

ATTENTION TO DETAIL

Posted on 04.01.2024 by Rupert Dent



Category: [Drones/UAS](#)

Edition DUASFB 9

Editorial

Sometimes it's easy to get absorbed in the task and lose sight of what's around

Welcome to Drone FEEDBACK Edition 9.

Winter is upon us. Whilst the period since our last meeting in July has offered some ideal weather for Drone-based data scanning, as well as Drone transport trials, the winter months will provide some weather-related challenges. Think cloud, rain, icing, much lower temperatures that will reduce battery life, along with numb fingers that press the wrong buttons!

From a regulatory perspective, much policy development work is being undertaken on Pre-Determined Risk Assessments "PDRA", Airspace Modernisation and Temporary Restricted Areas or

“TRAs”. In addition, the CAA’s Safety Leadership Group or “SLG”, which CHIRP has been asked to join, has had its first meeting. The SLG consists of a group of Drone Stakeholders that will help contribute to the continuing development of RPAS safety policy. CHIRP’s role will be to feedback Human Factors and Just Culture related recommendations into the SLG, so that they can be considered in safety policy development.

There have been a couple of notable events in the Drone ecosystem since July, including a great deal of chat about SORA 2.5, the precise wording in Operations manuals about the risks involved in the overflight of uninvolved persons and how they can be mitigated on renewal of OAs and new iterations of PDRAs. One particularly interesting Skywise Safety Notice ([SN-2023/005](#)) was published on 9th October referring to the accuracy or otherwise of Geo Fencing on some Drone systems’ flight apps. This caught our eye because we have had reports of discrepancies between the accuracy of FRZs, prohibited areas etc marked on some Drone manufacturers Geozone Flight Apps, as distinct from where they are located according to the Aeronautical Information Publication or “AIP”. Regular readers may remember [FEEDBACK 3](#) dated January 2022, where this was highlighted with regards to a Prohibited area P611/2.2. The area was shown as a circle on the 1:500,000 Aeronautical chart but was delineated by a multiple sided polygon on the DJI Geo Zone Map. The basic message of SN-2023/005 is that Drone pilots are ultimately responsible for where they fly their Drone, and the AIP is the ultimate source they need to consult. Being aware of this point will help Drone Operators to stay safe and not fly somewhere they shouldn’t. (Data from the AIP is available in map form on the NATS UAS airspace restrictions page, link here: <https://nats-uk.ead-it.com/cms-nats/opencms/en/uas-restriction-zones/> on DroneSafetyMap.com and in the Drone Assist app.).

Human Factor related errors will however continue to creep into day-to-day Operations and make life difficult. Let’s see if we can learn something from the occurrences described below.

Rupert Dent, Drone/UAS Programme Manager

NOTAM compilation and awareness

Whilst not a formal DUAS report, the following has come to us via the CHIRP GA section and applies to the Drone and Modellers community. Figure 1 shows a copy of a NOTAM that was filed by a Model Club and contained an error that caused some confusion regarding the maximum height element. In one place a maximum height is quoted as being 640 ft and in another it is quoted as being 2,500ft. A correction to the report was subsequently published as shown in Figure 2.

The report to the GA Advisory Board goes on to deal with other matters, but for the Drone and Model Club Community we thought it was important to highlight that the accuracy of NOTAMS, which are filed by the relevant Operator, should be checked very carefully. In this instance we understand that the mistake was made during the manual transcription from the NOTAM form

(that was completed correctly) into the NOTAM publication system. Remember also that NOTAMs are only advisory for other aviators (except the military who generally avoid all NOTAM'd areas where practical). A NOTAM does not confer any protection other than to advise of an activity, other aviators are at liberty to fly through them if they so desire (no matter how ill-advised) and so ground operators still need to keep a good lookout for other aircraft that might be in the NOTAM'd airspace.

Figure 1

Q) EGTG/QWUXX/IV/NBO/W/000/007/5138N00053W001

A) EGTG B) FROM: 23/10/09 12:19 C) PERM

E) CADMORE END, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

LOCATION: 513811N 0005319W

UPPER LIMIT: 2500FT AGL

LOWER LIMIT: SFC

CONTACT: XXXXXXXX MODEL AIRCRAFT CLUB XXXXXXXX

SITE ELEVATION: 640FT

HOURS: HJ

UK AIP ENR 5.5 REFERS

F) SFC G) 640FT AMSL

Figure 2

Q)EGTT/QWUXX/IV/NBO/W/000/022/5138N00053W001 H7411/23

A) EGTG B) 2310171358 C)PERM

E) ADD NEW MODEL AIRCRAFT FLYING SITE CADMORE END, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

LOCATION: 513811N 0005319W

UPPER LIMIT: 1500FT AGL

LOWER LIMIT: SFC

CONTACT: XXXXXXXX MODEL AIRCRAFT CLUB XXXXXXXX

SITE ELEVATION: 640FT

HOURS: HJ

UK AIP ENR 5.5 REFERS

F) SFC G) 2140FT AMSL



