

When Fuel Becomes a Hazard Aviation Fuelling Errors, Fuel Contamination and Flight Safety CASE STUDY Max Air Boeing 737-300 Fuel Contamination Event Yola Airport, Nigeria — 7 July 2023

OKORO OBINNA¹, ADEJUBEE F.M²

^{1, 2} The University of America Curacao

Abstract- Aviation fuel is a safety-critical element of aircraft operations. Its integrity must be protected from production or import through transportation, storage, filtration, quality testing and delivery into the aircraft. Fuel contamination can involve water, particulate matter, microbiological growth, cross-contamination by another fuel or product, or other substances that may render the fuel unsuitable. The safety significance of contamination is heightened by the fact that a failure may originate outside the airline while its consequences appear inside the aircraft.

This book investigates the impact of aviation fuelling errors and fuel contamination using the Max Air Boeing 737-300 registration 5N-MHM event at Yola Airport on 7 July 2023 as a Nigerian case study. The NCAA reported contamination of the aircraft's main fuel tanks and an APU shutdown on the ground. The regulator subsequently took action concerning Max Air's Boeing 737 operations and initiated an organizational audit. A later NCAA communication described water found in fuel tanks of some aircraft and announced wider stakeholder collaboration to investigate the root cause and close safety gaps. [8], [9]

The study adopts a qualitative documentary case-study approach. It combines regulatory evidence with international aviation fuel guidance and safety-management concepts. ICAO identifies contamination by water, particulates, microbiological growth and cross-contamination as fuel-quality concerns and describes the supply chain as extending from refining through transportation, storage, airport systems and refuelling. IATA likewise describes technical fuel operations as encompassing contamination, storage and distribution, technical standards and fuel disruptions, while its guidance covers fuel specifications, refuelling procedures, supply-chain quality and aircraft fuel systems. [1], [2], [3]

The analysis demonstrates that fuelling safety should be treated as a multi-layered system rather than as a single task. The book proposes a prevention framework built around product identification, traceability, sampling, filtration, storage controls, independent verification, personnel competence, reporting, auditing, emergency response and regulatory oversight. It concludes with recommendations for airlines, airports, fuel suppliers, maintenance organizations, regulators and aviation-training institutions.

Keywords- Aviation fuel; Jet A-1, fuel contamination, aircraft refuelling, wrong fuelling, fuel quality; human factors; Safety Management System, risk management, Max Air, Yola Airport, Nigeria, NCAA, aviation safety.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Modern aviation is a high-reliability system. Its safety depends on the coordinated performance of aircraft design, maintenance, flight operations, air traffic services, airport infrastructure, ground handling, fuel supply and regulatory oversight. A weakness in one part of the system can propagate into another part. Aviation fuel is particularly important because it is both a physical product and an operational dependency: the aircraft cannot safely complete its intended flight without fuel that satisfies the applicable specification and is delivered through a controlled process.

ICAO has described aviation fuel quality as a significant aviation-safety issue. Its fuel-quality initiative recognized that contamination may occur across the supply chain, including refining, transportation, storage, airport hydrant systems and the refuelling process. ICAO's Doc 9977 was

developed as a signpost to internationally accepted fuel-quality, operations and training practices. [2]

In Nigeria, the issue has direct regulatory relevance. The NCAA issued an advisory circular on aircraft refuelling issues and safety procedures on 14 July 2023, identifying refuelling safety as an important ground-handling safety issue and specifically noting fuel contamination and water as hazards. [10]

1.2 Aviation Fuel and Flight Safety

The relationship between fuel and flight safety is often underestimated because fuel is commonly viewed as a routine ground-service activity. In reality, the quality of fuel can affect aircraft fuel pumps, filters, control systems, engines and auxiliary systems. The operational chain begins before the aircraft arrives: the fuel has already passed through several facilities, containers, transfer points and quality-control decisions.

Aviation fuel must therefore be managed as a safety-critical material. The correct question is not simply whether fuel was delivered, but whether the organization can demonstrate that the correct product, in the correct condition, through the correct equipment, reached the correct aircraft.

