



Negative crude oil prices: Supply chain disruptions and strategic lessons

Augusta Heavens Ikevuje ^{1,*}, Jephta Mensah Kwakye ¹, Darlington Eze Ekechukwu ², Olorunshogo Benjamin Ogundipe ³ and Andrew Emuobosa Esiri ¹

¹ Independent Researcher, Houston Texas, USA.

² Independent Researcher, UK.

³ Department of Mechanical Engineering, Redeemer's University, Ede, Osun-State, Nigeria.

Open Access Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 2024, 08(01), 085–093

Publication history: Received on 07 August 2024; revised on 16 September 2024; accepted on 18 September 2024

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53022/oarjms.2024.8.1.0050>

Abstract

The 2020 collapse of crude oil prices into negative territory was unprecedented and exposed critical vulnerabilities in the global oil supply chain. This review examines the factors that contributed to negative pricing, including excess supply, storage limitations, geopolitical instability, and market speculation. It also highlights the oil supply chain's significant disruptions, particularly in transportation, production, and distribution. Strategic lessons from the crisis are explored, emphasizing the importance of risk management, flexible supply chains, and policy adaptations to ensure future resilience. Finally, the review offers recommendations for industry players and policymakers to safeguard against future crises, focusing on diversified energy portfolios, enhanced logistical capabilities, and stronger regulatory frameworks to stabilize the market in the face of volatility.

Keywords: Negative oil prices; Supply chain disruptions; Risk management; Oil futures market; Geopolitical instability

1. Introduction

Crude oil prices have always been subject to volatility due to the interplay of supply and demand forces, geopolitics, market sentiment, and economic conditions (Duan, Khurshid, Rauf, Khan, & Calin, 2021). Unlike other commodities, oil is influenced by many factors, including production policies set by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), shifts in global demand due to economic activities, and speculations in futures markets (Moghaddam & Wirl, 2018). Traditionally, oil prices are seen as a bellwether for global economic performance; rising prices often signal robust economic activities, while falling prices may suggest a slowdown or excess supply in the market (Al Rousan, Sbia, & Tas, 2018).

However, in an unprecedented event in April 2020, oil prices plummeted into negative territory for the first time in history (Imsirovic, 2022). West Texas Intermediate (WTI) crude, a benchmark for U.S. oil, traded at -\$37.63 per barrel, leaving investors and market participants in shock. Negative oil prices meant that producers were essentially paying buyers to take the oil off their hands, signaling a collapse in demand and a major breakdown in the oil supply chain (Katyukha & Mottaeva, 2021).

The collapse of crude oil prices into the negative range was triggered by a confluence of events that reflected broader vulnerabilities in the global oil market. First and foremost, the COVID-19 pandemic led to a severe contraction in global economic activities, reducing oil consumption across major sectors, including transportation, manufacturing, and aviation. Countries across the globe went into lockdowns, drastically reducing travel and industrial output (Weiss, Schwarzenberg, Nelson, Sutter, & Sutherland, 2020).

* Corresponding author: Augusta Heavens Ikevuje

At the same time, oil production continued at relatively high levels, particularly in the U.S., where shale oil production had expanded in the preceding years. With demand shrinking and production relatively stable, the world's oil storage facilities quickly reached capacity, creating a logistical nightmare. The inability to store excess oil compounded the issue, leading to the negative pricing incident. While this was the first time oil prices turned negative, it highlighted long-standing inefficiencies and rigidities in the oil supply chain and the vulnerabilities of producers and distributors to sudden demand shocks (Solarin, Gil-Alana, & Lafuente, 2020).

Understanding the root causes of the negative crude oil prices and their impact on supply chains is crucial for various stakeholders, including governments, oil producers, and downstream industries. Disruptions in the oil supply chain impact the profitability of oil companies and have far-reaching consequences on energy security, inflation, and the stability of economies reliant on oil production and exports. Analyzing the disruptions that occurred during this period provides valuable strategic lessons for mitigating future risks and maintaining resilience in the face of unpredictable economic and geopolitical events.

2. Factors Leading to Negative Crude Oil Prices

In April 2020, the world witnessed an unprecedented event in the oil market: crude oil prices, specifically West Texas Intermediate (WTI), fell into negative territory. This anomaly was not a result of a single factor but a convergence of various dynamics that impacted supply, demand, and the broader economic landscape (Bandyopadhyay, 2021). The primary causes of negative crude oil prices were an excess supply of oil and a shortage of storage capacity, geopolitical tensions that influenced production decisions, and the speculative nature of the oil futures market. These factors interacted in ways that exposed vulnerabilities in the oil supply chain and financial markets, leading to an event that had broad implications for the global economy.

