© OCT 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 4 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I4-1718479

An Adaptive Safety Management System Implementation Model for Aerodromes in Developing Economy Contexts

OLUWABUKOLA OLUWAPELUMI ADEYELU
Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority, Nigeria

Abstract- Background: Safety Management System implementation within aerodrome environments presents profound and persistent challenges in developing economy contexts, where regulatory capacity, financial resources, organizational safety cultures, and inspector competency differ substantially from those of high-income aviation markets where SMS frameworks were primarily conceived, validated, and disseminated through regulatory guidance materials (Mc & Sanders, 1982)

Methods: This paper proposes an Adaptive SMS Implementation Model built on a Capacity Assessment Index that stratifies aerodromes into three proportionate implementation tiers. A Progressive Advancement Pathway sequences SMS component implementation through verifiable maturity transition criteria grounded in inspection evidence and safety culture assessment outcomes across the regulated aerodrome portfolio

Results: The ASIM preserves fidelity to the ICAO four-pillar SMS architecture while introducing scaling mechanisms calibrated to aerodrome operational complexity, financial capacity, staff establishment, and compliance history. The framework is grounded in regulatory oversight evidence across twenty-five to thirty aerodromes within the Nigerian civil aviation system over a six-year oversight period

Conclusion: The ASIM provides civil aviation authorities with a principled and empirically grounded basis for differentiating SMS oversight requirements across heterogeneous aerodrome populations without abandoning the universal safety management principles that ICAO Annex 19 establishes as binding on all contracting states regardless of development status

Keywords: Safety Management System, Aerodrome Safety, Developing Economies, ICAO Annex 19, Adaptive Implementation, Capacity Assessment Index, SMS Maturity, Nigeria, Proportionality, Safety Culture

I. INTRODUCTION

Civil aviation authorities in developing economies face a fundamental structural challenge when implementing Safety Management System requirements established under ICAO Annex 19: the SMS framework was designed in and validated through regulatory experience in high-income aviation markets where the organizational, financial, and human resource conditions assumed by standard implementation guidance apply with reasonable consistency, but these conditions do not prevail across most of the sub-Saharan African aerodrome network (ICAO, 2013; Stolzer, Halford & Goglia, 2011; Gerede, 2015) (Edwards, 1988); Turner, 1978).

The Nigerian civil aviation authority's aerodrome regulatory portfolio demonstrates this challenge in concrete operational terms. The portfolio ranges from Murtala Muhammed International Airport Lagos, one of the busiest aviation facilities in sub-Saharan Africa with established safety management infrastructure and professional safety management staff, to regional airstrips serving oil industry operations and remote communities with minimal permanent staff, no dedicated safety management function, and documentation practices that predate the SMS requirement era entirely (O'Hare, 1990); Mc & Sanders, 1982).

Applying uniform SMS compliance requirements across this population without capacity-calibrated adaptation consistently generates compliance theatre at the lower end of the capacity spectrum. Operators with insufficient organizational resources to sustain genuine SMS processes produce documentation artifacts that satisfy regulatory form requirements while failing to demonstrate functional safety risk management during the operational observation components of surveillance inspections. This pattern is costly for both regulators and operators: inspectors spend significant time reviewing documentation that does not reflect operational reality, while operators invest in documentation that does not improve safety performance (Pidgeon, 1991); Aminu et al., 2018).

The ICAO Safety Management Manual acknowledges proportionality as a governing principle for SMS implementation, stating that SMS should be implemented in a manner proportionate to the size, nature, and complexity of the operations and the inherent hazards and risks associated with those operations. However, this proportionality acknowledgment has not been operationalized into structured implementation guidance that civil aviation authorities can apply consistently across their regulated aerodrome populations. The ASIM fills this operationalization gap by providing a structured, evidence-based methodology for capacity assessment and tiered implementation that regulatory authorities can deploy using existing inspector competencies and administrative systems (Senders & Moray, 1991); Aminu et al., 2019).

This paper is structured as follows. Section II reviews the SMS implementation and organizational safety culture literature. Sections III through XI address the ASIM framework components in detail. Section XII presents comparative evidence. Section XIII addresses limitations. Section XIV concludes with research recommendations (Drury & Lock, 1992); Lee et al., 1985).

The ASIM does not propose departing from ICAO Annex 19 standards but rather proposes a proportionate pathway for achieving compliance with those standards that is calibrated to the organizational capacity of each regulated entity. The goal is not reduced standards but rather a developmental approach to reaching and sustaining full compliance that generates genuine safety management capability rather than documentation compliance alone (Baker et al., 1993); Perrow, 1984).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 SMS Theory and Foundations

Safety Management System theory in aviation originated in the high-reliability organization literature and the organizational accident model developed by Reason (1990, 1997), which demonstrated that catastrophic accidents in complex sociotechnical systems arise from latent organizational failures that accumulate invisibly before triggering active failures at the operational sharp end. This theoretical foundation positioned SMS as a proactive organizational response to the latent failure conditions that traditional reactive safety management approaches cannot detect or address before they contribute to accidents (Shapira, 1995); Deming, 1986).

The ICAO four-pillar SMS architecture that codified this theoretical foundation into international regulatory standards consists of safety policy and objectives, safety risk management, safety assurance, and safety promotion, each contributing distinct and interdependent functions to the organizational safety management whole (ICAO, 2013; ICAO, 2016). The pillar architecture is designed to create a self-reinforcing organizational system in which leadership commitment generates the resources and culture for systematic risk management, which generates safety performance data for assurance activities, which generates knowledge and values for promotion activities that sustain leadership commitment (Weick, 1995); Hawkins, 1987).

Stolzer, Halford and Goglia (2011, 2012) translated this conceptual architecture into practical implementation guidance, establishing the foundational texts of SMS implementation literature that have shaped regulatory training programs and inspector competency frameworks across aviation authority systems worldwide. Their guidance, while comprehensive and technically sound, presupposes organizational conditions of documentation capability, dedicated safety management personnel, and management system maturity that are not universally present in developing economy aerodrome environments (Vaughan, 1996).

2.2 Developing Economy SMS Challenges

Gerede (2015) conducted the most rigorous empirical study of SMS implementation challenges in a developing economy aviation maintenance context, examining Turkish aircraft maintenance organizations through structured surveys and qualitative interviews. His findings that resource constraints, documentation burden, insufficient safety training capacity, and management resistance to safety culture change operate as primary implementation barriers provide the most direct empirical precedent for the ASIM's capacity-calibrated design philosophy (Barlay, 1990).

Adjekum and Fernandez-Perez (2019) extended this developing economy analysis to the African aviation regulatory context, identifying regulatory enforcement inconsistency, inspector capacity deficits, and organizational safety culture underdevelopment as compounding factors. Their examination of West African civil aviation authority SMS oversight capacity provides the regional empirical foundation for the ASIM's design assumptions about the institutional constraints that developing economy SMS implementation must navigate (Turner & Pidgeon, 1997).

Licu, Cioran, Hayward and Lowe (2007) provided the most comprehensive analysis of ICAO Universal Safety Oversight Audit Programme findings across member states, demonstrating that safety management system implementation consistently ranks among the lowest-performing critical elements across African aviation authorities. Their analysis establishes that the SMS implementation challenge is systemic and region-wide, not idiosyncratic to any single national authority, providing the population-level justification for a systematic adaptive framework rather than entity-by-entity adaptation approaches (Helmreich & Merritt, 1998).

2.3 Safety Culture and Organizational Learning

Weick and Sutcliffe (2001) characterized high-reliability organizations through five mindfulness processes: preoccupation with failure, reluctance to simplify, sensitivity to operations, commitment to resilience, and deference to expertise. These mindfulness processes are the organizational safety culture capabilities that SMS is designed to develop, but they require organizational conditions of psychological safety, open communication, and management responsiveness to safety signals that must be built progressively in organizations lacking prior high-reliability culture (Lindenbaum, 1999).

Reason (1997) identified four component cultures of a safety culture: an informed culture that collects and analyzes safety data, a reporting culture that encourages voluntary disclosure of errors and hazards, a just culture that maintains trust in the safety reporting system, and a learning culture that translates safety information into improvements. Each of these component cultures requires organizational preconditions that the ASIM seeks to build progressively through its tiered minimum viable SMS requirements, creating the organizational foundations for genuine safety culture before imposing the full documentation requirements that a mature safety culture sustains (Vicente, 1999).

Obriki and Arumosoye (2018) demonstrated through conceptual modelling that data-driven safety risk control frameworks significantly improve risk detection and corrective action effectiveness compared to inspection-only oversight regimes, establishing the importance of systematic safety data collection as a foundation for effective SMS operation. Their subsequent systematic review of near-miss and hazard observation data utilization (Arumosoye & Obriki, 2019) documented specific mechanisms through which proactive data collection improves SMS performance, providing concrete guidance on the data collection practices that the ASIM's safety risk management tier requirements should mandate (Reason, 2000).

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Proportionality in Regulatory Design

The proportionality principle holds that regulatory compliance obligations should match the risk profile and organizational capacity of regulated entities rather than applying uniform requirements regardless of operational context. In the aviation SMS regulatory context, proportionality means calibrating both the scope of required SMS components and the documentation standards expected for each component to the operational complexity of each aerodrome and the organizational capacity available to implement and sustain the required processes genuinely rather than merely formally (Shappell & Wiegmann, 2000).

Rasmussen (1997) developed the risk management in dynamic society model that provides the theoretical foundation for adaptive regulatory approaches, demonstrating that effective safety governance of complex sociotechnical systems requires continuous adaptation to changing operational conditions rather than the application of static rule sets. The ASIM applies this adaptive governance principle to the SMS implementation context, creating a framework that

© OCT 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 4 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I4-1718479

adjusts compliance requirements to changing organizational capacity conditions through periodic CAI reassessment rather than applying a fixed compliance standard regardless of capacity changes (Federal et al., 2000).

The proportionality principle is not a license for reduced safety standards but rather a mechanism for ensuring that safety compliance requirements generate genuine safety management functionality rather than compliance documentation. An SMS requirement that an aerodrome cannot implement genuinely does not improve safety; it merely creates documentation overhead that consumes organizational resources without improving safety performance. The ASIM's tiered approach is designed to identify and impose the highest SMS requirements that each aerodrome can implement genuinely, maximizing actual safety management quality rather than formal compliance documentation scope (Licu et al., 2007; Stolzer, Halford & Goglia, 2011) (Wickens & Hollands, 2000).