1.3 The Aviation Fuelling Chain

A simplified chain is: production/import → terminal → transportation → airport receipt → storage → filtration/water control → refuelling equipment or hydrant → aircraft tank → aircraft fuel system. IATA describes aviation-fuel infrastructure as a network of facilities within and upstream of airports, including production, intermediate storage, airport fuel farms, storage tanks, loading facilities and hydrant systems. [1], [3], [6]

1.4 Why Fuelling Errors Matter

The consequences of a fuelling error vary. Some errors are detected immediately and cause no aircraft damage. Others may require fuel removal, inspection or maintenance. More serious contamination can contribute to loss of engine or system performance. The safety objective is therefore to prevent the event and, when prevention fails, detect it before the aircraft is exposed to unacceptable risk.

1.5 Statement of the Problem

The Max Air Yola case demonstrates the importance of fuel-quality controls in Nigerian aviation. The NCAA reported fuel contamination in the main fuel tanks of B737-300 5N-MHM and an APU shutdown on the ground. It later announced wider investigation and stakeholder collaboration after water was found in fuel tanks of some aircraft. [8], [9]

1.6 Aim

To examine the impact of aviation fuelling errors and fuel contamination on flight safety and develop practical prevention and risk-management measures using the Max Air Yola event as a case study.

1.7 Objectives

- Explain the aviation fuel supply and aircraft-refuelling process.
- Identify major forms and sources of aviation fuel contamination.
- Document the publicly established facts surrounding the Max Air Yola case.
- Analyze technical, human and organizational barriers.
- Examine operational, regulatory and financial consequences.
- Develop a practical aviation fuel-quality risk-control framework for Nigerian operations.

1.8 Research Questions

- What are the main sources of aviation fuel contamination?
- Which barriers should prevent contaminated fuel from reaching an aircraft?
- What does the public evidence establish about the Max Air Yola event?
- What are the potential impacts of fuelling errors?
- How can Nigerian aviation stakeholders strengthen fuel-quality assurance?

1.9 Significance

The study is significant for pilots, aircraft engineers, fuel handlers, airport operators, safety managers, airline executives, regulators, students and researchers. It translates a documented Nigerian occurrence into a structured safety-learning framework.

1.10 Scope

The book focuses on aviation turbine fuel, quality assurance, fuelling operations, contamination, human factors, SMS, risk management and the Max Air Yola case. It does not attempt to establish criminal, civil or regulatory liability.

1.11 Methodology

The work uses documentary case-study analysis. Primary case evidence is taken from NCAA public releases and advisory material. International context is drawn from ICAO and IATA publications. Analytical models are used to organize the evidence and identify possible barriers. [8], [9], [1], [2], [3]

1.12 Limitations

A full technical investigation would require original fuel samples, laboratory results, fuel-batch records, storage records, refuelling logs, aircraft maintenance records, interviews and other evidence not necessarily available in public sources. The analysis therefore distinguishes documented facts from hypotheses and safety questions.

1.13 Key Terms

- Fuel contamination — unwanted material or product in fuel that may make it unsuitable for aircraft use.
- Fuelling error — an incorrect action or omission during fuel receipt, storage, transfer, identification or delivery.
- Into-plane fuelling — delivery of fuel into an aircraft.
- Fuel quality assurance — controls that preserve fuel identity, cleanliness and specification.
- Barrier — a preventive or mitigative control between a hazard and an unwanted consequence.
- Occurrence — an aviation event that may affect or indicate safety performance.
- Safety Management System — an organized approach to managing safety risk and improving safety performance.

