

**From:** [UKAB Press Office](#)

**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2011 10:12 AM

**Subject:** Slight rise in airprox incidents in 2010 - press release

# News Release

21 April 2011

## SLIGHT RISE IN AIRPROX INCIDENTS IN 2010

The latest report from the UK Airprox Board (UKAB) shows an improvement during the first six months of 2010 in the most serious airprox incidents<sup>[1]</sup> involving commercial air transport aircraft, with no reported events at all concerning passenger airlines in the highest risk categories – A and B<sup>[2]</sup>. There had been one category B incident during the first six months of 2009.

There was, however, a small overall increase in reported airprox incidents between January-June 2010 compared to the same period the year before. There were a total of 79 incidents in the first half of 2010 involving commercial, military and general aviation aircraft, in contrast to 60 during January to June 2009.

General aviation aircraft were involved in ten more incidents than in the same period the year before - 44 compared to 34. These included two category A incidents, an increase on the single category A incident during the same period in 2009.

Commenting on the figures the Director of UKAB, Ian Dugmore, said: “Although on the face of it an increase in airprox incidents in 2010 looks like a setback, in fact it is very much a return to normal. The significant fall in incidents in 2009 was almost certainly a blip, probably stemming from a reduction in flying activity during the recession. The 2010 figures, meanwhile, are in line with five-year averages.”

Today’s report shows that the causes of airprox incidents remain predominantly late sightings and non-sightings of aircraft by pilots. The majority of these occur in Class G (uncontrolled) airspace where pilots have the responsibility to see and avoid other aircraft.

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

Today’s report is available on the UKAB website [www.airproxboard.org.uk](http://www.airproxboard.org.uk) (click on >publications>analysis of airprox in UK airspace).

The bi-annual UKAB reports continue to be distributed in hardcopy and CD format.

For more information contact the UKAB Press Office on [press.office@airproxboard.org.uk](mailto:press.office@airproxboard.org.uk) tel. 020 7453 6025

**Notes to Editors:**

1, 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.

2. 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<br>determine the risk involved, or inconclusive<br>or conflicting evidence precluded such<br>determination. |

Names or operators' identities are not published. Disidentification is a deliberate policy to encourage open and honest reporting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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 \*\*\*\*\*