2.1. Excess Supply and Storage Limitations

One of the most immediate causes of negative crude oil prices was the vast oversupply of oil that flooded the market in early 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic led to a drastic reduction in oil demand, particularly from the transportation, manufacturing, and aviation sectors (Le, Le, & Le, 2021). Global lockdowns, travel restrictions, and the overall slowdown of economic activity resulted in a significant drop in oil consumption, which fell by as much as 30% globally in the early months of the pandemic. However, despite this drop in demand, oil producers did not scale back production quickly enough (Sucre & Carvajal, 2020).

At the same time, OPEC and its allies, including Russia, were involved in a price war that led to increased oil output. This price war was triggered by a disagreement between Russia and Saudi Arabia regarding production cuts in response to the pandemic. Rather than reducing supply, both countries ramped up production in an effort to protect their market shares, exacerbating the global oversupply. The U.S. shale oil industry, already operating at high levels of production, also contributed to the glut in the market. As a result, the market became saturated with oil that had no immediate buyers (Umekwe, 2018).

This oversupply quickly led to a significant storage problem. Oil must be stored in specialized facilities, including tanks, ships, and pipelines until it can be sold and transported. However, the sudden drop in demand meant that storage facilities rapidly reached capacity. By April 2020, the key oil storage hub in Cushing, Oklahoma, which serves as the delivery point for WTI crude oil, was nearly full. Without available storage, traders who had purchased oil contracts for future delivery found themselves unable to take physical possession of the oil, forcing them to sell those contracts at any price—even at a loss. This dynamic played a critical role in pushing oil prices into negative territory, as traders essentially paid others to take the oil off their hands due to the lack of storage options (Burns & Kane, 2022).

2.2. Impact of Geopolitical and Economic Conditions

Geopolitical tensions and broader economic conditions also played a major role in the decline of crude oil prices into negative territory. Historically, geopolitical events have significantly impacted oil markets, and the situation in 2020 was no different (Singh, 2020). The price war between Saudi Arabia and Russia was the primary geopolitical factor that influenced the oil market during this period. This price war was triggered by Russia's refusal to agree to Saudi Arabia's proposal for deeper production cuts to stabilize the market in response to the pandemic-induced demand collapse. In retaliation, Saudi Arabia increased its production and lowered its prices in a bid to undercut Russia's market share (Ma, Xiong, & Bao, 2021).

The result was a flood of oil into an already oversupplied market, creating a perfect storm for prices to collapse. Although OPEC+ eventually agreed to cut production in mid-April, the damage had been done by then, and the market was already

under extreme pressure from the glut of oil. Furthermore, other oil-producing nations, particularly in North America, were slow to reduce output. The downturn particularly affected U.S. shale producers, who had expanded production significantly in the preceding years. The economics of shale oil production are such that it is difficult for producers to quickly scale back operations, as many have high fixed costs and are reliant on sustained output to service debt obligations (Razek & McQuinn, 2021).

On top of these geopolitical tensions, the broader economic conditions exacerbated the situation. The COVID-19 pandemic led to a global recession, causing not only a decrease in oil demand but also uncertainty about the future of economic recovery (Jomo & Chowdhury, 2020). This uncertainty weighed heavily on the oil market, with investors fearing a prolonged downturn and a slow return to pre-pandemic demand levels. The convergence of geopolitical strife and economic uncertainty created a volatile environment for crude oil, driving prices to unprecedented lows (M. H. Khan, Ahmed, Mughal, & Khan, 2023).

2.3. Market Speculation and Oil Futures Dynamics

Another critical factor contributing to the negative pricing event was the speculative nature of the oil futures market. Futures contracts allow traders to buy and sell oil for delivery at a future date, enabling them to hedge against price fluctuations or to profit from price movements. However, futures markets also involve financial speculation, where investors have no intention of taking physical delivery of oil trade contracts to capitalize on short-term price movements (Liu, Ding, Lv, Wu, & Qiang, 2019).