II. AVIATION FUEL: CHARACTERISTICS, QUALITY AND SUPPLY

2.1 Aviation Turbine Fuel

Commercial turbine aircraft commonly use fuels such as Jet A or Jet A-1 depending on the applicable supply region and specification. The precise specification is not a matter for informal selection: aircraft operators, suppliers and fuel handlers must use the approved fuel requirements applicable to the aircraft and operation. [3]

IATA's technical-fuel program covers fuel specifications, refuelling procedures, supply-chain quality and aircraft fuel-system considerations. [3]

2.2 Fuel Specifications

Fuel specifications define physical and chemical characteristics that support safe operation. Specifications allow fuel to be tested at relevant stages of the supply chain. IATA explains that quality-control documents can accompany fuel from its origin through subsequent transfer points, supporting traceability and confirmation of specification compliance. [3], [6]

2.3 Fuel Supply Chain

The supply chain may involve ships, pipelines, rail, trucks, terminals, intermediate storage and airport fuel farms. Every transfer is a potential contamination or documentation point. A robust system therefore treats each handover as a controlled interface. [1], [6]

2.4 Receipt and Storage

Airport fuel farms need appropriate receiving procedures, tank identification, segregation, water management, inspection, sampling, maintenance and documentation. Storage tanks must be protected from ingress of water and foreign matter. Tank status should be known before product is received. [11]

2.5 Filtration

Filtration protects downstream equipment by removing particles and, depending on system design, managing water. Filter condition and differential pressure are important indicators. Abnormal trends should be investigated rather than normalized. [11]

2.6 Water Management

Water is one of the most important fuel contaminants. It can enter through condensation, leaks, contaminated transport equipment, poor drainage or other pathways.

Water may settle in storage systems but can become entrained during fuel movement. Effective drainage and detection are therefore critical. [2], [11]

2.7 Fuel Sampling

Sampling provides an opportunity to verify fuel condition before release or use. Sampling must be representative, correctly performed, clearly identified and supported by a reliable test method. An incorrectly performed sample can create false confidence. [4], [11]

2.8 Documentation and Traceability

Traceability allows an organization to answer: Where did this fuel come from? Which batch was it? Which tank held it? Which equipment transferred it? Who performed the operation? Which aircraft received it? What checks were completed? Without these records, investigation and corrective action become more difficult. [6]

2.9 Into-Plane Fuelling

Into-plane fuelling combines product control with human-machine interaction. The operator must identify the aircraft, confirm the fuel requirement, check equipment, establish required bonding or grounding, connect correctly, monitor delivery and complete documentation. Communication with the flight crew or responsible aircraft personnel is also important. [4], [10]

2.10 Quality Assurance

Quality assurance should be continuous. IATA describes fuel technical operations as including contamination, storage and distribution, disruptions and compliance with technical standards. It also describes the Fuel Quality Pool as a mechanism through which participating airlines share fuel inspection reports and workload. [3], [5]

III. FUELLING ERRORS AND CONTAMINATION

3.1 Meaning of Fuelling Error

A fuelling error is any deviation from the approved process that can affect fuel identity, quantity, quality or safe delivery. The term should not be limited to putting one fuel grade into an aircraft designed for another. Contamination, inadequate verification,

incorrect documentation, poor sampling and equipment-control failures can also constitute fuelling-system failures.

3.2 Wrong Product

Wrong-product events may occur when fuel is incorrectly identified, incorrectly loaded, incorrectly transferred or incorrectly connected to an aircraft. Controls include labeling, physical segregation, equipment compatibility and independent verification.

3.3 Cross-Contamination

Cross-contamination may occur when another product, fuel grade or additive enters the fuel. IATA's fuel-supply terminology includes cross-contaminated products, water, particulates and microbiological growth within the concept of contaminated fuel. [2], [3]

3.4 Water Contamination

Water can cause corrosion, freezing concerns and other fuel-system problems. The NCAA's July 2023 communication explicitly identified water found in fuel tanks of some aircraft as part of the Nigerian fuel-contamination concern. [2], [9]

3.5 Particulate Contamination

Particles may originate from corrosion, dirt, tank coatings, equipment wear or filter debris. They can restrict fuel flow, damage components or contribute to filter blockage. [2], [11]

3.6 Microbiological Contamination

Microorganisms can grow where water and fuel coexist. Their activity may contribute to sludge, corrosion and filter problems. IATA maintains guidance specifically addressing microbial contamination, including causes, risks, testing and treatment. [2]

3.7 Additives and Chemical Contamination

Uncontrolled introduction of additives or chemicals can change fuel properties. Fuel handling must therefore maintain product integrity and prevent unauthorized or unintended mixing.

