Kurdish Studies
September 2021
Volume: 09, No: 02, pp 448-453
ISSN: 2051-4883 (Print) | ISSN 2051-4891 (Online)
www.KurdishStudies.net

DOI: 10.67145/ks.v9i2.4148

The Global Oil Price Crisis of 2020: Causes, Consequences and Economic Implications

Yogesh Manohar Bende

[1]Research Scholar, Yevatmal , Maharashtra, Email - yogeshbende666@gmail.com

Abstract

The global oil price crisis of 2020 was one of the most extraordinary disruptions in the history of international energy markets. Unlike conventional oil-price downturns, the 2020 crisis was driven by the simultaneous collapse of global oil demand and a major dispute among leading oil-producing countries over production policy. The COVID-19 pandemic brought international travel, commuting and large parts of industrial activity to a sudden halt, while the breakdown of the OPEC+ negotiations in March 2020 initially removed an important constraint on supply. The result was an unprecedented imbalance between the amount of crude oil available and the amount that consumers were able to purchase. Global oil demand fell by an estimated 8.5 million barrels per day (mb/d), or 8.8%, in 2020the largest annual decline ever recorded by the International Energy Agency (IEA) (IEA, 2021). In April 2020, West Texas Intermediate (WTI) futures briefly fell below zero and settled at approximately US$37.63 per barrel on 20 April, an event without precedent in the modern oil market (Le et al., 2021). Brent crude also fell sharply, reaching levels below US$20 per barrel during the most severe phase of the crisis. The crisis had consequences far beyond oil companies. Oil-exporting economies experienced severe fiscal and external pressures, while oil-importing economies benefited from lower energy costs but simultaneously suffered from the broader economic recession caused by COVID-19. This paper examines the causes, consequences and wider economic implications of the 2020 oil-price crisis. It argues that the episode was not simply an oil-market supply shock. It was a compound demand, supply, financial and geopolitical shock. The paper also considers subsequent research on financial-market spillovers, oil-exporting economies and energy investment. Evidence from later studies suggests that the crisis accelerated changes that were already developing in the oil industry, including greater emphasis on financial discipline, diversification and the energy transition. More recent IEA evidence indicates that global oil-demand growth has subsequently slowed, while electric vehicles, efficiency improvements and changing patterns of Chinese oil consumption have become increasingly important (IEA, 2025).

Keywords: rude oil, oil price crisis, COVID-19, OPEC+, WTI, Brent crude, energy economics, oil exporters, oil importers, fiscal policy, energy transition

INTRODUCTION

Crude oil occupies a special position in the global economy. It is not simply another traded commodity. Oil is a major input into transportation, manufacturing, electricity generation, petrochemicals and international trade. Because of this, sudden changes in oil prices can influence inflation, economic growth, government revenues, investment and financial markets simultaneously. The oil market entered 2020 with several existing weaknesses. Global oil demand growth had already slowed, production capacity was expanding in several non-OPEC countries, and the United States had become an increasingly important producer because of the shale revolution. The IEA's Oil 2020 report, published shortly before the full global spread of COVID-19, had already warned that the market was facing significant supply and demand challenges (IEA, 2020).

COVID-19 then transformed a difficult market into an unprecedented crisis. As the virus spread internationally, governments introduced lockdowns, travel restrictions and social-distancing measures. Airlines reduced flights, commuters stopped traveling to work, factories closed temporarily and international tourism collapsed. Since transportation accounts for a large proportion of oil consumption, the effect on petroleum demand was immediate. The IEA estimated that global oil demand fell by 8.5 mb/d in 2020, equivalent to 8.8% of the previous year's demand. The transportation sector experienced particularly severe reductions: jet-fuel and kerosene demand fell by 41%, while gasoline demand declined by 12% (IEA, 2021).

The demand shock was followed by a supply-side shock. In early March 2020, negotiations between OPEC and its partners broke down. Saudi Arabia and Russia disagreed over production cuts, and Saudi Arabia subsequently announced that it would increase production. The combination of collapsing demand and increased supply pushed oil prices down dramatically (World Bank, 2020).

The most remarkable moment came on 20 April 2020, when the May WTI futures contract settled at a negative price. The settlement price was approximately −US$37.63 per barrel. In practical terms, this did not mean that every barrel of physical crude was being sold at negative prices. Rather, it reflected the extraordinary conditions surrounding a futures contract approaching expiration when storage capacity at the delivery point in Cushing, Oklahoma, was severely constrained (Le et al., 2021). The 2020 crisis therefore provides an important case for understanding how commodity markets respond when a

sudden collapse in demand occurs at the same time as excess supply, limited storage, financial-market uncertainty and geopolitical disagreement.