In April 2020, the WTI oil futures market became highly unstable as the May contracts neared expiration. As mentioned earlier, oil storage was scarce, and traders who held contracts for May delivery were scrambling to find buyers to avoid the obligation of taking physical delivery (Filippidis, Kizys, Filis, & Floros, 2019). Typically, traders roll over their contracts—selling the expiring contract and buying a new one for a later delivery date. However, with the full storage capacity and the demand for oil near record lows, few buyers were willing to purchase May contracts. This resulted in a massive sell-off as traders sought to offload their contracts at any price, even if that meant accepting negative prices (Connelly, 2023).

The behavior of speculators, many of whom were financial players with no capacity to store or use oil, intensified the market collapse. These investors had no choice but to pay others to take the contracts off their hands. The negative price reflected the cost of storing or disposing of the physical oil, which was effectively passed on to the buyer. The speculative nature of futures trading thus amplified the volatility in the market, pushing prices into unprecedented negative territory (Özelli, 2019).

This event highlighted the risks associated with speculative trading in the oil market. While futures markets play an essential role in price discovery and hedging, they can also exacerbate price swings under extreme conditions. In this case, the speculative nature of the market created a feedback loop, where traders who were unable to manage physical deliveries of oil contributed to the downward spiral of prices.

3. Supply Chain Disruptions during Negative Pricing Events

3.1. Transportation and Logistics Challenges

The global oil supply chain is highly complex, involving the extraction of crude oil from wells, transportation to storage facilities and refineries, and finally distribution to consumers. The 2020 negative pricing event highlighted several weaknesses in this chain, particularly in the area of transportation and logistics (Zhu, Chou, & Tsai, 2020). As oil prices plummeted and storage facilities reached capacity, the movement of crude oil from production sites to storage hubs and refineries became increasingly difficult.

One of the most pressing challenges was the lack of storage availability in key hubs. Unlike many other commodities, crude oil requires specialized storage facilities such as tanks, pipelines, and supertankers. In the United States, for example, the primary storage hub in Cushing, Oklahoma, which serves as the delivery point for West Texas Intermediate (WTI) crude, was filled nearly to capacity. As traders rushed to offload their contracts to avoid physical delivery, there was simply no room left to store the oil. This logistical bottleneck was a major factor contributing to the dramatic plunge in oil prices (McRae, 2018).

Additionally, transportation networks were strained as producers and traders scrambled to find alternative ways to store their excess crude. In some cases, producers resorted to storing oil in ships, creating what is known as floating

storage (Ready, Roussanov, & Taillard, 2023). This practice is costly and unsustainable in the long term, but it became a necessary measure as land-based storage options were exhausted. Supertankers, typically used for international shipments, were repurposed to act as temporary storage for the surplus crude, adding an extra layer of complexity and cost to an already stressed supply chain (Gilje, Ready, Roussanov, & Taillard, 2020).

The limitations of pipeline infrastructure also became apparent during this period. Pipelines, the most efficient method of transporting crude oil over long distances, could not accommodate the sudden surge in supply (Rickards, 2022). As demand for oil products such as gasoline and jet fuel collapsed due to pandemic lockdowns, the flow of crude through pipelines slowed significantly, creating a backlog in supply. With refiners reducing their intake, the oil that was already in transit through pipelines had nowhere to go, further exacerbating the storage problem. In some cases, pipeline operators had to impose restrictions on the amount of oil they could accept, adding to the logistical challenges faced by producers and traders (Romsom, 2022).

3.2. Effects on Oil Production, Storage, and Distribution

The supply chain disruptions during the negative pricing event had significant effects on oil production, storage, and distribution. Oil producers, particularly in North America, were hit hard by the price collapse and the resulting logistical bottlenecks (Celasun, Hansen, Mineshima, Spector, & Zhou, 2022). Shale oil producers in the U.S., who had been operating at high production levels in the years leading up to 2020, found themselves facing a stark choice: shut down wells or risk selling oil at a loss. Shutting down a well can be costly and complicated, particularly for shale producers, as restarting production requires additional investment and time. However, with storage capacity running out and prices turning negative, many producers had no choice but to curtail production (Shakya, Li, & Etienne, 2022).

The storage crisis also revealed the inadequacies of global oil storage infrastructure. In normal market conditions, storage facilities are used to manage short-term fluctuations in supply and demand. However, the magnitude of the demand collapse in 2020 far exceeded the available storage capacity, especially in key hubs like Cushing (Arshizadeh et al., 2021). As storage facilities filled up, traders and producers were forced to seek alternative solutions, including renting space in foreign facilities or using floating storage. These measures, while necessary, were expensive and unsustainable in the long term, adding further financial strain to an already stressed industry (Weijers et al., 2019).