3.8 Equipment Failure

Fuel hoses, couplings, valves, filters, pumps, meters and tanks can fail. Equipment condition is therefore

part of fuel-quality assurance, not merely maintenance housekeeping. [11]

3.9 Documentation Failure

A fuel system can be physically correct but administratively unsafe if records are wrong. Incorrect batch numbers, missing certificates or incomplete sampling records can prevent effective traceability.

3.10 Human Error

Human error can include slips, lapses, mistakes and procedural deviations. The safety response should examine the conditions under which the error occurred, not only the final action. [3], [4]

3.11 Procedural Drift

Procedural drift occurs when a shortcut becomes normal because it appears to produce acceptable results. Over time, a temporary deviation can become an informal standard. Fuel handling is especially vulnerable because many operations are repetitive.

3.12 Prevention

Prevention requires layers: product identification, segregation, documentation, storage controls, filtration, sampling, equipment maintenance, training, independent verification, reporting, audit and regulatory oversight.

IV. CASE STUDY: MAX AIR AT YOLA

4.1 Background

The Max Air case is useful because it is a Nigerian aviation event documented directly by the national aviation regulator. It should therefore be studied as a safety-management case rather than converted into an unsupported accusation.

4.2 Aircraft and Event

The NCAA stated that on 7 July 2023, B737-300 registration 5N-MHM experienced fuel contamination of its main fuel tanks at Yola Airport, Adamawa State, leading to an APU shutdown on the ground. [8]

4.3 Timeline

Date	Event	Source significance
7 July 2023	Fuel contamination reported in the main fuel tanks of B737-300 5N-MHM at Yola; APU shutdown on ground.	Direct NCAA case statement [8].
11 July 2023	5N-MHM air return to Abuja due to duct-overheat indication.	Listed by NCAA among occurrences considered in its action [8].
13 July 2023	NCAA suspended Parts A3 and D43 of Max Air's B737 Operations Specifications and ordered an organizational audit.	Direct NCAA regulatory action [8].
20 July 2023	NCAA announced deeper investigation and stakeholder consultation after water was found in fuel tanks of some aircraft.	Direct NCAA fuel-quality response [9].

4.4 Regulatory Response

The NCAA stated that its 13 July action followed several occurrences involving the Boeing 737 type in Max Air's fleet. It constituted an inspection team to audit the organization and said the audit had to be satisfactory before the airline could further operate the aircraft type. [8]

4.5 Fuel Contamination

The public record establishes contamination, but the first NCAA release does not provide the full laboratory characterization, exact point of entry, or complete causal chain. A responsible academic analysis therefore avoids declaring a particular cause without evidence.

4.6 Water Contamination Context

On 20 July 2023, the NCAA stated that water had been found in the fuel tanks of some aircraft and that it was consulting the NMDPRA, FAAN, NSIB, airlines, fuel suppliers and other stakeholders. The regulator described the issue as multifaceted and called for investigation of all facets of the fuel ecosystem. [9]

4.7 What the Evidence Establishes

- Aircraft 5N-MHM was a Boeing 737-300.
- Fuel contamination of the main fuel tanks was reported at Yola Airport on 7 July 2023.
- An APU shutdown occurred on the ground.
- The NCAA took regulatory action involving Max Air's Boeing 737 operations on 13 July 2023.

- The NCAA later described water found in the fuel tanks of some aircraft and initiated broader stakeholder investigation.

4.8 What the Evidence Does Not Establish

- The precise contaminant responsible for every aspect of the 5N-MHM event.
- The identity of the person or organization that introduced the contamination.
- The exact physical point in the supply chain where contamination occurred.
- The complete laboratory findings or all maintenance findings.
- Any legal conclusion about negligence or liability.

4.9 Case Analysis

The case should be viewed through the question of barrier performance. If contamination reached the aircraft, one or more controls did not prevent or detect it early enough. The investigation question is therefore broader than 'Who made the mistake?' It includes: Which controls existed? Were they correctly designed? Were they implemented? Were they monitored? Did personnel have authority to stop the operation? Were abnormal indicators reported? Were corrective actions effective?