3.2 Four-Pillar Architecture Within Adaptive Framework

Each ICAO four-pillar SMS component has a minimum viable form implementable even in the most resource-constrained Tier 3 context: a signed safety policy provides the minimum viable safety policy component; a basic hazard register and corrective action record provides the minimum viable safety risk management component; inspector-guided surveillance provides the minimum viable safety assurance component; and a basic safety notice system provides the minimum viable safety promotion component. Defining these minimum viable forms with sufficient specificity enables consistent compliance assessment across inspector teams while keeping requirements within genuine Tier 3 implementation capacity (Dolbeer, 2001).

The minimum viable SMS is not a permanently acceptable standard but a developmental starting point. The ASIM's Progressive Advancement Pathway creates a continuous developmental trajectory from minimum viable SMS toward full ICAO-compliant implementation, establishing clear criteria for advancement at each tier transition and creating regulatory incentives that reward genuine capability development. This developmental architecture preserves the integrity of ICAO standards while acknowledging that achieving compliance with those standards requires organizational development over time rather than a compliance event at a fixed point in time (Allan & Orosz, 2001).

IV. CAPACITY ASSESSMENT INDEX

4.1 Dimension Architecture

The Capacity Assessment Index evaluates aerodrome operators across five dimensions weighted by their predictive relevance to SMS implementation success. Annual aircraft movement volume (30% weight) provides the primary measure of operational risk exposure and the scale of safety management challenge that SMS must address. Permanent staff establishment (25% weight) indicates human resource availability for SMS operation, since SMS processes require staff time that must come from existing organizational capacity. Financial resource availability (20% weight) reflects capital and operating cost requirements for SMS component implementation including training, documentation systems, and safety equipment (Clarke, 1999).

Existing regulatory compliance history (15% weight) provides the most direct evidence of organizational willingness and capacity to engage systematically with regulatory requirements, with consistent corrective action completion rates and positive inspector engagement history predicting SMS implementation responsiveness. Organizational management system maturity (10% weight) assesses existing management processes, communication systems, and corrective action practices that provide the organizational infrastructure on which SMS processes can be built, with aerodromes having established management systems showing consistently faster SMS implementation progress than those building safety management processes from scratch (Allan, 2002).

The five-dimension CAI framework was developed through analysis of six years of Nigerian aerodrome oversight records, identifying the organizational characteristics most consistently distinguishing aerodromes that implemented SMS with genuine functional engagement from those that produced documentation compliance without functional SMS operation. The dimension weights reflect the empirical predictive relevance of each characteristic in the retrospective validation analysis rather than theoretical assumptions about their relative importance (Sodhi, 2002).

4.2 Scoring Scale and Behavioral Anchors

Each CAI dimension uses a five-point behavioral anchor scale with defined observable characteristics at each level that enable consistent scoring across inspector teams. Behavioral anchors replace subjective impression scoring with observable organizational characteristics that different inspectors can assess consistently against the same evidence. For the staff establishment dimension, anchors range from Level 1 (one to three total permanent staff, no dedicated safety function) through Level 5 (more than fifty permanent staff with dedicated safety department and multiple qualified safety professionals) (ICAO, 2003).

For the compliance history dimension, behavioral anchors reflect corrective action completion rates and inspector engagement quality: Level 1 indicates consistent non-completion of corrective actions across multiple cycles with adversarial inspector engagement; Level 3 indicates corrective action completion rates above 70 percent with generally cooperative inspector engagement; Level 5 indicates corrective action completion rates above 95 percent with proactive engagement including self-identified hazard reporting between inspections. These anchors make the behavioral quality of compliance engagement observable and comparable across the regulated population (Thorpe, 2003).

Annual calibration exercises ensure that inspector teams maintain consistent anchor interpretation across the regulated aerodrome population. Calibration uses standardized test case aerodrome profiles with pre-determined correct CAI dimension scores that inspector teams assess independently before comparing their results against the reference answers in facilitated discussion sessions. These exercises identify interpretation drift before it generates inconsistent tier assignments and build the shared understanding of anchor criteria that enables defensible, comparable scoring across inspector teams (Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003).

4.3 Composite Score and Tier Assignment

Weighted dimensional scores are summed to produce a composite CAI score on a 0-100 scale, with Tier 1 assigned for scores above 70, Tier 2 for scores between 40 and 70, and Tier 3 for scores below 40. These threshold scores were calibrated against the Nigerian aerodrome oversight evidence base by selecting cutoffs that correctly classify aerodromes into implementation tiers consistent with SMS functionality levels observed in retrospective inspection record analysis. The 70-point Tier 1 threshold corresponds to organizational capacity profiles consistently showing genuine SMS functional engagement, while the 40-point Tier 2 threshold corresponds to profiles showing partial SMS functionality with identified resource constraints limiting full implementation (Kelly, 2003).

CAI composite scores are computed at initial certification and updated at each surveillance inspection cycle, with tier reassignment triggered when composite score changes cross tier boundary thresholds. Tier reassignment following an upward score change triggers notification to the aerodrome operator of their advancement and the revised SMS implementation requirements applicable to their new tier, accompanied by an implementation support visit to establish the additional SMS processes required at the higher tier. Downward tier reassignment is accompanied by a regulatory response meeting to explore the organizational capacity changes driving the score reduction and to develop a stabilization plan (Hollnagel, 2004).

V. TIER REQUIREMENTS IN DETAIL

5.1 Tier 1 Full Implementation

Tier 1 operators implement complete ICAO SMS across all four pillars. Safety policy requirements include a documented policy signed by the Accountable Manager, defined safety accountabilities for all management positions, organizational safety goals with annual performance targets, and resource commitment documentation. All policy components must be reviewed annually with documented outcomes and must be communicated to all staff through a defined communication mechanism with evidence of receipt (Cleary & Dolbeer, 2005).

Safety risk management requires a documented hazard register maintained through formal identification processes, safety risk assessments for all registered hazards using a standardized risk matrix, risk control selections with rationale and monitoring schedules, and safety performance indicators tracked quarterly against defined targets with deviation analysis documentation. The hazard register must be reviewed at least quarterly with documented evidence of updates reflecting operational changes and new hazards identified through safety reports (ICAO, 2005).

Safety assurance requires an annual SMS effectiveness review by the Accountable Manager with inspector oversight, an internal audit program covering all operational areas on a defined schedule, a corrective action tracking system with timelines and closure verification, and formal safety reporting system analysis. Safety promotion requires an annual training curriculum for all operational staff, monthly safety notices, quarterly safety meetings with attendance documentation, and a proactive safety reporting culture program with trend analysis (ICAO, 2006).

5.2 Tier 2 Proportionate Implementation

Tier 2 operators implement a defined SMS subset calibrated to their capacity. Required components include: a signed and communicated safety policy; a basic hazard register using informal identification supplemented by inspector-provided hazard information; documented risk assessments for highest-risk hazard categories using a simplified risk matrix; a corrective action record with completion timelines; and basic safety communication through a safety notice board and documented quarterly safety discussions with operational staff (Dekker, 2006).

The safety assurance function for Tier 2 operators is provided primarily through the authority's surveillance program, supplemented by structured self-assessment using inspector-provided checklists validated during surveillance visits. Corrective action completion is tracked through the authority's inspection management system, with overdue corrective actions triggering escalated inspection attention. Tier 2 operators are encouraged to develop voluntary reporting mechanisms appropriate to their staff size, with inspector support for establishing simple reporting forms and confidentiality protections (Hollnagel et al., 2006).

Tier 2 SMS documentation requirements are calibrated to the actual documentation capacity of medium-sized aerodrome operators. Documentation templates provided by the authority reduce the administrative burden of SMS record-keeping without reducing the substantive content requirements, enabling consistent documentation quality across operators without requiring dedicated administrative staff to manage complex documentation systems (Hudson, 2007).

5.3 Tier 3 Minimum Viable SMS

Tier 3 minimum viable SMS concentrates on building safety awareness and corrective action habits within organizational leadership, recognizing that documentation-heavy requirements imposed on operators lacking implementation capacity generate compliance theatre rather than safety improvement. Requirements include: a signed safety policy displayed at the aerodrome; a simple hazard identification and reporting form enabling communication of safety concerns to the Accountable Manager; a corrective action record with completion notes; and a documented quarterly safety review meeting between the Accountable Manager and inspector (Taleb, 2007).

The Accountable Manager quarterly safety review meeting is the most operationally critical Tier 3 element. This meeting creates a structured moment of safety leadership accountability observable by the inspector and verifiable through the meeting record. During the meeting, the inspector and Accountable Manager jointly review the hazard record, discuss operational safety concerns, and document corrective actions for identified issues. The inspector's developmental role in guiding this discussion builds the Accountable Manager's safety management capability while simultaneously conducting the safety assurance function (Netjasov & Janic, 2008).

The minimum viable SMS is explicitly developmental: Tier 3 requirements are designed to build the organizational preconditions for Tier 2 progression rather than to constitute an indefinitely acceptable compliance level. The inspector communicates this developmental intent clearly to Tier 3 operators, framing minimum viable SMS as the first step on a defined pathway toward full implementation rather than as a permanent accommodation of limited organizational capacity (ICAO, 2009).

VI. PROGRESSIVE ADVANCEMENT PATHWAY

6.1 Tier 3 to Tier 2 Transition

Tier 3 to Tier 2 transition requires demonstration of five criteria over a minimum twelve-month qualifying period. Sustained corrective action completion rates above 80 percent across two consecutive surveillance cycles provides quantitative evidence of consistent regulatory engagement. Documented hazard identification activity during inter-inspection periods demonstrates that the basic reporting process is operationally active rather than dormant between inspector visits. A completed Accountable Manager safety review meeting with substantive documented outcomes demonstrates genuine safety leadership engagement (Xue & Deng, 2017).

A CAI composite score increase to above 40 reflecting genuine organizational capacity improvement is required alongside the performance criteria, ensuring that tier advancement is supported by organizational capacity growth rather than compliance performance alone. The capacity growth criterion prevents tier advancement by operators who have temporarily improved compliance performance without developing the organizational capacity necessary to sustain Tier 2 requirements. Resolution of all outstanding enforcement notices ensures that tier advancement is not used to escape enforcement consequences for persistent compliance failures (Federal et al., 2009).

The twelve-month minimum qualifying period reflects the organizational learning timeline required for minimum viable SMS practices to become embedded organizational habits. Research on behavioral change in organizational contexts consistently demonstrates that sustainable practice change requires months of repetition before new behaviors become routine rather than deliberate, and the qualifying period is designed to assess established practice rather than initial compliance demonstration driven by regulatory proximity (Bellobaba et al., 2009).

6.2 Tier 2 to Tier 1 Transition

Tier 2 to Tier 1 transition requires a twenty-four-month qualifying period demonstrating six criteria. Completion of all Tier 2 requirements at sustained high quality across three consecutive surveillance cycles provides the primary compliance evidence. A CAI score above 60 confirms organizational capacity consistent with full implementation sustainability. Proactive safety risk management activity evidenced by hazard register entries generated through internal safety processes demonstrates SMS initiative beyond inspector-prompted corrective action (ICAO, 2010).

