Aviation Safety Investigation Report 199301960

Beech Aircraft Corp Duchess Boeing Co B737

05 July 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:	199301960	Occurrence Type:	Incident
Location:	Canberra ACT		
State:	ACT	Inv Category:	4
Date:	Monday 05 July 1993		
Time:	1408 hours	Time Zone	EST
Highest Injury Level: None			
Aircraft Manufacturer: Boeing Co			
Aircraft Model:	737-377		
Aircraft Registration:			Serial Number: 24305
Type of Operation:		nestic High Capacity	Passenger
Damage to Aircraft:	Nil		C .
Departure Point:	Melbourne VIC		
Departure Time:	1331 EST		
Destination:	Canberra ACT		
Aircraft Manufacturer: Beech Aircraft Corp			
Aircraft Model:	76		
Aircraft Registration:	VH-KTF	Serial Numbe	r: ME-342
Type of Operation:	Instructional Unkr	nown	
Damage to Aircraft:	Nil		
Departure Point:	Goulburn NSW		
Departure Time:	1345 EST		
Destination:	Canberra ACT		

Approved for Release: Saturday, October 30, 1993

VH-KTF [Beech76] was proceeding on an instrument flight rules [IFR] training flight from Goulburn to Canberra and was being radar vectored by Canberra Approach control [APP] for a right downwind leg for runway 35. The pilot was maintaining 6,000 feet being the last assigned altitude.

VH-CZP [Boeing 737] was proceeding on a regular public transport flight from Melbourne to Canberra and was being radar vectored by APP for a left base to runway 35. The pilot was also assigned 6,000 feet by Air Traffic Control [ATC].

APP was being performed by a trainee controller who had completed four weeks of a proposed twelve week training period. This controller was supervised by a suitably qualified training officer.

At 1406 hours VH-KTF was given a left turn onto a heading of 320 degrees with the intention by ATC of using this turn to provide 5NM separation with VH-CZP who was to be given a left turn onto the localiser ahead of VH-KTF.

As VH-CZP was approaching the centre line the training officer realised that the trainee was leaving the issuing of the turn instruction a little late and decided to instruct the trainee to turn VH-CZP immediately. At 1408 hours the trainee issued the turn instruction using the callsign CZF. The captain of VH-CZP then queried this instruction and with this further delay the ATC training officer decided to take over and issued instructions to both VH-CZP and VH-KTF which placed the two aircraft on diverging headings. During these manoeuvres the horizontal distance between the aircraft reduced to 2.5NM with no vertical differential.

The weather conditions were such that both crews were in cloud throughout the occurrence and no pilot saw another aircraft.

The required separation standard was either 5NM horizontally or 1,000 feet vertically.

Significant Factors

1. The trainee approach controller allowed VH-CZP to get too close to the localiser before implementing a turn onto final.

2. The trainee approach controller used the wrong callsign when issuing VH-CZP with a turn instruction.

3. The training officer allowed the traffic situation to develop to a point where he was unable to guarantee separation once the trainee made an error.