V. IMPACT OF FUELLING ERRORS

5.1 Technical Impact

Fuel contamination can affect tanks, pumps, filters, valves, fuel metering and engine fuel systems. The exact effect depends on the contaminant and its concentration. It is therefore unsafe to assume that all contamination has the same technical consequence. [2], [11]

5.2 APU and Engine Systems

The Max Air event is significant because the NCAA specifically associated the reported fuel contamination with an APU shutdown on the ground. An APU shutdown is not equivalent to an in-flight engine failure; however, it demonstrates that fuel quality can affect aircraft systems before departure. [8]

5.3 Maintenance Impact

Suspected contamination may trigger inspections, sampling, draining, cleaning, filter examination, component checks and documentation reviews. Maintenance resources can therefore be diverted from normal scheduled activity.

5.4 Operational Impact

An aircraft affected by a fuel-quality event may be delayed, cancelled, substituted or removed from service. If regulatory restrictions follow, the operational effect can extend across the fleet.

5.5 Passenger Impact

Passengers can experience delays, cancellations, missed connections and uncertainty. Even when no injury occurs, safety-related disruption can affect confidence in the airline and airport system.

5.6 Financial Impact

Direct costs can include contaminated fuel disposal, testing, aircraft downtime, maintenance and additional ground services. Indirect costs may include schedule disruption, passenger handling, substitute aircraft and lost utilization.

5.7 Regulatory Impact

Regulators may impose inspections, operational restrictions, corrective-action requirements or other measures when evidence indicates a safety concern. The Max Air case demonstrates how a fuel-related event can become part of a broader regulatory response.

5.8 Safety-Culture Impact

The response to an event communicates the organization's safety values. If personnel believe reporting a contamination concern will be punished unfairly, they may hide early warning signs. If reporting is encouraged and corrective action follows, the organization gains information that can prevent recurrence.

5.9 Long-Term Organizational Impact

Repeated events can reveal systemic weaknesses in training, supervision, contractor management, equipment reliability or safety assurance. Long-term improvement therefore requires measurement of

corrective-action effectiveness rather than simply closing an audit finding.

VI. HUMAN FACTORS AND ROOT-CAUSE ANALYSIS

6.1 Human Factors

Human performance is influenced by the environment in which people work. Fuelling personnel may operate under time pressure, shift work, weather constraints, repetitive tasks, equipment noise and communication demands. A human error is often the visible endpoint of a chain of conditions.

6.2 Swiss-Cheese Model

The Swiss-cheese model is useful for illustrating how multiple defenses can contain weaknesses. In a fuel system, the layers may include supplier certification, transportation controls, storage inspection, filtration, sampling, documentation, refueller checks, aircraft acceptance and regulatory oversight. If weaknesses align, a contamination event can pass through several layers.

6.3 Bow-Tie Model

A bow-tie analysis places the central hazard between preventive barriers and mitigative barriers. For fuel contamination, the hazard may be contaminated fuel available for aircraft use. Threats include water ingress, particles, microbial growth and cross-contamination. Preventive barriers include segregation, testing and filtration. Mitigative barriers include detection, stop-work procedures, maintenance response and regulatory action.

6.4 Reason's Error Concepts

Reason's approach distinguishes active failures from latent conditions. An incorrect action at the refuelling point may be an active failure, while inadequate training, unclear procedures, poor equipment design or weak supervision may be latent conditions that made the active failure more likely.

6.5 Organizational Factors

Organizations influence safety through staffing, procurement, maintenance budgets, contractor selection, training standards, audit programs and management attention. Safety can deteriorate when

production pressure consistently competes with safety controls.

6.6 Contractor Interface

Fuel handling may involve organizations that are separate from the airline. This creates interface risk. The airline must know what standards the contractor applies, how competence is verified, how incidents are reported and how corrective actions are monitored.

6.7 Communication

Fuel grade, aircraft registration, quantity, equipment status and abnormal findings must be communicated accurately. Ambiguous terminology or assumptions can undermine otherwise good technical controls.

6.8 Fatigue and Workload

Fatigue can reduce attention, working memory and decision quality. Workload can also create pressure to complete repetitive tasks quickly. Shift design, staffing and supervision are therefore part of the safety system.