The distribution segment of the oil supply chain also faced significant disruptions. With refiners cutting back on their intake of crude oil due to falling demand for refined products like gasoline and diesel, the normal flow of crude from production sites to refineries was interrupted. In some cases, oil that was already en route to refineries had to be rerouted or stored temporarily until refinery operations could resume at normal capacity. This created inefficiencies in the distribution network and increased costs for producers and traders who were already dealing with thin or negative profit margins (N. Khan, Fahad, Naushad, & Faisal, 2020).

Moreover, the imbalance between production and consumption led to an uneven distribution of crude oil and refined products across regions. Some areas experienced an oversupply of oil, while others faced shortages due to transportation and refining operations disruptions. This geographical mismatch in supply and demand created additional challenges for the industry, as companies struggled to align production with consumption patterns that the pandemic had dramatically altered (Yang, Liu, Saydaliev, & Iqbal, 2022).

3.3. Impact on Stakeholders: Producers, Refiners, and Consumers

The negative oil prices and the associated supply chain disruptions had profound implications for key stakeholders in the oil industry, including producers, refiners, and consumers. Each group was affected in different ways, but all faced significant challenges as a result of the market turmoil (Bandyopadhyay, 2021).

The negative pricing event was financially devastating for oil producers, particularly those involved in shale production in the U.S. Many producers, especially smaller and more leveraged companies, were already operating on thin margins before the crisis. The collapse in prices pushed many of these companies into bankruptcy or forced them to drastically reduce production. Larger producers with more diverse portfolios fared somewhat better, but even they faced significant losses and were forced to adjust their operations to survive the downturn.

Refiners, too, were impacted by the collapse in oil prices, although their challenges were somewhat different from those faced by producers. With demand for refined products such as gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel falling sharply due to pandemic-related lockdowns, refiners had to reduce their intake of crude oil and cut back on production (Jefferson, 2020). This led to a backlog of crude oil in the supply chain and further strained storage capacity. Additionally, refiners

had to navigate the logistical challenges of operating in a market where the normal flow of crude and refined products had been disrupted (Ruble, 2019).

For consumers, the collapse in oil prices initially seemed like a silver lining, as it led to lower prices at the pump. However, the benefits were short-lived, as the pandemic severely limited travel and economic activity. Lower gasoline prices were of little use to consumers who were under lockdown and unable to drive or travel. Moreover, the broader economic implications of the oil price collapse—such as job losses in the oil sector and the financial instability of oil-dependent regions—offset any short-term gains from lower fuel prices (Ogbuigwe, 2018).

The supply chain disruptions during the negative pricing event had far-reaching consequences for the oil industry and the global economy. The logistical challenges, storage limitations, and distribution inefficiencies exposed vulnerabilities in the oil supply chain that will need to be addressed to prevent future disruptions. For producers, refiners, and consumers alike, the negative oil prices of 2020 were a stark reminder of the interconnectedness of the global oil market and the importance of building resilient supply chains (Yermakov, Henderson, & Fattouh, 2019).

4. Strategic Lessons Learned from the Crisis

4.1. Risk Management in Volatile Markets

One of the most critical lessons from the 2020 oil crisis is the importance of comprehensive risk management strategies in volatile markets. The event highlighted how quickly market conditions can shift, exposing producers, traders, and consumers to financial losses. Many companies were caught off guard by the rapid decline in demand and the corresponding price collapse, leading to significant operational and financial distress.

Risk management in such environments requires both proactive and reactive measures. On the proactive side, companies must develop more sophisticated forecasting models that incorporate a broader range of potential scenarios, including unexpected global disruptions like pandemics or geopolitical conflicts. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that traditional forecasting methods often rely on historical trends and may not adequately prepare companies for rare but high-impact events. Incorporating stress testing and scenario planning into risk management processes can help companies better anticipate and respond to sudden market shifts (Poll, Polyvyanyy, Rosemann, Röglinger, & Rupprecht, 2018).

