

**Aviation Safety Investigation Report
199301633**

**Boeing Co
B737-400**

19 May 1993

Readers are advised that the Australian Transport Safety Bureau investigates for the sole purpose of enhancing transport safety. Consequently, Bureau reports are confined to matters of safety significance and may be misleading if used for any other purposes.

Investigations commenced on or before 30 June 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with Part 2A of the Air Navigation Act 1920.

Investigations commenced after 1 July 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with the Transport Safety Investigation Act 2003 (TSI Act). Reports released under the TSI Act are not admissible as evidence in any civil or criminal proceedings.

NOTE: All air safety occurrences reported to the ATSB are categorised and recorded. For a detailed explanation on Category definitions please refer to the ATSB website at www.atsb.gov.au.

The Bureau did not conduct an on scene investigation of this occurrence. The information presented below was obtained from information supplied to the Bureau.

Occurrence Number:	199301633	Occurrence Type:	Incident
Location:	Esperance		
State:	WA	Inv Category:	4
Date:	Wednesday 19 May 1993		
Time:	2116 hours	Time Zone	EST
Highest Injury Level:	None		

Aircraft Manufacturer:	Boeing Co		
Aircraft Model:	737-476		
Aircraft Registration:	VH-TJE	Serial Number:	24430
Type of Operation:	Air Transport Domestic High Capacity Passenger Scheduled		
Damage to Aircraft:	Nil		
Departure Point:	Adelaide SA		
Departure Time:			
Destination:	Perth WA		

Approved for Release: Wednesday, October 26, 1994

VH-TJE was enroute Adelaide to Perth. After passing Esperance the pilot requested a change of level to flight level 290. Because the aircraft was less than 15 minutes from the Air Traffic Services (ATS) boundary with Perth, the request for level change was co-ordinated with Perth (ATS). It was during this co-ordination that it was realised that the Esperance position report had not been passed to Perth ATS by Melbourne ATS as required.

The Melbourne air traffic controller on duty when it was realised that the position report had not been passed to Perth ATS had taken over from two other controllers, a training officer and a trainee, who had just been involved in a separate incident and were relieved to explain to the ATS Centre Co-ordinator what had happened.

It has not been determined whether the relieving air traffic controller inherited the problem or whether he failed to pass on the position report. There was no breakdown in separation. Perth ATS was expecting the aircraft. Had the request for change of level not been co-ordinated with Perth, Perth ATS would soon have asked for the position report anyhow.

Significant Factors

The following factors were considered relevant to the development of the incident:

1. The air traffic controller had just taken over the position.

2. A previous controller may have failed to pass on the position report.
3. An air traffic controller did not comply with laid down procedures.