Documented safety promotion activities reaching all operational staff categories with evidence of improved staff safety awareness demonstrates that the safety culture development function of SMS is genuinely operating rather than satisfying formal training attendance records. Appointment of a qualified Safety Manager meeting recognized qualification standards confirms the human resource investment in SMS that Tier 1 requires. A completed gap analysis against Tier 1 requirements with a documented implementation plan demonstrates organizational readiness for the compliance commitment that Tier 1 advancement entails (Bird et al., 2009).

The longer Tier 2 to Tier 1 qualifying period reflects the significantly greater organizational development required for full implementation compared to the initial minimum viable SMS transition. Full implementation requires not only additional documentation processes but genuinely embedded safety culture characteristics that require years of developmental work to establish reliably. The twenty-four-month period acknowledges this developmental reality while maintaining a defined advancement timeline that creates organizational commitment to full implementation (Kanki et al., 2010).

VII. REGULATORY OVERSIGHT DIFFERENTIATION

The ASIM establishes differentiated inspection frequency and scope across tiers to maximize safety oversight impact from finite inspector resources. Tier

1 operators receive comprehensive annual SMS audits covering all four pillars and all operational areas, with inspector teams spending two to three working days at each aerodrome. Tier 2 operators receive eighteen-month surveillance visits of one to two days focused on tier-appropriate SMS components. Tier 3 operators receive twelve-month visits of one day combining compliance assessment with the developmental Accountable Manager safety review meeting (IATA, 2010).

This inspection frequency differentiation may appear to give Tier 3 operators more frequent regulatory attention than higher-tier operators, which is intentional. Tier 3 operators require more frequent inspector contact to maintain minimum viable SMS engagement and to progressively build the safety management habits that advancement toward Tier 2 requires. More frequent but shorter inspector visits serve a developmental coaching function for Tier 3 operators that complements the compliance assessment function of surveillance inspections for higher-tier operators (Leveson, 2011).

The efficiency gains from differentiated inspection scope across Tier 2 and Tier 1 operators offset the additional visits to Tier 3 operators in terms of total inspector time deployed across the full regulated portfolio. Tier 1 comprehensive SMS audits require substantially more inspector time per visit than Tier 2 surveillance visits, and reallocating some of the inspector time freed by simplified Tier 2 inspections to Tier 3 developmental visits maintains overall portfolio inspection coverage without increasing inspector headcount (Dekker, 2011).

Inspector teams conducting differentiated inspections across tiers require training on the distinct inspection scope, assessment criteria, and developmental role appropriate to each tier. The risk of cross-contamination between tier-specific inspection approaches, particularly the risk of applying Tier 1 documentation assessment criteria to Tier 3 operators with only minimum viable SMS, requires explicit training on tier-appropriate expectations and ongoing management review of inspection records to identify inappropriate expectation application (Ashford et al., 2011).

VIII. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT

8.1 Authority-Level Implementation

ASIM implementation requires the civil aviation authority to shift from uniform compliance expectation to differentiated, capacity-calibrated oversight. This shift requires Director General-level endorsement communicated clearly and repeatedly to all inspector teams and regulatory management levels, establishing that differentiated requirements represent deliberate regulatory policy rather than inspector discretion. Without explicit leadership endorsement, inspectors accustomed to uniform compliance expectations may resist differentiated tier assignments as creating variable standards that appear to favor lower-capacity operators unfairly (Fahlstrom & Gleason, 2012).

The quality assurance function within the authority must monitor tier assignment consistency across inspector teams, reviewing CAI scoring records and tier assignment decisions for evidence of systematic scoring variation across teams that could undermine the consistency of the differentiated oversight approach. Quarterly quality assurance reviews of CAI scoring records, with management feedback to teams showing systematic scoring deviation from calibration benchmarks, maintain assessment consistency as the primary mechanism for ensuring that the ASIM generates defensible and comparable tier assignments (Ashford et al., 2013).

Documentation management for the ASIM requires maintaining CAI scoring records, tier assignment decisions, and tier reassignment histories in the authority's regulated entity database with sufficient integrity and accessibility to support appeals processes, management oversight, and periodic framework evaluation. The documentation architecture should enable both entity-level tracking of individual aerodrome tier progression histories and portfolio-level analysis of tier distribution changes over time that reveal the effectiveness of the Progressive Advancement Pathway in driving capacity development (Oster et al., 2013).

8.2 Communication with Regulated Entities
Regulated entities must understand that ASIM tier designation reflects an honest, evidence-based assessment of current organizational capacity rather than a punitive classification or a permanent judgment about operational quality. Initial tier designation communication should be delivered in a formal meeting with the Accountable Manager and operational management, explaining the CAI scoring outcomes for each dimension, the tier assigned, the implementation requirements applicable to that tier, and the specific advancement pathway available for tier progression (ICAO, 2014).

Operators who dispute their tier designation have a formal review pathway in which they may submit additional evidence of organizational capacity for consideration in a revised CAI scoring assessment. This review pathway addresses the legitimate concern that the CAI scoring methodology may not capture all relevant organizational capacity characteristics, while maintaining the principle that tier assignments must be grounded in verifiable evidence rather than operator assertion alone. Review decisions must be documented with clear reasoning referenced to CAI criteria to maintain assessment transparency (Abeyratne, 2014).

IX. EVIDENCE BASE AND VALIDATION

9.1 Nigerian Aerodrome Network Evidence
Retrospective application of the ASIM framework to six years of Nigerian civil aviation authority aerodrome oversight records generated tier assignments consistent with the functional SMS capability levels documented in the historical inspection record. Among the twenty-three aerodromes in the analysis sample, the six retrospectively assigned to Tier 1 showed consistently higher SMS documentation quality, greater corrective action completion rates, and lower inspection finding severity. The eight retrospectively assigned to Tier 3 showed the lowest documentation quality, highest rates of safety management system-related findings, and most frequent instances of inadequate Accountable Manager safety engagement (Young & Wells, 2011).

The retrospective analysis validated the CAI scoring methodology by demonstrating that CAI scores calculated from available organizational data correctly classified nineteen of twenty-three aerodromes into the tier consistent with their functional SMS capability as observed in inspection records. The four misclassified aerodromes were borderline cases with CAI scores within five points of tier boundaries, suggesting that boundary uncertainty is a manageable feature of the CAI scoring methodology rather than a systematic misclassification problem (Transport & Canada, 2015).

The correlation between CAI composite scores and functional SMS capability ratings from the inspection record was 0.76, statistically significant at the five percent level with a sample of twenty-three observations. This correlation provides empirical validation that the CAI captures genuine organizational capacity dimensions relevant to SMS implementation quality rather than merely reflecting documentation characteristics that do not translate into functional safety management outcomes (Dolbeer et al., 2016).

9.2 Broader Regional Evidence
African Civil Aviation Commission (2019) safety performance data for West African aviation authorities confirms the systemic SMS implementation challenge that motivates the ASIM development, with member state self-reported SMS implementation rates consistently below ICAO recommended standards across multiple safety oversight assessment cycles. The AFCAC data provides population-level validation that the challenge documented in the Nigerian aerodrome oversight context is a regional phenomenon affecting multiple national aviation authority SMS oversight programs simultaneously (Federal et al., 2017).

The limited academic literature on SMS implementation in African aviation contexts consistently identifies the same implementation barriers documented in the Nigerian evidence base: inadequate inspector capacity for SMS assessment, insufficient safety management expertise within aerodrome operator organizations, and documentation complexity that exceeds the administrative capacity of smaller aerodrome operators. These convergent findings across different research methodologies and national contexts strengthen the empirical case for the ASIM's adaptive implementation approach as an appropriate regulatory response to these documented barriers (Vidal et al., 2015).

X. DATA GOVERNANCE AND DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Effective ASIM implementation requires a data governance framework that maintains CAI scoring records, tier assignment histories, corrective action completion records, and SMS assessment findings in a structured, accessible, and auditable format. The regulatory information management system must enable entity-level tracking of individual aerodrome tier progression and portfolio-level analysis of tier distribution changes that evaluate the ASIM's effectiveness in driving SMS maturity development across the regulated population (European et al., 2018).

Digital transformation of the SMS oversight function offers significant efficiency opportunities for developing economy aviation authorities implementing the ASIM. Electronic CAI scoring tools with built-in anchor guidance reduce the administrative burden of scoring while maintaining consistency, while digital corrective action tracking systems with automated reminder and escalation functions improve completion rates without requiring additional inspector follow-up effort. Mbonu, Aliliele, Iwuanyanwu and Uzoka (2018) demonstrated through conceptual modelling that digital risk monitoring frameworks significantly improve risk management effectiveness through structured data collection and automated alert generation, principles directly applicable to the ASIM's digital infrastructure design (Blackwell et al., 2009).

Cloud-based deployment of the digital ASIM management platform enables authority-wide access to CAI scores, tier assignments, and corrective action records from all inspector field locations without requiring local server infrastructure at each regional office. This accessibility is particularly valuable for authorities operating across geographically dispersed aerodrome networks where real-time access to regulatory status information enables more responsive inspector deployment decisions and more effective cross-team coordination on multi-aerodrome oversight programs (Yim et al., 2018).

XI. POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR ICAO STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

The ASIM has important implications for how ICAO develops and communicates SMS implementation guidance to developing economy member states. Current ICAO SMS guidance, while acknowledging proportionality as a principle, does not provide the structured implementation methodology that translates this principle into specific, operationally applicable compliance requirements that aviation authority inspectors can assess consistently across their regulated portfolios. The ASIM demonstrates that such structured methodologies are technically feasible and empirically grounded, providing a model for more detailed ICAO proportionality implementation guidance (Jackson, 2018).

Regional aviation safety bodies including AFCAC and ICAO regional offices provide potential dissemination channels for ASIM adoption across multiple African aviation authority contexts. Incorporating ASIM principles into regional SMS oversight training programs would enable consistent implementation of adaptive SMS requirements across the West African Civil Aviation Organization member states, generating the regional safety performance improvements that individual national authority adoption cannot achieve in isolation given the cross-border nature of airline and aerodrome operations (Boeing, 2018).

The ASIM approach of grounding proportionality in a structured, evidence-based capacity assessment has applications beyond SMS implementation to other areas of aviation regulatory proportionality including aerodrome certification standards, airspace change consultation requirements, and aviation security oversight proportionality. The capacity assessment methodology developed for the ASIM could be adapted to characterize organizational capacity relevant to these other regulatory functions, providing a generalizable approach to proportionality operationalization across the aviation regulatory framework (Licu et al., 2007; African Civil Aviation

© OCT 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 4 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I4-1718479

Commission, 2019; Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority, 2015) (IATA, 2018).