Another key aspect of risk management is the use of financial instruments to hedge against price volatility. Futures contracts, options, and other derivatives are important in allowing companies to lock in prices and protect themselves from adverse price movements. However, the 2020 crisis also revealed the risks of over-reliance on such instruments, particularly in situations where market liquidity dries up or when physical delivery of oil becomes a challenge, as seen with the storage crisis. Going forward, companies must strike a balance between using financial instruments for hedging and maintaining operational flexibility to manage physical supply and demand imbalances (Boyle & McDougall, 2018).

Additionally, oil companies need to diversify their portfolios and revenue streams to reduce their exposure to price fluctuations in a single commodity. Vertical integration, where companies control multiple production, refining, and distribution stages, can provide some level of insulation from market shocks (Bollino & Galkin, 2021). Similarly, diversification into alternative energy sources, such as natural gas, renewables, or hydrogen, can help oil companies weather periods of low oil prices by spreading their risk across different markets. In a world increasingly focused on energy transition, such diversification will also align oil companies with long-term trends toward sustainability (Antonakakis, Cunado, Filis, Gabauer, & De Gracia, 2018).

4.2. Importance of Flexible Supply Chains

The oil price collapse also underscored the need for more flexible and resilient supply chains in the energy sector. The traditional model of oil supply chains, which relies on stable flows of crude from production sites to refineries and storage hubs, was severely tested during the 2020 crisis. The glut of oil and the lack of storage capacity created significant bottlenecks, leading to inefficiencies and financial losses across the industry. Going forward, building flexibility into supply chains will be crucial for mitigating the impacts of similar crises (Losz, Boersma, & Mitrova, 2019).

One key lesson is the need for greater storage capacity and more adaptive logistics. The 2020 event revealed the limitations of existing storage infrastructure, particularly in key hubs like Cushing, Oklahoma. Oil producers and traders should consider diversifying their storage options to avoid future bottlenecks, including investing in new facilities or expanding floating storage capabilities (Cornot-Gandolphe, 2018). This would provide more breathing room when

demand collapses and storage space becomes scarce. Additionally, companies should explore decentralized storage strategies that allow them to store crude closer to production sites or in locations with more available capacity, thereby reducing the reliance on a few key hubs (Markou, 2020).

Logistical flexibility is another important factor. The inability to efficiently move oil through pipelines and shipping routes during the 2020 crisis compounded the supply chain disruptions. To address this, oil companies must invest in more dynamic transportation networks that can quickly adapt to changing market conditions. This could include upgrading pipeline infrastructure to enable more rapid adjustments in flow rates or securing access to alternative shipping routes that bypass congested areas. For example, leveraging new technologies like blockchain and advanced analytics can improve supply chain visibility and enable real-time decision-making to better manage disruptions (Alfaqiri et al., 2019).

The importance of partnerships and collaboration along the supply chain also became evident during the crisis. Oil companies can create more integrated and responsive supply chains by building stronger relationships with suppliers, transportation providers, and storage operators. Collaborative strategies, such as shared storage arrangements or joint ventures in logistics, can help mitigate risks by pooling resources and optimizing capacity during periods of disruption. These partnerships can also foster innovation, driving the development of new solutions to enhance supply chain resilience (Sharma, Adhikary, & Borah, 2020).

4.3. Policy and Regulatory Adaptations for Future Resilience

The 2020 oil crisis also brought into focus the need for policy and regulatory adaptations to better prepare the industry for future disruptions. Governments, regulatory bodies, and industry stakeholders must work together to create frameworks that enhance the resilience of the oil market while ensuring environmental and economic sustainability.

One key area for policy intervention is the regulation of oil production and storage. During the 2020 price collapse, the lack of coordinated production cuts, particularly in non-OPEC countries, contributed to the oversupply problem. While OPEC+ eventually agreed to reduce production, it came too late to prevent the negative pricing event. International cooperation on production management will be critical to preventing future supply gluts. This could involve establishing more flexible production quotas that can be adjusted more rapidly in response to sudden changes in demand and creating mechanisms for quicker coordination among major oil-producing nations (Noreng, 2020).

Regulatory frameworks around storage capacity also need to be reevaluated. Governments could incentivize the construction of additional storage facilities or develop more innovative storage solutions, such as underground storage or renewable energy-powered storage systems. Policymakers could also explore strategic storage reserves that can be tapped during crises to stabilize the market. Similar to national strategic petroleum reserves, these reserves would provide a buffer against future supply chain disruptions.