THE GLOBAL OIL MARKET BEFORE COVID-19

To understand the 2020 crisis, it is necessary to examine the condition of the oil market before the pandemic. During the 2010s, the global oil market underwent a major transformation because of the expansion of U.S. shale production. Hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling allowed U.S. producers to increase oil output substantially. This reduced the relative dominance of traditional producers and gave the United States a much larger role in global energy markets. At the same time, OPEC and non-OPEC producers, particularly Russia, had increasingly coordinated production policies through the OPEC+ framework. By the beginning of 2020, however, the market was already facing uncertainty. Oil demand growth had slowed in 2019, while production from the United States, Brazil, Canada and other non-OPEC countries was expanding. The IEA's March 2020 assessment noted that the oil market was already facing a potential supply overhang before the coronavirus became a global crisis (IEA, 2020). Therefore, COVID-19 did not create all of the weaknesses in the oil market. Instead, it magnified existing imbalances.

CAUSES OF THE 2020 OIL PRICE CRISIS

1. Collapse in Global Oil Demand

The most important cause of the 2020 oil-price collapse was the unprecedented reduction in demand. Oil consumption is closely connected with economic activity and mobility. When people drive to work, travel by air, use public transportation, transport goods or operate industrial machinery, they indirectly generate demand for petroleum products.

International aviation was particularly badly affected. According to the IEA, global passenger air traffic was approximately 66% below 2019 levels in 2020. Jet-fuel and kerosene demand consequently fell by 41% (IEA, 2021). Road transportation was also affected. Lockdowns meant fewer commuters and less discretionary travel. Industrial production declined in many countries, reducing demand for diesel and other fuels.

This created an unusual situation in which oil producers could continue producing crude but consumers were suddenly unable or unwilling to use it. The World Bank described COVID-19 as producing simultaneous negative supply and demand shocks, with the collapse in oil demand particularly damaging for oil-producing economies (World Bank, 2020).

2. The OPEC+ Dispute

The demand collapse alone would have been sufficient to create a major oil-price decline. The situation became much worse because of the breakdown in negotiations between OPEC and its partners. On 5 March 2020, OPEC proposed production cuts of 1.5 mb/d for the second quarter of the year. Russia rejected the proposal the following day. Saudi Arabia subsequently announced an increase in production and offered substantial discounts to customers. The World Bank reported that Saudi Arabia announced plans to increase production to 12.3 mb/d and offered discounts of almost 20% in important markets (World Bank, 2020). The result was a simultaneous collapse in demand and expansion in supply. This is important because oil markets are particularly sensitive to relatively small differences between supply and demand. When inventories are already high, even a modest excess supply can put considerable downward pressure on prices. In March 2020, Brent crude prices fell below US$46 per barrel and continued declining as the pandemic spread globally (IEA, 2020).

3. The Storage Problem

One of the less obvious causes of the extraordinary April 2020 price collapse was the shortage of available storage. Oil differs from many financial assets because it is a physical commodity. If producers cannot sell crude immediately, they need somewhere to store it. During normal market conditions, storage acts as a buffer. When supply is temporarily greater than demand, companies can store excess oil and sell it later.

The IEA reported that U.S. crude stocks increased by 53.7 million barrels in April, while floating storage also increased substantially (IEA, 2020). This created severe pressure on the physical oil market.

The negative WTI price should therefore be understood in the context of both the physical market and the futures market. Traders holding contracts for physical delivery needed to find storage or otherwise dispose of the crude. When available storage became extremely scarce, the value of immediate delivery could become negative. Le, Le and Le (2021), using an autoregressive distributed lag model with structural breaks, identify the role of COVID-19 cases, economic-policy uncertainty, expected stock-market volatility, the Saudi-Russian oil-price conflict and speculation in oil futures in explaining the extraordinary movement in WTI prices.

THE HISTORIC NEGATIVE OIL PRICE

The most memorable event of the crisis occurred on 20 April 2020. WTI futures for May delivery settled at approximately −US$37.63 per barrel. This was the first time a major benchmark oil futures contract had fallen below zero. The event generated widespread confusion because a negative oil price appears to contradict normal economic intuition. However, the explanation becomes clearer when the nature of futures contracts is considered. A futures contract close to expiration creates an obligation concerning physical delivery. At a time when storage was severely constrained, holding such a contract could become costly.

The negative price was therefore not evidence that all oil in the global market had become worthless. Instead, it was a signal of extreme stress at a particular physical delivery point and in a particular futures contract. The event nonetheless revealed an important weakness in commodity markets: physical infrastructure can become a binding constraint on financial markets. The IEA explicitly linked negative WTI prices to the scarcity of storage created by the collapse in oil demand (IEA, 2020).

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE OIL PRICE CRISIS

1. Consequences for Oil-Exporting Economies

Oil-exporting countries were among the biggest economic losers from the crisis. For many exporters, oil revenues provide a substantial share of government income, export earnings and foreign exchange. When prices collapsed, governments faced an immediate decline in revenues.