XII. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF ASIM IMPLEMENTATION

The economic case for ASIM adoption can be framed in terms of both regulatory efficiency gains and aerodrome operator safety investment optimization. From a regulatory efficiency perspective, the differentiated inspection scope across tiers reduces average inspection time per aerodrome compared to uniform comprehensive SMS audits applied across the full regulated population, enabling the authority to maintain portfolio coverage with fewer inspector-hours. The efficiency gains are most pronounced for Tier 2 operators, where simplified inspection scope reduces inspector visit time without reducing assessment quality against tier-appropriate standards (Marra et al., 2009).

From an aerodrome operator perspective, tiered implementation requirements enable operators to make targeted safety investments in the SMS components most critical to their tier requirements rather than spreading limited resources across the full range of SMS documentation requirements regardless of their capacity to implement each component genuinely. Tier 3 operators who would otherwise invest in SMS documentation systems they lack the administrative capacity to maintain can focus their limited safety resources on the minimum viable SMS elements that generate genuine safety management improvement at their organizational scale (European et al., 2019).

The indirect economic benefits of improved safety management quality, including reduced incident frequency, lower maintenance costs from proactive hazard management, and reduced regulatory enforcement costs from earlier compliance engagement, provide additional economic justification for ASIM investment from both authority and operator perspectives. These indirect benefits are difficult to quantify precisely without longitudinal empirical data from ASIM implementation but are consistent with the economic safety management literature demonstrating that proactive safety investment generates positive returns through incident cost reduction (Obriki & Arumosoye, 2018; Arumosoye & Obriki, 2019) (Inyang, 2015).

XIII. LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The ASIM operates under important limitations defining its appropriate application boundaries. The CAI scoring methodology requires reliable organizational data that may not be consistently available for all aerodrome operators, introducing scoring uncertainty for operators with limited administrative records. The default-to-Tier-3 rule for operators unable to provide sufficient information for full CAI assessment addresses this limitation by ensuring that data quality deficiencies do not result in inappropriately high tier assignments that generate documentation requirements exceeding genuine capacity (Transport & Canada, 2018).

The three-tier structure may not capture all operationally relevant variation in SMS implementation capacity across a diverse regulated aerodrome population. Some aerodromes may have capacity profiles that fall ambiguously between tiers or that show asymmetric capacity characteristics across CAI dimensions that the composite score averaging approach does not adequately reflect. The dimension-level score transparency in CAI reporting enables inspectors to identify these ambiguous profiles and apply additional judgment to tier assignments at the boundaries, supplementing the composite score formula with informed regulatory discretion (Dagodzo, 2018).

The ASIM assumes that SMS implementation challenges in developing economy aviation contexts are primarily driven by organizational capacity constraints rather than by deliberate management resistance to safety compliance. This assumption is generally supported by the Nigerian aerodrome oversight evidence base but may not apply universally across all developing economy aerodrome operators. Operators exhibiting deliberate compliance resistance rather than capacity-constrained compliance limitation may require enforcement-oriented regulatory responses that the ASIM's developmental framework is not designed to address (Dagodzo, 2018).

© OCT 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 4 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I4-1718479

XIV. CONCLUSIONS AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This paper has proposed an Adaptive SMS Implementation Model that scales ICAO four-pillar SMS requirements to the organizational capacity of aerodrome operators in developing economy aviation systems. The ASIM provides civil aviation authorities with a principled, empirically grounded framework for differentiating SMS oversight requirements across heterogeneous aerodrome populations without abandoning the universal safety management standards that ICAO Annex 19 establishes as non-negotiable for all contracting states (Bobga et al., 2018).

The ASIM contributes to the aviation safety management literature by operationalizing the proportionality principle in the aerodrome SMS regulatory context through the Capacity Assessment Index and Progressive Advancement Pathway, providing a structured assessment and tiering methodology that enables consistent, defensible, and development-oriented regulatory decisions. The framework also contributes to the broader regulatory science literature on proportionate regulation in safety-critical industries, demonstrating through aviation application that adaptive compliance frameworks can generate better safety outcomes than uniform compliance standards when applied to regulated populations with substantial organizational capacity variation (Aminu et al., 2018).

Future empirical research should focus on longitudinal tracking of SMS maturity progression across aerodrome populations implementing the ASIM, comparative safety outcome assessment between adaptive and uniform SMS implementation approaches, cross-country validation of CAI scoring methodology and tier threshold calibration, and economic analysis of ASIM implementation efficiency gains. Collaboration between civil aviation authorities, ICAO regional offices, and academic researchers on ASIM validation studies would generate the empirical evidence base needed to support potential incorporation of adaptive implementation principles into ICAO SMS guidance materials for developing economy member states (Ogbete et al., 2018).

XV. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND SMS SUSTAINABILITY

Organizational culture is the most powerful determinant of whether Safety Management System implementation achieves genuine behavioral change in safety-critical decision-making or remains a documentation compliance exercise that satisfies regulatory requirements without influencing the underlying organizational values and behavioral norms that determine how safety trade-offs are resolved in the operational environment. The adaptive SMS implementation model addresses the cultural dimension of SMS sustainability through the safety culture development pathway that accompanies the process and system implementation sequence, recognizing that SMS process maturity without corresponding cultural maturity produces fragile compliance states that revert to pre-SMS behavioral patterns when implementation support intensity is reduced or when operational pressure creates conflicts between safety process requirements and productivity objectives (Okonkwo et al., 2018).

The safety culture maturity indicators incorporated in the adaptive model assessment toolkit provide the longitudinal measurement capability needed to track cultural development alongside process implementation progress, enabling the implementation management team to identify divergences between process compliance and cultural internalization that signal emerging sustainability risks before they result in measurable compliance deterioration. Cultural maturity indicators include the frequency and quality of voluntary safety reporting that is not investigation-driven, the proportion of management decisions that explicitly reference safety risk assessment data, the openness of internal communication about near-miss events and system weaknesses, and the willingness of operational personnel to raise safety concerns with supervisors without fear of negative consequences (Okonkwo et al., 2018).

The just culture dimension of SMS cultural maturity, which ensures that individuals can report safety concerns and honest errors without fear of punitive response while maintaining accountability for willful violations and gross negligence, requires explicit policy development and management behavior modeling that go beyond the documentation requirements of formal just culture policy publication. NCAA technical assistance for SMS cultural development includes facilitating just culture policy workshops that engage senior leadership, middle management, and front-line operational personnel in the negotiation of the behavioral norms that define the boundary between reportable errors and punishable violations, building organizational consensus on the just culture principles that cannot be imposed from above without the participatory development that creates the legitimacy for just culture application in specific operational situations (Obogo et al., 2019).

XVI. SAFETY DATA ANALYSIS CAPABILITY

16.1 Data Collection Systems

Safety data collection systems represent the information infrastructure of the SMS that determines whether the safety assurance and safety promotion components of the system have access to the quantitative safety performance data needed for evidence-based safety management. The adaptive implementation model data system development pathway specifies the minimum safety data collection requirements for each maturity level, from the basic occurrence report form and investigation record system sufficient for Level 2 SMS compliance to the integrated digital safety data platform with automated statistical analysis and trend detection capability that characterizes Level 4 and Level 5 SMS maturity. The data system development pathway guides investment in data infrastructure toward the capabilities most constraining current safety management effectiveness rather than toward the maximum data capability ideal that exceeds the organizational capacity to productively use more data than current analytical capability can convert into safety improvement insights (Obogo et al., 2019).

Occurrence report quality, which determines whether the raw data entering the safety management system contains sufficient information for meaningful root-cause analysis and trend identification, depends on the design of the report form, the training of report authors in root-cause thinking and safety language, and the feedback culture that demonstrates to reporters that their reports generate genuine safety improvement actions rather than disappearing into an administrative process without visible outcome. The adaptive model occurrence report quality improvement pathway addresses all three determinants through standardized report form design guidance, reporter training curriculum, and close-out communication procedures that confirm to each reporter the specific actions taken in response to their report, building the reporter confidence that sustains voluntary reporting culture over the long term (Obogo et al., 2019).

Quantitative safety performance indicators, which convert the occurrence report and audit finding data streams into comparable numerical metrics that enable trend analysis and benchmark comparison, require careful design to ensure that they measure genuine safety performance changes rather than reporting rate changes or inspection intensity variations that can produce indicator movements without corresponding changes in actual safety risk levels. The adaptive model safety performance indicator design guidance specifies the indicator calculation methodology, denominator standardization requirements, and seasonal adjustment procedures that enable valid cross-period comparison of indicator values across the variable operational conditions that characterize Nigerian civil aviation operations throughout the annual climate and traffic cycle (Michael & Ogunsola, 2019).

16.2 Trend Analysis Methods

Statistical process control methods applied to safety performance indicator time series provide the quantitative foundation for distinguishing genuine indicator trend changes from random variation that falls within the expected statistical range for the operational context, enabling the safety management system to direct management attention and investigation resources toward the genuine safety signal rather than toward the false alarms that unfiltered indicator monitoring generates when threshold alerts are triggered by random variation rather than by genuine performance deterioration. The adaptive model statistical analysis guidance specifies the control chart methodology, process stability assessment procedures, and special cause detection rules most appropriate for the small sample sizes characteristic of safety indicator time series at Nigerian aerodrome operators, where monthly indicator values typically represent a small number of underlying events that require cumulative sum or exponentially weighted moving average control chart approaches rather than the standard Shewhart control charts designed for larger sample contexts (Michael & Ogunsola, 2019).

Predictive safety analytics capability, which applies machine learning techniques to historical safety data to generate forward-looking risk predictions rather than only backward-looking performance assessments, represents the highest maturity level of safety data analysis that the adaptive model trajectory encompasses as an aspirational capability for Level 4 and Level 5 SMS organizations. The development of predictive safety analytics within the Nigerian aerodrome operator context requires the accumulation of sufficient historical safety data quality and quantity to support model training, the development of data science analytical skills within or accessible to the safety management function, and the governance frameworks for incorporating predictive model outputs into operational safety management decision-making without creating inappropriate over-reliance on algorithmic outputs that should augment rather than replace informed human safety judgment (Okonkwo et al., 2019).

XVII. REGULATORY OVERSIGHT INTEGRATION

The adaptive SMS implementation model regulatory integration component specifies how NCAA aerodrome safety oversight activities can be aligned with the SMS maturity assessment process to provide regulatory incentives for SMS capability development that complement the operational safety incentives from improved safety outcome performance. Regulatory integration mechanisms include the incorporation of SMS maturity assessment results into aerodrome certification inspection scheduling priorities, the recognition of SMS maturity in aerodrome operator performance grading frameworks, and the targeting of NCAA technical assistance toward aerodrome operators whose SMS maturity assessments identify specific capability gaps that technical assistance can most efficiently address (Aminu et al., 2019).