Another critical area for policy action is the regulation of financial markets, particularly the oil futures market. The speculative nature of oil futures trading played a significant role in exacerbating the negative pricing event. While futures markets are essential for price discovery and hedging, more stringent oversight is needed to prevent excessive speculation that can destabilize the market. Regulatory bodies could implement tighter controls on speculative trading and introduce circuit breakers that halt trading during periods of extreme volatility to prevent price collapses.

Finally, the 2020 crisis highlighted the need for policies that support the transition to cleaner energy sources. As the world moves toward a lower-carbon future, the oil industry will face increasing pressure to adapt to new environmental standards and consumer preferences (Aktar, Alam, & Al-Amin, 2021). Governments can play a crucial role in facilitating this transition by incentivizing oil companies to invest in renewable energy, carbon capture technologies, and energy efficiency improvements. This will help mitigate the impact of future oil price crises and align the industry with global efforts to combat climate change (Kuzemko et al., 2020).

5. Conclusion

Several key insights emerged from the events surrounding negative oil prices. First, the importance of effective risk management in volatile markets became undeniable. The inability of many companies to foresee or mitigate the impact of plummeting oil prices underscored the need for better forecasting models, more flexible financial instruments, and diversified portfolios to cushion against market shocks.

Second, the crisis highlighted severe weaknesses in oil supply chains, particularly in transportation and storage. The glut of oil and lack of adequate storage capacity revealed the limitations of existing infrastructure and the need for more dynamic and adaptable logistics networks. The reliance on centralized storage hubs like Cushing, Oklahoma, proved detrimental, creating bottlenecks and increased costs for producers and traders when demand evaporated.

Finally, the crisis illuminated the essential role of policy and regulatory frameworks in managing both supply and market stability. The lack of coordinated global production management contributed to the oversupply, while speculative activities in the oil futures market exacerbated price volatility. These factors demonstrated the need for stronger, more responsive governance mechanisms in the industry.

5.1. Future Outlook for Oil Pricing and Supply Chain Strategies

The future of oil pricing is likely to remain volatile, driven by shifting geopolitical dynamics, economic uncertainty, and the transition to renewable energy sources. As the world moves toward a lower-carbon economy, the demand for oil is expected to face long-term structural decline, which will impact pricing dynamics. However, oil will still play a critical role in the global energy mix in the near to medium term, meaning that supply chain strategies must adapt to manage both cyclical and structural changes in demand.

Companies in the oil industry will need to focus on building more flexible, scalable supply chains that can adjust quickly to fluctuations in supply and demand. This may involve investing in new storage capacity, upgrading transportation infrastructure, and adopting technologies that improve real-time decision-making in logistics. Additionally, diversification into alternative energy sources will help companies reduce their dependence on oil and mitigate future risks related to pricing volatility.

Recommendations

To ensure future resilience, both industry players and policymakers must take proactive steps based on the lessons learned from the 2020 crisis. For industry players, enhancing risk management capabilities should be a priority. This involves developing more robust hedging strategies, diversifying portfolios into renewable energy, and implementing more agile supply chain management systems.

Policymakers, on the other hand, must focus on creating regulatory environments that support market stability. This includes promoting international cooperation to manage global oil production, strengthening oversight of financial markets to prevent excessive speculation, and incentivizing investments in storage infrastructure and alternative energy solutions. Moreover, as the world transitions to greener energy sources, policymakers must provide clear guidelines to help the oil industry navigate this shift while maintaining economic stability.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

- [1] Aktar, M. A., Alam, M. M., & Al-Amin, A. Q. (2021). Global economic crisis, energy use, CO₂ emissions, and policy roadmap amid COVID-19. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 26, 770-781.
- [2] Al Rousan, S., Sbia, R., & Tas, B. K. O. (2018). A dynamic network analysis of the world oil market: Analysis of OPEC and non-OPEC members. *Energy Economics*, 75, 28-41.
- [3] Alfaqiri, A., Hossain, N. U. I., Jaradat, R., Abutabenjeh, S., Keating, C. B., Khasawneh, M. T., & Pinto, C. A. (2019). A systemic approach for disruption risk assessment in oil and gas supply chains. *International Journal of Critical Infrastructures*, 15(3), 230-259.
- [4] Antonakakis, N., Cunado, J., Filis, G., Gabauer, D., & De Gracia, F. P. (2018). Oil volatility, oil and gas firms and portfolio diversification. *Energy Economics*, 70, 499-515.
- [5] Arshizadeh, S., Gorgani, S. H., Taheri, P., Givgol, M., Shahrokhi, S., & Abdalisousan, A. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on oil supply in the short term. *Advanced Journal of Science and Engineering*, 2(2), 120-135.