6.9 Safety Culture

A positive safety culture is demonstrated by behavior: personnel stop unsafe work, managers listen to reports, audits are acted upon, and corrective actions are verified.

6.10 Root-Cause Questions

- What happened?
- What should have happened?
- Which barrier should have prevented it?
- Which barrier should have detected it?
- Why did that barrier fail or become ineffective?
- What conditions made the failure possible?
- Was the problem known previously?
- Did previous reports lead to effective action?
- What evidence would confirm or reject each causal hypothesis?

VII. SAFETY MANAGEMENT AND RISK CONTROL

7.1 Safety Management System

An SMS provides a structure for hazard identification, risk assessment, safety assurance and continuous improvement. Fuel-quality hazards should be included

because contamination can arise from both operational and organizational sources. [10]

7.2 Hazard Identification

Hazards should be identified from inspections, occurrence reports, audits, maintenance findings, fuel tests, supplier information and trend data. A hazard register should identify the responsible owner and required controls.

7.3 Risk Assessment

Risk assessment should consider severity and likelihood using the organization's approved methodology. A fuel-contamination hazard may have low probability but high consequence, making preventive barriers important.

7.4 Critical Barriers

Critical barriers should be explicitly identified and monitored. Examples include correct fuel identification, water checks, filtration, sampling, equipment integrity, independent verification and stop-work authority.

7.5 Audits

Audits should test actual practice. A procedure that exists on paper but is not followed does not provide an effective barrier. Audit programs should sample different shifts, locations, personnel and contractors. [10]

7.6 Occurrence Reporting

Near misses are valuable. A report of water detected before fuelling, an identification mismatch, abnormal filter pressure or missing documentation can reveal a weak barrier before an aircraft is affected. [10]

7.7 Stop-Work Authority

Fuel handlers should have clear authority to pause or stop fuelling when a critical safety condition is uncertain. This authority must be supported by management behavior.

7.8 Emergency Response

A suspected contamination event should trigger a defined sequence: stop or isolate as appropriate; notify responsible personnel; protect the aircraft; preserve samples and records; identify affected product and equipment; perform technical assessment; determine

scope; correct the condition; and release only after competent authorization.

7.9 Corrective Action

Corrective action should address the barrier, not merely the person. 'Retrain employee' may be insufficient if the underlying problem is ambiguous labeling, poor equipment design or weak supervision.

7.10 Safety Performance Indicators

- Number of fuel-quality deviations
- Water-detection findings
- Filter differential-pressure exceedances
- Sampling non-conformities
- Documentation discrepancies
- Fuelling-related delays
- Audit findings and repeat findings
- Training/competency compliance
- Corrective actions overdue
- Reported near misses

VIII. NIGERIAN AVIATION FUELLING FRAMEWORK

8.1 Regulatory Environment

Nigeria's aviation-fuel system crosses multiple regulatory and operational boundaries. The NCAA regulates civil aviation safety and oversight, while other public bodies and private organizations have responsibilities within the wider fuel and airport ecosystem. The NCAA's 20 July 2023 release itself illustrates this interdependence by describing collaboration with FAAN, NMDPRA, NSIB, airlines, fuel suppliers and other stakeholders. [8], [9]

8.2 Stakeholder Responsibilities

Safety improves when responsibilities are clear. Every organization should know what it controls, what it verifies and what it must report to another organization.

8.3 NCAA

The NCAA's role includes aviation safety oversight, approval and surveillance of regulated organizations, and issuance of safety guidance. The Authority's 2023 aircraft-refuelling advisory circular specifically addressed refuelling issues and safety procedures. [10]

8.4 NMDPRA

The NCAA's July 2023 communication involved NMDPRA because the wider petroleum supply chain intersects with aviation fuel quality. The release stated that NMDPRA was investigating the issue from the downstream-sector perspective. [9]

8.5 Airports

Airport organizations have responsibilities connected with infrastructure, access, fuel-farm interfaces, emergency coordination and operational environment. Fuel-quality responsibilities must be clearly allocated rather than assumed.