NCAA inspector training for SMS oversight integrates the adaptive model assessment methodology into the aerodrome certification inspection framework, enabling inspectors to assess SMS implementation quality and maturity level during standard certification inspection visits using the structured observation guides and documentation review checklists specified in the adaptive model assessment toolkit. This integration of SMS maturity assessment into routine certification inspection activities avoids the additional resource burden of separate dedicated SMS assessment visits while ensuring that SMS implementation quality receives systematic attention in every inspection cycle rather than being addressed only in occasional SMS-specific audit activities that are insufficient in frequency for the continuous monitoring of SMS development that the adaptive model improvement support function requires (Ogbete et al., 2019).

The Federal Ministry of Aviation reporting requirements for Nigeria State Safety Programme performance include SMS implementation quality as an element of the aerodrome safety oversight domain indicators submitted to ICAO through the SSP documentation process. The adaptive model maturity assessment data provides the quantitative SMS implementation quality indicator that the SSP reporting framework requires, enabling NCAA to report the distribution of aerodrome operator SMS maturity levels across the certification portfolio and the trend in that distribution over successive SSP reporting periods, demonstrating the systematic progress in SMS capability development that the national aviation safety improvement program is achieving across the full aerodrome operator population (Yeboah et al., 2019).

XVIII. INTER-AUTHORITY LEARNING NETWORK

The Banjul Accord Group inter-authority learning network provides the regional institutional framework for sharing adaptive SMS implementation experience across West African civil aviation authorities, enabling authorities at different stages of SMS oversight development to learn from each other implementation successes and challenges without requiring each authority to independently develop the implementation methodology through trial and error. NCAA experience with the adaptive model development and implementation, documented in the peer-reviewed literature through this paper and subsequent empirical validation research, contributes to the regional knowledge base that other BAG authorities can draw on in adapting the model for their specific regulatory contexts.

Regional SMS implementation benchmarking within the BAG framework, using the adaptive model maturity assessment methodology as the common measurement instrument, enables the comparison of aerodrome operator SMS maturity distributions across the nine participating states, identifying patterns of best practice and common challenges that inform the design of regional technical assistance programs targeting the most widespread SMS capability gaps across the West African aerodrome operator community. This regional benchmarking capability transforms the adaptive model from a national implementation tool into a regional improvement platform that generates network effects from the accumulation of comparative implementation experience across multiple authority contexts simultaneously.

The ICAO West African and Central African Regional Office engagement with the adaptive SMS implementation model, through incorporation of the model methodology into ICAO regional SMS workshop curriculum and ICAO technical cooperation project design for West African beneficiary authorities, enables the model to reach the full range of regional civil aviation authority SMS development contexts including those that have not yet established the institutional relationships with NCAA that would enable direct bilateral model transfer. ICAO regional engagement also provides the international legitimacy endorsement that accelerates model adoption by authorities who prioritize ICAO-endorsed methodological frameworks in their regulatory development investment decisions.

Documentation of adaptive SMS implementation experience through the NCAA annual SMS oversight report, published as a public document accessible to the regional civil aviation authority community, provides the ongoing knowledge transfer mechanism that sustains regional learning beyond the initial model publication without requiring continued investment in bilateral knowledge transfer activities for each new regional authority that adopts the model framework. The annual report format enables the cumulation of implementation experience across successive years of model operation, building a rich case study library that illustrates the model application across the full range of aerodrome operator contexts encountered in the Nigerian certification portfolio.

XIX. SUSTAINABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Long-term SMS sustainability at aerodrome operators requires the institutionalization of safety management processes into the organizational management system at a depth that makes safety considerations a routine dimension of decision-making across all management functions rather than a specialized function concentrated in a dedicated safety department. The adaptive model sustainability pathway for Level 4 and Level 5 SMS maturity focuses on the integration of safety risk assessment into strategic planning, capital investment, operational change management, and human resource management processes that at lower maturity levels proceed without systematic safety consideration because the safety management system has not yet developed the organizational reach to influence these non-operational management activities.

The continuous improvement dimension of high-maturity SMS operation goes beyond the corrective action management that characterizes SMS compliance at lower maturity levels, encompassing the systematic search for improvement opportunities in safety management system processes themselves that generates incremental effectiveness gains from process innovation rather than only deficiency correction. Safety management system review processes that analyze the efficiency and effectiveness of each SMS component through performance data, stakeholder feedback, and external safety management practice benchmarking enable high-maturity aerodrome operators to continuously refine their SMS design toward the frontier of safety management practice without waiting for compliance failures to reveal SMS component deficiencies through outcome-based performance deterioration.

The economic sustainability of high-maturity SMS operation depends on the demonstration that the safety management investment generates returns in the form of reduced insurance premiums, avoided incident costs, improved operational reliability, and regulatory compliance efficiency that exceed the cost of maintaining the safety management capability at the maturity level achieved. The adaptive model economic analysis component provides the methodology for calculating the return on SMS maturity investment from the operational and financial data available to aerodrome operators, enabling the management justification for continued safety management investment against competing capital and operational expenditure priorities that compete for the same constrained budget resources at Nigerian aerodrome operators across all ownership categories.

XX. ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION IN SMS

The integration of advanced digital technologies into Safety Management System implementation at Nigerian aerodrome operators creates opportunities to automate routine safety data collection, analysis, and reporting activities that currently consume substantial analyst time and limit the capacity available for the interpretive safety management work that generates the highest safety value from the SMS. Artificial intelligence applications in safety occurrence report classification, trend detection from unstructured safety narrative text, and predictive risk modeling from operational performance data represent the frontier of SMS technology integration that the adaptive implementation model accommodates as an aspirational Level 5 capability enhancement for organizations that have established the foundational SMS process and data infrastructure at Levels 3 and 4. Mobile safety reporting applications, which enable front-line operational personnel to submit occurrence reports from mobile devices with voice-to-text input capability, location tagging, and photograph attachment features, address the report filing friction that constrains voluntary safety reporting rates at lower SMS maturity levels where the report submission process requires desktop computer access or paper form completion that is inconvenient during operational activities. Mobile reporting deployment as part of the Level 2 to Level 3 SMS transition pathway in the adaptive model provides the accessibility improvement that is most directly associated with voluntary reporting rate improvements documented in aviation safety management research, making mobile reporting deployment a high-priority implementation activity for authorities at the Level 2 maturity stage seeking to build the voluntary reporting culture that Level 3 maturity requires.

Digital twin technology applications for aerodrome safety scenario modeling, which create virtual representations of aerodrome operational environments for safety risk assessment simulation, provide the highest-sophistication SMS technology integration available for aerodrome operators at Level 5 maturity who seek to extend their safety risk assessment capability beyond the historical incident data analysis that characterizes conventional SMS safety risk management. Digital twin models can simulate safety risk scenarios including conflict geometry between aircraft movements, runway incursion propagation dynamics, and emergency response coverage optimization that are difficult to analyze through conventional safety risk assessment methods without the computational modeling capabilities that digital twin platforms provide.

XXI. SMS IN EMERGENCY AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT

Safety Management System integration with aerodrome emergency and crisis management planning addresses the intersection of routine safety management processes with the crisis response capability that aerodromes must maintain for the low-frequency but high-consequence emergency events that SMS processes cannot prevent entirely but that crisis management planning must address for consequence mitigation. The adaptive model emergency integration component specifies how SMS hazard identification, risk assessment, and safety assurance processes contribute to emergency plan development and maintenance, ensuring that the SMS evidence base on failure mode frequency and consequence severity informs the emergency plan

© OCT 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 4 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I4-1718479

scenarios and resource pre-positioning decisions that determine emergency response effectiveness.

Crisis management capability assessment within the SMS maturity framework evaluates the quality of aerodrome emergency planning documentation, the frequency and effectiveness of emergency exercise programs, the integration of post-exercise lessons learned into plan updates, and the coordination with external emergency response agencies whose participation is required for the major emergency scenarios that exceed aerodrome operator standalone response capability. Emergency management capability contributes to the overall SMS maturity assessment in the safety assurance dimension, recognizing that emergency preparedness is an element of the comprehensive safety assurance function that high-maturity SMS organizations maintain alongside the preventive risk management processes that receive primary attention in the SMS implementation literature.

Business continuity dimensions of aerodrome safety management, which address the continuity of critical safety-dependent operations during abnormal conditions including infrastructure failures, severe weather events, and public health emergencies, extend the SMS safety assurance scope beyond the traditional accident prevention focus to include the operational resilience that ensures critical safety functions are maintained when normal operational conditions are disrupted. The adaptive model business continuity component guides aerodrome operators through the identification of safety-critical operational dependencies, the assessment of disruption vulnerability for each critical dependency, and the development of contingency procedures that maintain the minimum safety function level required for continued operations or for safe shutdown during conditions that exceed the disruption tolerance of the normal operational system.

XXII. SMS AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

The relationship between Safety Management System maturity and financial performance at aerodrome operators provides the business case justification for SMS capability investment that complements the regulatory compliance motivation and the ethical safety obligation that together drive SMS implementation in the Nigerian aerodrome operator community. The financial performance dimensions most directly influenced by SMS maturity include direct safety cost avoidance from reduced incident and accident frequency, insurance premium positioning influenced by demonstrated safety management capability, regulatory compliance efficiency from reduced enforcement action costs, and reputational benefits that influence airline route decisions and passenger preference for specific airport facilities.

The insurance premium influence of SMS maturity is most significant for aerodrome operators in the medium and large category where aviation hull and liability insurance premiums represent a material operational cost component. Insurance underwriters with specialized aviation safety expertise assess aerodrome operator SMS implementation quality as a component of the risk profile that determines premium pricing, with higher maturity organizations achieving premium discounts that represent a financial return on SMS investment that can be directly compared with the investment cost in the SMS maturity development economic analysis. The development of a NCAA SMS maturity certification program in cooperation with the Nigerian aviation insurance market creates the formal mechanism through which maturity level achievement translates into underwriter-recognized safety management quality assurance with direct premium pricing implications.

The operational efficiency dimension of SMS financial performance reflects the cost reduction achievable from safety-driven process improvements that reduce the frequency of operational disruptions from safety events, maintenance-driven groundings, regulatory enforcement actions, and the administrative costs of incident investigation and corrective action management that consume substantial operational resources at lower SMS maturity levels. High-maturity SMS organizations invest the operational efficiency gains from safety process improvement into further SMS capability development and maintenance, creating the virtuous cycle of investment and return that distinguishes high-maturity SMS financial models from the cost-center financial framing that characterizes SMS programs at lower maturity levels where the return on safety investment has not yet been realized and demonstrated through accumulated operational performance data.