- [6] Bandyopadhyay, K. R. (2021). COVID-19 and the Big Oil Price Crash: Exploring the Anatomy. *Sustainable Development Insights from India: Selected Essays in Honour of Ramprasad Sengupta*, 239-257.
- [7] Bollino, C. A., & Galkin, P. (2021). Energy security and portfolio diversification: Conventional and novel perspectives. *Energies*, 14(14), 4257.
- [8] Boyle, P., & McDougall, J. (2018). *Trading and pricing financial derivatives: A guide to futures, options, and swaps*: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- [9] Burns, C. B., & Kane, S. (2022). Arbitrage breakdown in WTI crude oil futures: An analysis of the events on April 20, 2020. *Resources Policy*, 76, 102605.
- [10] Celasun, O., Hansen, M. N.-J. H., Mineshima, M. A., Spector, M., & Zhou, J. (2022). *Supply Bottlenecks: Where, Why, How Much, and What Next?* : International Monetary Fund.
- [11] Connelly, C. (2023). Oil Market Recovery and the Future of OPEC+: Exit the Bear? In *GCC Hydrocarbon Economies and COVID: Old Trends, New Realities* (pp. 249-282): Springer.
- [12] Cornot-Gandolphe, S. (2018). *New and Emerging LNG Markets: The Demand Shock*: OCP Policy Center.
- [13] Duan, W., Khurshid, A., Rauf, A., Khan, K., & Calin, A. C. (2021). How geopolitical risk drives exchange rate and oil prices? A wavelet-based analysis. *Energy Sources, Part B: Economics, Planning, and Policy*, 16(9), 861-877.
- [14] Filippidis, M., Kizys, R., Filis, G., & Floros, C. (2019). The WTI/Brent oil futures price differential and the globalisation-regionalisation hypothesis. *International Journal of Banking, Accounting and Finance*, 10(1), 3-38.
- [15] Gilje, E. P., Ready, R., Roussanov, N., & Taillard, J. P. (2020). The day that WTI died: Asset prices and firm production decisions. Retrieved from
- [16] Imsirovic, A. (2022). The Trading and Price Discovery for Crude Oils. In *The Palgrave Handbook of International Energy Economics* (pp. 327-358): Springer International Publishing Cham.
- [17] Jefferson, M. (2020). A crude future? COVID-19s challenges for oil demand, supply and prices. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 68, 101669.
- [18] Jomo, K. S., & Chowdhury, A. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic recession and recovery. *Development (Society for International Development)*, 63(2-4), 226.
- [19] Katyukha, P., & Mottaeva, A. (2021). Evolution of global oil benchmarks: new trends in pricing in the international oil market. Paper presented at the E3S Web of Conferences.
- [20] Khan, M. H., Ahmed, J., Mughal, M., & Khan, I. H. (2023). Oil price volatility and stock returns: Evidence from three oil-price wars. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, 28(3), 3162-3182.
- [21] Khan, N., Fahad, S., Naushad, M., & Faisal, S. (2020). COVID-2019 locked down effects on oil prices and its effects on the world economy. Available at SSRN 3588810.
- [22] Kuzemko, C., Bradshaw, M., Bridge, G., Goldthau, A., Jewell, J., Overland, I., . . . Westphal, K. (2020). Covid-19 and the politics of sustainable energy transitions. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 68, 101685.
- [23] Le, T.-H., Le, A. T., & Le, H.-C. (2021). The historic oil price fluctuation during the Covid-19 pandemic: What are the causes? *Research in International Business and Finance*, 58, 101489.
- [24] Liu, Z., Ding, Z., Lv, T., Wu, J. S., & Qiang, W. (2019). Financial factors affecting oil price change and oil-stock interactions: a review and future perspectives. *Natural Hazards*, 95, 207-225.
- [25] Losz, A., Boersma, T., & Mitrova, T. (2019). *A Changing Global Gas Order 3.0*. Columbia University Center on Global Energy Policy, 11.
- [26] Ma, R. R., Xiong, T., & Bao, Y. (2021). The Russia-Saudi Arabia oil price war during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Energy Economics*, 102, 105517.
- [27] Markou, F. (2020). Exemption Regime for new gas infrastructures under European & National law-The case of Alexandroupolis Floating Storage and Regasification Unit (FSRU)–An Energy Gateway to Europe.
- [28] McRae, S. (2018). Crude oil price differentials and pipeline infrastructure. Retrieved from
- [29] Moghaddam, H., & Wirl, F. (2018). Determinants of oil price subsidies in oil and gas exporting countries. *Energy Policy*, 122, 409-420.