8.6 Airlines

Airlines remain responsible for ensuring that their operations are conducted safely, including oversight of contracted services. They should know the fuel arrangements at each station and have processes for accepting, monitoring and reporting fuel-quality risks.

8.7 Fuel Suppliers

Fuel suppliers should maintain product identity, specification compliance, storage integrity, transfer controls and traceability. Their records become essential evidence when an occurrence occurs.

8.8 Maintenance Organizations

Maintenance personnel may be among the first to detect contamination through filter debris, water findings, component condition or system indications. Findings should feed into the safety reporting system.

8.9 Training Institutions

Training institutions should teach aviation fuel as a safety-critical subject rather than as a purely ground-handling procedure. Students should understand the supply chain, contamination mechanisms, sampling, documentation and human factors.

8.10 Collaboration

Fuel quality crosses organizational boundaries. The Nigerian response described by the NCAA in July 2023 is an example of why regulator-to-regulator and industry collaboration is necessary. The stated objective was to identify gaps, establish root causes and prevent recurrence rather than simply assign blame. [9]

IX. CASE-BASED DISCUSSION AND LESSONS

9.1 Barrier Mapping

Stage	Potential hazard	Expected barrier	Evidence needed in an investigation
Fuel receipt	Wrong or contaminated product	Receipt checks, certificates, sampling	Batch documents, samples, tank records
Storage	Water/particles/microbial growth	Tank inspection, drainage, filtration	Inspection logs, water checks, filter data
Transfer	Cross-contamination	Segregation, equipment status	Hose/tank history, equipment records
Into-plane	Wrong product or quantity	Aircraft identification, independent verification	Fuelling log, crew/handler records
Aircraft acceptance	Unrecognized contamination	Sampling/technical checks	Aircraft maintenance and fuel records
Post-event	Repeat exposure	Isolation, investigation, corrective action	Root-cause and corrective-action evidence

9.2 Scenario Analysis

1) Scenario A: Water detected before fuelling

If water is detected before fuel is delivered to the aircraft, the primary safety opportunity is containment. The product or equipment can be placed on hold, the source investigated and the aircraft protected. The

event should still be reported because it provides information about barrier performance.

2) Scenario B: Contamination detected after aircraft fuelling

The response becomes more complex. The organization must determine the scope of affected

fuel, identify other aircraft or equipment potentially exposed, preserve evidence, perform technical assessment and prevent additional use until the condition is understood.

3) Scenario C: Contamination discovered after departure

This scenario has higher operational urgency. Flight crew procedures and aircraft-specific guidance become central. Ground organizations must support the aircraft, preserve records and coordinate investigation. The precise response depends on aircraft type, indications, fuel-system condition and approved procedures.

9.3 Lessons for Frontline Staff

- Do not rely on assumptions about fuel identity.
- Stop when a critical condition is unclear.
- Treat abnormal water or filter indications seriously.
- Record events accurately and immediately.
- Report near misses, not only aircraft-impacting events.
- Maintain equipment cleanliness and identification.
- Use approved procedures rather than informal shortcuts.

9.4 Lessons for Management

- Provide adequate staffing and equipment.
- Measure the health of safety barriers.
- Audit contractors as well as internal staff.
- Close repeat findings at the root cause.
- Reward early reporting and effective prevention.
- Maintain current procedures and training.
- Ensure safety information reaches decision-makers.

9.5 Lessons for Regulators

Regulators can use occurrence data to identify patterns rather than treating every event as isolated. Fuel-quality oversight can include station inspections, documentation reviews, sampling-program evaluation, supplier interfaces and verification that corrective actions are effective.

9.6 Lessons for Future Research

Future Nigerian studies could compare fuel-quality performance across airports, examine water-detection trends, evaluate training effectiveness, map the

national aviation-fuel supply chain, and assess the effectiveness of collaborative oversight.

X. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 Summary

This book has examined aviation fuel contamination and fuelling errors as system-safety issues. The Max Air Yola case provides a documented Nigerian example. The NCAA reported contamination of the main fuel tanks of 5N-MHM and an APU shutdown on the ground, followed by regulatory action and a wider fuel-quality investigation. [8], [9]

10.2 Conclusion

The evidence supports a simple but important safety principle: aviation fuel quality is a chain, and the chain is only as strong as its critical barriers. Product quality at origin is necessary but not sufficient. The product must remain protected during transport, storage, transfer, filtration and aircraft delivery.

The Max Air case should therefore be understood not merely as an aircraft event but as a question of supply-chain assurance. The public evidence does not justify assigning a specific cause without further investigation. What it does demonstrate is the need for strong barriers and coordinated oversight.

10.3 Recommendations for Airlines

- Include fuel contamination in SMS hazard registers.
- Audit fuel providers and station arrangements using risk-based criteria.
- Require clear traceability for fuel deliveries.
- Use independent verification for critical fuelling information.
- Review fuel-quality occurrence trends across the network.
- Ensure maintenance and flight operations share relevant fuel-quality information.

10.4 Recommendations for Fuel Suppliers

- Maintain strict product segregation.
- Maintain accurate batch and transfer records.
- Monitor storage tanks for water and contamination.
- Maintain filtration and transfer equipment.

- Train and periodically assess personnel.
- Report suspected contamination immediately.
- Preserve samples and records after abnormal events.

10.5 Recommendations for Airports

- Clarify responsibilities at airport fuel interfaces.
- Support safe access and emergency response.
- Coordinate fuel-quality information with airlines and suppliers.
- Include fuel-system hazards in airport safety programs.
- Support regulator access to relevant records.

10.6 Recommendations for Regulators

- Maintain current fuel-quality and refuelling guidance.
- Use occurrence data to identify systemic trends.
- Coordinate oversight with petroleum and safety-investigation authorities.
- Verify corrective-action effectiveness.
- Encourage consistent fuel-quality standards across airports.
- Promote industry training and competence.

10.7 Recommendations for Training

Aviation fuel training should include fuel specifications, contamination mechanisms, storage, filtration, sampling, documentation, human factors, communication, emergency response and SMS integration. Practical exercises should use realistic abnormal scenarios.

10.8 Further Research

A national research program could establish a Nigerian aviation fuel-safety database containing anonymized reports of contamination, water findings, filter blockages, wrong-fuel events, near misses and corrective actions. Such a database could support trend analysis and targeted prevention.

Concerns and ICAO Safety Initiatives. ICAO. [ICAO](#)

- [3] International Air Transport Association (IATA). *Technical Fuel.* IATA. [IATA](#)
- [4] International Air Transport Association (IATA). *Fuel Servicing Guidance Materials.* IATA. [IATA](#)
- [5] International Air Transport Association (IATA). *IATA Fuel Quality Pool (IFQP).* IATA. [IATA](#)
- [6] International Air Transport Association (IATA). *SAF Handbook, Section 2.1: Fuel Specifications, Supply Chain Best Practices and Quality-Control Documents.* IATA. [IATA](#)
- [7] International Air Transport Association (IATA). *Aviation Fuel Supply Model Agreement, Edition 5.1, July 2023.* IATA. [IATA](#)
- [8] Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority (NCAA). (2023, July 13). *NCAA suspends Max Air operations of its Boeing 737 with immediate effect.* [NCAA](#)
- [9] Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority (NCAA). (2023, July 20). *Fuel Contamination: NCAA to Partner FAAN, NMDPRA others to Stop Reoccurrence.* [NCAA](#)
- [10] Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority (NCAA). (2023, July 14). *Aircraft Refuelling Issues and Safety Procedures.* Advisory Circular NCAA/DAWS/AD.1104/AOL 085/VOL. 1. [NCAA](#)
- [11] Nigeria Civil Aviation Authority (NCAA). (2023, April 10). *Storage, Handling and Quality Control of Aviation Fuel at Aerodromes.* Advisory Circular NCAA-AC-AWS020. [NCAA](#)

REFERENCES

- [1] International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). (2012). *Manual on Civil Aviation Jet Fuel Supply (Doc 9977).* [ICAO](#)
- [2] International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). *Aviation Jet Fuel: Fuel Quality*