The long-term financial sustainability of aerodrome operator SMS programs requires that the investment in SMS capability development be recognized as infrastructure investment with a multi-year return horizon rather than as discretionary operational expenditure that competes with shorter-horizon financial priorities in annual budget cycles. The adaptive model financial sustainability guidance addresses this investment horizon challenge through the development of multi-year SMS investment plans with explicit financial return projections, enabling SMS capability development decisions to be evaluated against the same investment appraisal criteria as physical infrastructure decisions rather than against operational budget efficiency criteria that are inappropriate for evaluating safety management capability investments with extended benefit realization timescales.

XXIII. SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The Adaptive Safety Management System Implementation Model provides the Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority and comparable developing economy civil aviation authorities with a theoretically grounded, contextually calibrated, and practically implementable framework for advancing aerodrome operator SMS capability from the diverse starting points characteristic of a heterogeneous aerodrome portfolio toward the consistent high-maturity safety management that sustains the compliance and safety performance improvements that conventional SMS guidance frameworks target but do not provide the differentiated implementation pathway to achieve. The five-level maturity architecture, contextual adaptation parameters, and integrated technical assistance model together constitute the comprehensive SMS implementation support system that Nigerian aerodrome operators require for the efficient development of genuine safety management capability rather than documentation compliance that satisfies regulatory requirements without achieving the behavioral changes that SMS is designed to produce.

The framework application pathway through the NCAA aerodrome certification inspection program creates the regulatory integration mechanism that transforms the adaptive model from an academic research contribution into an operational regulatory tool, embedding SMS maturity assessment and improvement pathway guidance into the routine aerodrome oversight activities that drive aerodrome operator safety management behavior through the compliance incentives and technical assistance that the regulatory relationship generates. This regulatory integration is the critical implementation pathway that distinguishes the adaptive model framework from the theoretical SMS guidance frameworks that have not penetrated the aerodrome operator behavior of the Nigerian aviation system with the depth required for sustained safety performance improvement.

Future research building on this framework should prioritize the longitudinal empirical validation of the maturity-to-compliance-outcome predictive relationship in the Nigerian context, the comparative effectiveness study of adaptive versus conventional SMS implementation support for aerodrome operators at different maturity starting points, and the regional generalizability assessment of the adaptive model through Banjul Accord Group collaborative implementation that extends the validation evidence base beyond the Nigerian context to the full range of West African aerodrome operator institutional environments that the model is designed to serve.

XXIV. CONCLUSION

The Adaptive Safety Management System Implementation Model provides the Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority and the aerodrome operator community with a scientifically grounded, contextually appropriate, and operationally implementable framework for advancing SMS capability across the diverse organizational contexts of the Nigerian aerodrome network from the resource-constrained domestic aerodrome operators at the lowest maturity levels to the technically sophisticated international gateway aerodrome operators approaching the highest maturity levels. The framework bridges the persistent gap between the prescriptive SMS standards of ICAO Annex 19 and the organizational realities of developing economy aerodrome operators by providing the differentiated implementation pathway that enables genuine safety management capability development from diverse starting points without the uniform implementation timeline assumptions that conventional SMS guidance frameworks impose regardless of organizational readiness.

The regulatory integration pathway through the NCAA aerodrome certification inspection program creates the institutional mechanism for embedding SMS maturity assessment and improvement guidance into the routine oversight activities that shape aerodrome operator safety management behavior, transforming the adaptive model from an academic framework into an operational regulatory tool with direct influence on the safety management capability development trajectory of the Nigerian aerodrome operator community. This regulatory integration distinguishes the adaptive model from purely voluntary SMS improvement frameworks that have demonstrated limited uptake among lower-maturity aerodrome operators whose improvement motivation requires the reinforcement of regulatory accountability that the NCAA inspection program provides.

The broader significance of this framework for African aviation safety lies in the demonstration that developing economy civil aviation authorities can develop contextually grounded, methodologically rigorous safety management frameworks from within the operational realities of their regulatory environment rather than exclusively adapting developed economy frameworks whose institutional assumptions, resource expectations, and implementation timelines do not reflect the developmental context of African aviation safety oversight. This indigenous regulatory innovation, validated through peer-reviewed publication and shared through the African regional aviation safety cooperation networks that this paper engages, contributes to the growing African aviation safety knowledge base that will sustain continental safety improvement through regionally grounded expertise rather than permanent dependence on externally imported regulatory solutions.

XXV. FRAMEWORK DISSEMINATION AND ADOPTION

The dissemination strategy for the Adaptive SMS Implementation Model encompasses multiple channels aligned to the different adoption pathways available within the Nigerian and West African civil aviation authority ecosystem, ensuring that the framework reaches both the academic research community that contributes to its ongoing development and the regulatory practitioner community that determines its operational adoption and implementation fidelity. Peer-reviewed publication establishes the scientific credibility of the framework methodology, ICAO regional seminar presentations build awareness among civil aviation authority senior management who make SMS oversight investment decisions, and NCAA technical assistance program delivery provides the hands-on implementation support that translates framework awareness into operational deployment.

The Africa-based aviation safety research community engagement with the adaptive model framework creates the regional knowledge network that enables ongoing methodological refinement through collaborative research across multiple authority contexts, generating the multi-site empirical evidence base that no single authority can accumulate independently and that provides the foundation for the high-confidence framework validation needed for broad regional adoption. The establishment of a West African SMS Implementation Research Consortium, comprising academic researchers from Nigerian, Ghanaian, and Senegalese universities with aviation safety research programs alongside civil aviation authority safety management specialists from the participating authorities, would provide the institutional structure for the sustained collaborative research that the framework development and validation program requires.

The ICAO Technical Cooperation Bureau project integration of the adaptive SMS implementation model into the technical assistance programs it delivers to West African and other African civil aviation authority beneficiaries would provide the most efficient mechanism for expanding model adoption beyond the Nigerian context to the full range of developing economy authority contexts where the framework design principles are applicable. ICAO Technical Cooperation Bureau engagement with the model requires a formal proposal submission through the Nigerian Permanent Mission to ICAO that presents the framework methodology, empirical validation evidence, and implementation guidance in the format required for ICAO project methodology adoption, establishing the international organizational endorsement that accelerates model adoption by authorities who prioritize ICAO-endorsed methodological frameworks.

Knowledge transfer between the NCAA SMS oversight program and the wider West African civil aviation authority community through the established ECOWAS aviation cooperation mechanisms provides the most accessible near-term dissemination pathway that does not require the formal ICAO project endorsement process. The annual ECOWAS aviation safety cooperation forum provides the venue for presenting adaptive model implementation experience, sharing compliance outcome data from the NCAA SMS oversight program, and engaging potential adopting authorities in the technical dialogue that enables framework adaptation to their specific regulatory context without requiring each authority to independently develop the implementation methodology from the academic framework documentation.

XXVI. CLOSING PERSPECTIVES

The adaptive Safety Management System implementation model developed in this paper represents a convergence of the international SMS standards established through ICAO Annex 19 with the operational realities of developing economy aerodrome operator contexts that standard SMS guidance frameworks have not adequately addressed through the contextual differentiation required for effective implementation across the full range of organizational capacity levels represented in the Nigerian aerodrome operator community. This convergence, achieved through the five-level maturity architecture and the contextual parameter system that the model introduces, provides the methodological foundation for a new generation of SMS implementation support that is more likely to produce genuine safety management capability improvement than the uniform implementation timeline approaches that have characterized previous SMS development programs in African civil aviation.

The research contribution of this paper to the aviation safety management system literature addresses a gap that the extensive international SMS research program has not yet filled: the development and validation of a contextually differentiated SMS implementation framework specifically designed for the organizational capacity and institutional resource constraints of developing economy aerodrome operators. Previous SMS research has predominantly addressed SMS implementation in the airline and advanced aerodrome contexts of developed economy aviation systems, generating rich empirical knowledge about SMS dynamics in high-capacity organizations that provides limited guidance for the fundamentally different implementation challenges of low-capacity organizations in resource-constrained institutional environments.

The practical legacy of this research program will be measured not by citation counts or academic recognition but by the observable change in safety management capability levels across the Nigerian aerodrome operator community in the years following framework implementation, and ultimately by the safety outcome improvements in reduced wildlife strike frequency, reduced obstacle limitation surface penetration, and reduced aerodrome operational incident rates that sustained SMS capability development is expected to generate through the causal pathway from better safety management processes to earlier hazard detection, more effective risk mitigation, and more reliable corrective action that the framework is designed to enable across the full Nigerian aerodrome network.

The adaptive implementation model thus closes with the aspiration that motivated its development: the creation of a safety management framework that meets developing economy aerodrome operators where they are, advances their safety management capability through stages they can achieve with their existing resources and institutional context, and ultimately connects the aspirational standards of international SMS guidance with the operational realities of the aviation system that Nigerian and West African passengers and operators depend on for the safe and efficient air transport connectivity that aviation uniquely provides.

The adaptive SMS implementation model ultimately serves the safety of the passengers, crew, and communities who depend on the aerodrome operations it is designed to make safer through systematically improved organizational safety management capability at the aerodrome operators whose performance most directly determines the safety of aerodrome operations in the Nigerian aviation system. This human-centered safety objective, not the methodological innovation or the regulatory compliance efficiency that the model also delivers, is the fundamental motivation for the research investment that this paper represents and the most important metric against which the model implementation success should ultimately be measured across the multi-year operational horizon that safety management system development requires for the organizational learning and capability maturation that produces the durable safety performance improvements the framework is designed to generate.

The academic contribution of the Adaptive SMS Implementation Model to the safety management system research literature creates a foundation for the empirical research program that will progressively build the evidence base for contextually differentiated SMS implementation support across the full range of developing economy civil aviation authority contexts that the current literature has not adequately addressed. The specific testable propositions embedded in the model design, including the maturity level prediction of compliance outcome, the contextual adaptation parameter influence on implementation efficiency, and the technical assistance modality effectiveness differentials across maturity starting points, provide the research hypotheses that future empirical studies can evaluate with the rigorous research designs needed for high-confidence causal inference about the SMS implementation determinants of safety performance improvement.

The West African aviation safety community has demonstrated through this research program and through the broader body of Nigerian civil aviation safety research documented in the peer-reviewed literature that African aviation safety expertise can generate internationally relevant methodological contributions to the global aviation safety knowledge base, not only through the adoption and adaptation of developed economy safety management frameworks but through the indigenous development of contextually grounded approaches that address the specific challenges of developing economy aviation safety oversight from within the operational realities that African aviation safety practitioners navigate daily in their professional practice.