- [30] Noreng, Ø. (2020). OPEC—from peak to peak. *Handbook of OPEC and the Global Energy Order: Past, Present and Future Challenges*.
- [31] Ogbuigwe, A. (2018). Refining in Nigeria: history, challenges and prospects. *Applied Petrochemical Research*, 8, 181-192.
- [32] Özelli, T. (2019). The conundrum of neoclassical economic theory and quantitative finance induced 2008 financial crisis and the great financial crisis enabled transition from cheap oil based mass-production economy to the emergence of cheap microchip enabled information economy [attention merchants' surveillance capitalism]. *Journal of Ekonomi*, 1(1), 49-83.
- [33] Poll, R., Polyvyanyy, A., Rosemann, M., Röglinger, M., & Rupperecht, L. (2018). Process forecasting: Towards proactive business process management. Paper presented at the Business Process Management: 16th International Conference, BPM 2018, Sydney, NSW, Australia, September 9–14, 2018, Proceedings 16.
- [34] Razeq, N. H., & McQuinn, B. (2021). Saudi Arabia's currency misalignment and international competitiveness, accounting for geopolitical risks and the super-contango oil market. *Resources Policy*, 72, 102057.
- [35] Ready, E. P. G. R., Roussanov, N., & Taillard, J. P. (2023). When Benchmarks Fail: The Day that WTI Died.
- [36] Rickards, J. (2022). *Sold Out: How Broken Supply Chains, Surging Inflation, and Political Instability Will Sink the Global Economy*: Penguin.
- [37] Romsom, E. (2022). Global oil theft: impact and policy responses (9292671472). Retrieved from
- [38] Ruble, I. (2019). The US crude oil refining industry: Recent developments, upcoming challenges and prospects for exports. *The Journal of Economic Asymmetries*, 20, e00132.
- [39] Shakya, S., Li, B., & Etienne, X. (2022). Shale revolution, oil and gas prices, and drilling activities in the United States. *Energy Economics*, 108, 105877.
- [40] Sharma, A., Adhikary, A., & Borah, S. B. (2020). Covid-19's impact on supply chain decisions: Strategic insights from NASDAQ 100 firms using Twitter data. *Journal of business research*, 117, 443-449.
- [41] Singh, A. K. (2020). The "Oil War" of 2020 between Saudi Arabia and Russia. *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*, 33(1/2), 24-42.
- [42] Solarin, S. A., Gil-Alana, L. A., & Lafuente, C. (2020). An investigation of long range reliance on shale oil and shale gas production in the US market. *Energy*, 195, 116933.
- [43] Sucre, C. G., & Carvajal, P. (2020). The Oil Market and the Pandemic: An Analysis of the Price Collapse, Effects and Responses in LAC.
- [44] Umekwe, M. P. (2018). Market impacts and global implications of US shale development and hydraulic fracturing: an economic, engineering, and environmental perspective: University of Alaska Fairbanks.
- [45] Weijers, L., Wright, C., Mayerhofer, M., Pearson, M., Griffin, L., & Weddle, P. (2019). Trends in the North American frac industry: Invention through the shale revolution. Paper presented at the SPE hydraulic fracturing technology conference and exhibition.
- [46] Weiss, M. A., Schwarzenberg, A. B., Nelson, R. M., Sutter, K. M., & Sutherland, M. D. (2020). Global economic effects of COVID-19: Congressional Research Service Washington, DC.
- [47] Yang, Y., Liu, Z., Saydaliev, H. B., & Iqbal, S. (2022). Economic impact of crude oil supply disruption on social welfare losses and strategic petroleum reserves. *Resources Policy*, 77, 102689.
- [48] Yermakov, V., Henderson, J., & Fattouh, B. (2019). Russia's heavy fuel oil exports: challenges and changing rules at home and abroad.
- [49] Zhu, G., Chou, M. C., & Tsai, C. W. (2020). Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic exposing the shortcomings of current supply chain operations: A long-term prescriptive offering. *Sustainability*, 12(14), 5858