



International Civil Aviation Organization

**The Second Meeting of the ICAO Asia/Pacific Search and Rescue Task Force  
(APSAR/TF/2)**

Singapore, 27 – 30 January 2014

---

**Agenda Item 4: Asia/Pacific and inter-regional SAR planning, coordination and cooperation**

**PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

(Presented by French New Caledonia)

**SUMMARY**

This paper presents a possible way to gain coordination by improving their arrangements through the exchange of lessons learnt and good practices.

**Strategic Objectives:**

A: *Safety* – Enhance global civil aviation safety

**Global Plan Initiatives:**

Not Applicable

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This information paper aims to produce a feedback on peer-review process performed by European NSA's (National Supervisory agencies), a combined effort between NSAs, formalised by the European Commission and facilitated by EUROCONTROL, in the context of building the FAB's (Functional blocks of Airspace).

The legal basis is:

- Art. 4 of Regulation (European Community - EC) N° 549/2004 (NSA nomination)
- Art. 6 of Regulation (EC) N° 550/2004 (common requirements)
- Art. 9 of Commission Regulation (EC) N° 2096/2005

The Peer Review process is based on a “teach and learn” approach: it does not replace the audits performed on States / NSAs (e.g. ESIMS\*, USOAP\*\*). NSA's intention was to improve their arrangements through the exchange of lessons learnt and good practices.

\* ESIMS : EUROCONTROL ESARR Implementation Monitoring and Support programme

ESARR: Eurocontrol Safety Regulatory Requirements

\*\* USOAP: ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme

---

## 2. DISCUSSION

- **Main objectives of the Peer Reviews:**
  - Review arrangements of SAR organizations vs. ICAO/IMO and ICAO/PAC requirements
  - Identify opportunities for improvement / need for changes to arrangements
  - Identify arrangements that could be implemented via ICAO/IMO and ICAO/PAC rules
  - Identify issues raised during implementation of supervisory tasks
- **Main goals of the Peer Reviews:**
  - Raise standards of the SAR organizations
  - Promote continuous improvement
  - Achieve measurable common performance standards
  - Foster SAR organizations cooperation
  - Improve trust and confidence in / among SAR organizations
- **A peer review is not:**
  - An audit
  - A place to complain
  - A never-ending meeting
  - A battlefield
  - “Strong” vs. “weak” SAR organizations
  - A showroom of findings
  - A “tea and biscuits” meeting
- **A peer review is:**
  - Dialogue
  - Discipline
  - Collaboration
  - Active involvement
  - Looking for practical solutions
  - Efficient brainstorming
  - Time management
  - Respect
  - Knowledge, preparation
  - **RESULTS**
- **Mechanism understanding:**
  - High-level, process-based
  - Checklists are proposed to be used by the Peer Review Teams
  - There is also a confidentiality clause due to the access to ICAO USOAP and ESIMS audit reports, Safety Maturity Survey results documents, amongst others
  - Auditor’s profile is requested because they know the rules of the game
- **Actors**
  - Three different actors with three different roles: ICAO/PAC is to arrange the Peer Reviews, Mature countries are to conduct the Peer Reviews.
  - Additionally it is necessary to find an organization to act as facilitator, for example IMO or SPC.

**3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 The meeting is invited to consider the above concept as a means to evaluate the capability and maturity of SAR organizations and their compliance against the Annex 12 requirements.

.....

## **Annex**

### *Peer Reviewer Selection*

- **Process**
  - Highly skilled people - familiar with, and able to check, all aspects of the common requirements established in ICAO Annex 12 and relevant documents (IAMSAR, ...)
- **Requirements:**
  - Good knowledge of the Search and Rescue structure and operations
  - Availability to perform several Peer Reviews in the next 3 years
  - Preferably solid experience in certification / auditing / oversight or operational reviews of ANSPs or equivalent
- **Selection**
  - Nominations allowed for different backgrounds and profiles. Basic requirements are covered
  - Pre-selection activities led to conclude that all nominations are valid and accepted
  - Training sessions to ensure common understanding of projected tasks
  - Besides of the background, Peer Reviewers' expected profile concerning attitude, behavior, dialogue, social skills...
  - Cultural factors, scope of the exercise, background, genre, personal skills or even relationships could be part of the criteria
- **Training**
  - Objective: Common Peer Review conduct:
    - Preparation, contacts
    - Familiarisation with guidelines, formats, templates, database, OST
    - Time management, entry and exit meetings, reports / conclusions
    - Very important: to avoid audit approach. Paving the way for arrangements
- **Highlights:**
  - All Peer Reviews must follow the same procedures (no "reinvention of the wheel"!)
  - It does not mean that Peer Reviews must be identical: dynamics and results of the Peer Review exercises will be very different
  - Additional advantage: a good opportunity to meet your partners
- **Confidentiality Policy**
  - A set of documents will be available before each PR takes place
  - Relevant information about countries situation, safety maturity of the States, ESIMS, USOAP results, etc. will be accessible for the preparation
  - Due to the sensitivity of some documents, there will be a confidentiality policy clause to be signed.