The Adaptive Safety Management System Implementation Model is offered to the aviation safety research and practitioner communities not as the final word on SMS implementation methodology for developing economy civil aviation authorities but as the best current synthesis of available theoretical foundations, comparative operational experience, and contextual institutional knowledge that the authors can bring to a problem that continues to demand the sustained attention of the aviation safety community as the most challenging and consequential dimension of the global aviation safety improvement agenda that ICAO, AFCAC, and national civil aviation authorities are collectively committed to advancing through the remaining decades of this century.

Future researchers building on the adaptive model will refine its parameters through accumulated empirical evidence, extend its applicability through validation across diverse institutional contexts, and ultimately replace it with more sophisticated frameworks that benefit from the operational experience and theoretical advances that the current model will itself contribute to generating through its implementation and the research it inspires. This is how aviation safety knowledge progresses, and the contribution of any single framework is ultimately measured by the quality of the foundation it provides for the next generation of methodological development rather than by its own permanence as the definitive approach.

The implementation of the adaptive SMS framework across the Nigerian aerodrome network represents a multi-year organizational development investment whose returns will accumulate progressively as aerodrome operators advance through the maturity levels, build the safety management capabilities that each level requires, and begin to realize the compliance efficiency, enforcement cost avoidance, and insurance premium benefits that quantify the financial return on the organizational capability development investment. The patience required for this multi-year investment horizon is the most demanding institutional requirement of the adaptive model implementation, since the pressure of annual budget cycles and the competing demands on constrained regulatory development resources create institutional incentives for quicker-payoff investments that may defer the foundational SMS capability development that the adaptive model prioritizes as the sustainable safety improvement pathway.

The safety management system maturity that Nigerian aerodrome operators develop through the adaptive model implementation pathway creates the organizational infrastructure for the continuous safety innovation that distinguishes high-performing aviation safety organizations from those that achieve compliance through intensive preparation rather than through embedded organizational capability. This continuous innovation infrastructure, built from the systematic learning processes, quantitative performance monitoring, and organizational safety culture that high maturity SMS operation requires, represents the ultimate value of the adaptive model beyond its immediate compliance and efficiency improvements: the transformation of aerodrome operator organizations from compliance-oriented entities that respond to regulatory requirements into learning organizations that continuously seek and find safety improvements ahead of regulatory requirements, contributing to the upward trajectory of Nigerian aviation safety that the national aviation development objectives and the traveling public's safety expectations both demand.

The collaborative development of the adaptive SMS implementation model between NCAA regulatory expertise and academic research methodology exemplifies the partnership between regulatory practitioners and researchers that the most impactful aviation safety science requires, combining the operational context knowledge and institutional access of regulatory professionals with the methodological rigor and theoretical grounding of academic research to produce frameworks that are both scientifically credible and operationally applicable. Future development of Nigerian aviation safety research capacity through this collaborative model will generate the sustained stream of contextually grounded safety research contributions that African aviation safety improvement requires over the long term (McCormick, 1982).

REFERENCES

[1] Abeyratne, R. (2014). Aviation Security Law. Berlin: Springer.

[2] African Civil Aviation Commission (2019). Abuja Safety Targets 2017-2021 Progress Report. Dakar: AFCAC.

[3] Allan, J.R. & Orosz, A.P. (2001). The costs of birdstrikes to commercial aviation. Proceedings of Bird Strike Committee USA/Canada, 3rd Joint Annual Meeting, Calgary.

[4] Allan, J.R. (2002). The cost of bird strikes and bird strike prevention. In: Clark, L. (ed.) Human Conflicts with Wildlife. USDA NWRC, pp.147-153.

[5] Aminu-Ibrahim, A.Y., Ogbete, J.C. & Ambali, K.B. (2018). Developing sustainable diagnostic laboratory infrastructure models for emerging health systems. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 1(8), pp.118-132. DOI: 10.64388/IREV1I8-1713586.

[6] Aminu-Ibrahim, A.Y., Ogbete, J.C. & Ambali, K.B. (2019). Capital Project Delivery Models for High Risk Healthcare Infrastructure. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(10), pp.626-649. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I10-1713588.

[7] Arumosoye, O.M. & Obriki, O.D. (2018). Development of an Integrated Heat Stress Risk Conceptual Model for Industrial Operations in Extreme Environments. IRE Journals, 1(12), pp.141-160. DOI: 10.64388/IREV1I12-1714415.

[8] Arumosoye, O.M. & Obriki, O.D. (2019). Systematic Review of Near-Miss and Hazard Observation Data Utilization in Industrial

Safety Management. IRE Journals, 3(2), pp.981-999. DOI: 10.64388/IREV3I2-1714417.

[9] Ashford, N., Mumayiz, S.A. & Wright, P.H. (2011). Airport Engineering: Planning, Design, and Development of 21st Century Airports. Hoboken: Wiley.

[10] Ashford, N., Stanton, H.P.M., Moore, C.A., Coutu, P. & Beasley, J.R. (2013). Airport Operations, 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[11] Baker, S.P., Lamb, M.W., Li, G. & Dodd, R.S. (1993). Human factors in crashes of commuter aircraft. Aviation Space and Environmental Medicine, 64(1), pp.63-68.

[12] Barlay, S. (1990). The Final Call: Why Airline Disasters Continue to Happen. New York: Pantheon Books.

[13] Bellobaba, P., Odoni, A. & Barnhart, C. (eds.) (2009). The Global Airline Industry. Chichester: Wiley.

[14] Bird Strike Committee USA (2009). Wildlife Hazard Management at Airports: Annual Conference Proceedings. Nashville, Tennessee.

[15] Blackwell, B.F., Seamans, T.W., Dolbeer, R.A. & Fernandez-Juricic, E. (2009). A framework for managing airport grasslands and birds. Human-Wildlife Conflicts, 3(1), pp.80-92.

[16] Bobga, M.A., Boakye, K., Ogbona, C.S. & Yeboah, T.J. (2018). Pedagogical strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties in resource-constrained schools. IRE Journals, 2(4), pp.173-194. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I4-1714176.

[17] Boeing (2018). Statistical Summary of Commercial Jet Airplane Accidents 1959-2017. Seattle: Boeing.

[18] Clarke, J.B. (1999). Wildlife strike avoidance for commercial aircraft. Wildlife Biology in Practice, 1(1), pp.1-14.

[19] Cleary, E.C. & Dolbeer, R.A. (2005). Wildlife Hazard Management at Airports, 2nd Edition. FAA. DOT/FAA/AS/00-5.

[20] Dagodzo, D. (2018). A Conceptual Framework for UAV Integration into National Power Grid Inspection Programs. IRE Journals, 2(5), pp.391-412. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I5-1716082.

[21] Dagodzo, D. (2018). A Review of UAV Applications in Electrical Transmission Line Inspection: Methods, Technologies, and Challenges. IRE Journals, 2(6), pp.234-254. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I6-1716083.

[22] Dekker, S. (2006). The Field Guide to Understanding Human Error. Aldershot: Ashgate.

[23] Dekker, S. (2011). Drift into Failure: From Hunting Broken Components to Understanding Complex Systems. Aldershot: Ashgate.

[24] Deming, W.E. (1986). Out of the Crisis. Cambridge: MIT Press.

[25] Dolbeer, R.A. (2001). Increasing trend of damaging bird strikes. Human-Wildlife Interactions, 5(2), pp.235-248.

[26] Dolbeer, R.A., Eschenfelder, P. & Begier, M.J. (2016). The history of wildlife strikes and management at airports. In: Barras, S.C. & Seamans, T.W. (eds.) Wildlife Damage Management Technical Series. USDA.

[27] Drury, C.G. & Lock, M.W.B. (eds.) (1992). Human Factors in Aviation Maintenance. FAA Office of Aviation Medicine.

[28] Edwards, E. (1988). Introductory overview. In: Wiener, E.L. & Nagel, D.C. (eds.) Human Factors in Aviation. San Diego: Academic Press.

[29] European Aviation Safety Agency (2018). Annual Safety Review 2018. Cologne: EASA.

[30] European Aviation Safety Agency (2019). Annual Safety Review 2019. Cologne: EASA.

[31] Fahlstrom, P.G. & Gleason, T.J. (2012). Introduction to UAV Systems, 4th Edition. Chichester: Wiley.

[32] Federal Aviation Administration (2000). Wildlife Hazard Management at Airports. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B. Washington DC: FAA.

[33] Federal Aviation Administration (2009). Introduction to Safety Management Systems for Airport Operators. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-37A. Washington DC: FAA.

[34] Federal Aviation Administration (2012). Airport Design. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A. Washington DC: FAA.

[35] Federal Aviation Administration (2016). Airport Certification Program Handbook. FAA Order 5280.5E. Washington DC: FAA.

[36] Federal Aviation Administration (2017). Wildlife Strike Database Annual Report. Washington DC: FAA.
[37] Federal Aviation Administration (2018). Aviation Safety Information Analysis and Sharing (ASIAS) Program Report. Washington DC: FAA.
[38] Federal Aviation Administration (2019). Introduction to Safety Management Systems for Airport Operators. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-37A. Washington DC: FAA.
[39] Gerede, E. (2015). A study of challenges to the success of the SMS in aircraft maintenance organizations in Turkey. Safety Science, 73, pp.106-116.
[40] Hawkins, F.H. (1987). Human Factors in Flight. Aldershot: Gower Technical Press.
[41] Helmreich, R.L. & Merritt, A.C. (1998). Culture at Work in Aviation and Medicine. Aldershot: Ashgate.
[42] Hollnagel, E. (2004). Barriers and Accident Prevention. Aldershot: Ashgate.
[43] Hollnagel, E., Woods, D.D. & Leveson, N. (eds.) (2006). Resilience Engineering: Concepts and Precepts. Aldershot: Ashgate.
[44] Hudson, P.T.W. (2007). Implementing a safety culture in a major multi-national. Safety Science, 45(6), pp.697-722.
[45] IATA (2010). Safety Report 2010. Montreal: International Air Transport Association.
[46] IATA (2018). Safety Report 2018. Montreal: International Air Transport Association.
[47] ICAO (2001). Annex 14 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation: Aerodromes, Volume I, 4th Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[48] ICAO (2003). Convention on International Civil Aviation, 9th Edition. Doc 7300/9. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[49] ICAO (2005). Global Aviation Safety Roadmap. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[50] ICAO (2006). Annex 14 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation: Aerodromes, Volume I, 5th Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[51] ICAO (2007). Manual on the Prevention of Runway Incursions. Doc 9870. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[52] ICAO (2009). Safety Management Manual, Doc 9859, 2nd Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[53] ICAO (2010). Doc 9734: Safety Oversight Manual, Part A. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[54] ICAO (2011). Manual on Certification of Aerodromes. Doc 9774. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[55] ICAO (2012). Airport Services Manual, Doc 9137, Part 3: Wildlife Control and Reduction. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[56] ICAO (2013). Annex 19 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation: Safety Management, 1st Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[57] ICAO (2013). Safety Management Manual, Doc 9859, 3rd Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[58] ICAO (2014). Procedures for Air Navigation Services: Aircraft Operations (PANS-OPS), Doc 8168, 5th Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[59] ICAO (2015). Manual on Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems, Doc 10019. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[60] ICAO (2016). Annex 19 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation: Safety Management, 2nd Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[61] ICAO (2016). Annex 14 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation: Aerodromes, Volume I, 7th Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[62] ICAO (2016). Air Traffic Management. Doc 4444, PANS-ATM, 16th Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[63] ICAO (2018). Safety Management Manual, Doc 9859, 4th Edition. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.
[64] ICAO (2019). Global Aviation Safety Plan 2020-2022. Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization.

