their expertise covers commercial air transport, general aviation and military flying (both fixed wing and rotary), along with civil and military air traffic control.

The UKAB does not apportion blame or liability and has no legal powers: its sole aim is to enhance flight safety by assessing what happened in terms of 'cause' and 'risk' and then raising awareness of the findings within the aviation community. Where appropriate, the UKAB can make specific safety recommendations for changes in procedures or, for instance, the introduction of new equipment.

There are four risk categories agreed at international level, as follows:

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|
| A | risk of collision | an actual risk of collision existed |
| B | safety not assured | the safety of the aircraft was compromised |
| C | no risk of collision | no risk of collision existed |
| D | risk not determined | insufficient information was available to
determine the risk involved, or inconclusive
or conflicting evidence precluded such
determination. |

Please consider the environment. Think before printing this email.



***** Before Printing consider the environment. This e-mail and any attachment(s) are for authorised use by the intended recipient(s) only. It may contain proprietary material, confidential information and/or be subject to legal privilege. If you are not an intended recipient then please promptly delete this e-mail, as well as any associated attachment(s) and inform the sender. It should not be copied, disclosed to, retained or used by, any other party. Thank you. Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business *****