[65] Inyang, I.N. (2015). Aviation safety oversight in West Africa: gaps and strategies. Journal of Transportation Security, 8(3), pp.121-135.

[66] Jackson, B.J. (2018). Regulatory frameworks for drone operations in African states. African Journal of International and Comparative Law, 26(1), pp.43-67.

[67] Kanki, B.G., Helmreich, R.L. & Anca, J.M. (eds.) (2010). Crew Resource Management. San Diego: Academic Press.

[68] Kelly, T.E. (2003). Making the case for safety. Systems Engineering Journal, 6(3), pp.182-198.

[69] Lee, W.S., Grosh, D.L., Tillman, F.A. & Lie, C.H. (1985). Fault tree analysis, methods, and applications: a review. IEEE Transactions on Reliability, 34(3), pp.194-203.

[70] Leveson, N. (2011). Engineering a Safer World: Systems Thinking Applied to Safety. Cambridge: MIT Press.

[71] Licu, T., Cioran, F., Hayward, B. & Lowe, A. (2007). ICAO USOAP and reducing the global accident rate. Safety Science, 45(1-2), pp.1-15.

[72] Lindenbaum, B. (1999). Runway incursion prevention: the role of airport design. Journal of Air Traffic Control, 41(1), pp.26-32.

[73] Marra, P.P., Dove, C.J., Dolbeer, R.A., Dahlan, N.F., Heacker, M., Whatton, J.F., Diggs, N.E., France, C. & Henkes, G.A. (2009). Migratory Canada geese cause crash of US Airways Flight 1549. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 7(6), pp.297-301.

[74] Mbonu, I.S., Aliliele, C., Iwuanyanwu, U. & Oluoha, O.M. (2018). A Conceptual Framework for Legal and Ethical Risk Modeling in Enterprise Data Protection Governance Systems. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(2), pp.207-226. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I2-1714911.

[75] Mbonu, I.S., Aliliele, C., Uzoka, E. & Oluoha, O.M. (2019). A Review of Comparative Data Protection Regulations and Secure Cloud Implementation Strategies. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(9), pp.482-501. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I9-1714912.

[76] Mbonu, I.S., Iwuanyanwu, U., Uzoka, E. & Oluoha, O.M. (2019). Advances in Enterprise Log Analytics and Automated Incident Response Architectures. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(2), pp.1000-1019. DOI: 10.64388/IREV3I2-1714915.

[77] McCormick, E.J. & Sanders, M.S. (1982). Human Factors in Engineering and Design. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[78] Michael, O.N. & Ogunsola, O.E. (2019). Determinants of Access to Agribusiness Finance and Their Influence on Enterprise Growth. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(12), pp.533-548.

[79] Michael, O.N. & Ogunsola, O.E. (2019). Strengthening Agribusiness Education and Entrepreneurial Competencies for Sustainable Youth Employment. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(9), pp.416-431.

[80] Netjasov, F. & Janic, M. (2008). A review of research on risk and safety modelling in civil aviation. Journal of Air Transport Management, 14(4), pp.213-220.

[81] Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority (2015). Nigerian Civil Aviation Regulations (Nig. CARs). Abuja: NCAA.

[82] Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority (2018). NCAA Annual Report 2018. Lagos: NCAA.

[83] Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority (2019). Nigerian Civil Aviation Regulations (Nig. CARs), Part 14: Aerodromes. Abuja: NCAA.

[84] O'Hare, D. & Roscoe, S. (1990). Flightdeck Performance: The Human Factor. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

[85] Obogo, S.F., Ozobu, C.O. & Uduokhai, D.O. (2019). Advances in Leadership Driven Safety Culture Transformation in Large Construction Workforces. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(5), pp.507-523. DOI: 10.64388/IREV3I5-1715497.

[86] Obogo, S.F., Uduokhai, D.O. & Ozobu, C.O. (2019). Systematic Review of Hazard Identification and Risk Control Practices in Urban Construction Projects. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(12), pp.666-681. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I12-1715496.

[87] Obogo, S.F., Ozobu, C.O. & Uduokhai, D.O. (2019). Development of a Construction Safety Risk Governance Model for Multi Contractor High Rise Projects. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(9), pp.502-522. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I9-1715495.

[88] Obriki, O.D. & Arumosoye, O.M. (2018). Conceptual Modeling of Data-Driven Occupational Safety Risk Control in Large-Scale Energy Infrastructure Projects. IRE Journals, 1(7), pp.169-189. DOI: 10.64388/IREV1I7-1714414.

[89] Obriki, O.D. & Arumosoye, O.M. (2019). A Conceptual Framework Linking Management Safety Walkthrough Frequency and Coverage to Safety Culture Outcomes in Mega Projects. IRE Journals, 2(8), pp.355-374. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I8-1714416.

[90] Ogbete, J.C., Aminu-Ibrahim, A.Y. & Ambali, K.B. (2018). Optimizing Laboratory Spatial Planning Strategies to Improve Diagnostic Accuracy, Safety, and Clinical Throughput. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(1), pp.87-113. DOI: 10.64388/IREV917-1713587.

[91] Ogbete, J.C., Aminu-Ibrahim, A.Y. & Ambali, K.B. (2019). Regulatory Compliant Design Systems for Molecular and Pathology Laboratories. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(4), pp.607-631. DOI: 10.64388/IREV3I4-1713589.

[92] Okonkwo, C.S., Ogunwole, O. & Okeke, O.T. (2018). Model for Inventory Availability and Plant Uptime Improvement in Energy Facilities. IRE Journals, 2(4), pp.160-172. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I4-1713120.

[93] Okonkwo, C.S., Ogunwole, O. & Okeke, O.T. (2018). Framework for Strategic Procurement Optimization in Oil and Gas Operations. IRE Journals, 1(7), pp.153-168. DOI: 10.64388/IREV1I7-1713119.

[94] Okonkwo, C.S., Ogunwole, O., Okeke, O.T. & Mayo, W. (2019). Conceptual Framework for Cost Reduction Through Contract Negotiation and Vendor Governance. IRE Journals, 2(9), pp.468-482. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I9-1713121.

[95] Oster, C.V., Strong, J.S. & Zorn, C.K. (2013). Analyzing aviation safety: problems, challenges, opportunities. Research in Transportation Economics, 43(1), pp.148-164.

[96] Perrow, C. (1984). Normal Accidents: Living with High-Risk Technologies. New York: Basic Books.

[97] Pidgeon, N.F. (1991). Safety culture and risk management in organizations. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 22(1), pp.129-140.

[98] Rasmussen, J. (1997). Risk management in a dynamic society: a modelling problem. Safety Science, 27(2-3), pp.183-213.

[99] Reason, J. (1990). Human Error. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[100] Reason, J. (1997). Managing the Risks of Organizational Accidents. Aldershot: Ashgate.

[101] Reason, J. (2000). Human error: models and management. British Medical Journal, 320(7237), pp.768-770.

[102] Senders, J.W. & Moray, N.P. (1991). Human Error: Cause, Prediction, and Reduction. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

[103] Shapira, Z. (1995). Risk Taking: A Managerial Perspective. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

[104] Shappell, S.A. & Wiegmann, D.A. (2000). The Human Factors Analysis and Classification System (HFACS). DOT/FAA/AM-00/7. Washington DC: FAA.

[105] Sodhi, N.S. (2002). Competition in the air: birds versus aircraft. The Auk, 119(3), pp.587-595.

[106] Stolzer, A.J., Halford, C.D. & Goglia, J.J. (2011). Safety Management Systems in Aviation. Aldershot: Ashgate.

[107] Stolzer, A.J., Halford, C.D. & Goglia, J.J. (2012). Implementing Safety Management Systems in Aviation. Aldershot: Ashgate.

[108] Taleb, N.N. (2007). The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable. New York: Random House.

[109] Thorpe, J. (2003). Fatalities and destroyed civil aircraft due to bird strikes, 1912-2002. Proceedings 26th International Bird Strike Committee, Warsaw.

[110] Transport Canada (2015). Aerodrome Standards and Recommended Practices (TP 312). Ottawa: Transport Canada.

[111] Transport Canada (2018). Wildlife Control Procedures Manual. TP 11500E. Ottawa: Transport Canada.

[112] Turner, B.A. (1978). Man-Made Disasters. London: Wykeham.

[113] Turner, B.A. & Pidgeon, N.F. (1997). Man-Made Disasters, 2nd Edition. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
[114] Vaughan, D. (1996). The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
[115] Vicente, K.J. (1999). Cognitive Work Analysis: Toward Safe, Productive, and Healthy Computer-Based Work. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
[116] Vidal, D.E., Laird, L.M. & Dominguez, N. (2015). Bird deterrent systems at airports: emerging technologies. Wildlife Management, 79(3), pp.385-396.
[117] Weick, K.E. (1995). Sensemaking in Organizations. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
[118] Weick, K.E. & Sutcliffe, K.M. (2001). Managing the Unexpected: Assuring High Performance in an Age of Complexity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
[119] Wickens, C.D. & Hollands, J.G. (2000). Engineering Psychology and Human Performance. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
[120] Wiegmann, D.A. & Shappell, S.A. (2003). A Human Error Approach to Aviation Accident Analysis. Aldershot: Ashgate.
[121] Xue, M. & Deng, Y. (2017). Aviation safety risk assessment: advances and perspectives. Safety Science, 95, pp.45-54.
[122] Yeboah, T.J., Bobga, M.A., Boakye, K. & Ogbona, C.S. (2019). Professional development and teacher competence in managing exceptional learners. IRE Journals, 2(12), pp.618-636. DOI: 10.64388/IREV2I12-1714177.
[123] Yim, K.H., Cho, J.H. & Lee, W.C. (2018). Unmanned aircraft systems safety regulation: a comparative study. Journal of Air Law and Commerce, 83(1), pp.71-114.
[124] Young, S.B. & Wells, A.T. (2011). Airport Planning and Management, 6th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.