This affected public budgets, investment programs and exchange rates. The effects were particularly serious in economies with high dependence on hydrocarbons and limited economic diversification. Research on Gulf economies shows that the combination of COVID-19 and the oil-price collapse created deeper vulnerabilities because hydrocarbons remained highly important for GDP, exports and government revenues. A later economic-modelling study by Al-Kibsi et al. (2022) found that the crisis exposed long-term weaknesses in hydrocarbon-dependent Gulf economies and argued that diversification and energy-transition reforms became increasingly important.

2. Fiscal Pressure

Oil-exporting governments experienced substantial fiscal pressure. When oil prices are high, governments can finance public spending relatively easily. When prices fall sharply, the same expenditure commitments become difficult to sustain.

Governments therefore have several options:

- reduce public expenditure;
- increase non-oil taxation;
- borrow;
- use sovereign wealth funds;
- reduce subsidies;
- postpone infrastructure projects.

Each option has economic and political costs. The crisis demonstrated the importance of fiscal buffers. Countries with large financial reserves were generally better positioned to absorb the shock than countries with limited savings.

3. Consequences for Oil-Importing Countries

Oil-importing economies experienced the crisis differently. In normal circumstances, lower oil prices can benefit oil importers because households and firms spend less on energy. Lower fuel prices can increase disposable income and reduce production costs. Countries such as India, Japan and many European economies are significant oil importers. In principle, lower crude prices reduce their import bills and improve their terms of trade. However, the 2020 crisis was unusual because low oil prices occurred during a global recession. People were not traveling, factories were not operating normally, and economic activity had fallen sharply. As a result, the positive effects of cheaper oil were partly offset by the broader economic damage caused by COVID-19.

This distinction is important. A normal oil-price decline caused by increased supply can stimulate oil-importing economies. A price decline caused by a collapse in global demand may instead be a symptom of economic weakness. Research on asymmetric oil shocks supports this distinction. Oil-price declines caused by different types of shocks do not necessarily have identical effects on oil-importing and oil-exporting economies (see, for example, the evidence in Energy Policy on the source of oil-price shocks).

IMPACT ON INFLATION

Energy is an important component of consumer prices and production costs. When crude oil and petroleum products become cheaper, transportation and some manufacturing costs decline. However, the inflationary impact of the 2020 oil shock was unusual because it occurred alongside a much larger collapse in economic activity. The IMF's April 2020 World Economic Outlook projected a 3% contraction in the global economy in 2020, describing the pandemic as a crisis substantially worse than the global financial crisis in terms of the expected economic contraction at that time (IMF, 2020). The combination of falling energy prices and collapsing demand therefore contributed to deflationary pressures in many economies. This was one reason why central banks introduced extraordinary monetary-policy measures during 2020.

FINANCIAL-MARKET CONSEQUENCES

The oil-price collapse also affected financial markets. Energy companies experienced large falls in share prices because investors expected lower revenues and weaker profitability. Oil-producing regions experienced pressure on currencies and financial assets. Research conducted after the crisis found strong relationships between oil prices and stock-market performance during the COVID-19 period. Heinlein, Legrenzi and Mahadeo (2021), studying oil exporters and importers, found that oil and stock-market returns became more strongly correlated during the COVID-19 crisis. They also found that stock markets in oil-exporting countries were more closely linked to oil prices than those of oil-importing countries. Another study by researchers examining the largest oil exporters and importers found strong co-movement between oil futures and stock markets, particularly during the initial March–May 2020 phase of the pandemic (Economic Analysis and Policy, 2022). These findings are economically important because they show that an oil-price shock can spread beyond the energy sector into broader financial markets.

IMPACT ON OIL COMPANIES AND INVESTMENT

The crisis placed enormous financial pressure on oil companies. Lower prices reduced revenues, while uncertainty made new investment projects less attractive. The IEA reported that upstream oil and gas investment in 2020 was approximately one-third lower than companies had initially planned and around 30% below 2019 levels (IEA, 2021).

This investment decline created an interesting long-term problem. Low prices reduce incentives to invest in new production. If demand subsequently recovers faster than expected, insufficient investment can produce a future supply shortage. The IEA estimated that the investment reductions during 2020 could remove approximately 2.1 mb/d from expected oil supply in 2025 (IEA, 2020). This demonstrates the delayed effects of oil-market shocks. A price collapse may benefit consumers in the short run but reduce investment in future supply, potentially creating greater price volatility later.

THE CRISIS AND THE ENERGY TRANSITION

The 2020 oil crisis also had implications for the global energy transition. Before COVID-19, governments and companies were already discussing climate change, renewable energy and the reduction of carbon emissions. The pandemic added another dimension to this debate.

Oil companies were suddenly facing uncertainty about long-term demand. Investors became more concerned about the possibility that some fossil-fuel assets could lose value during the transition to cleaner energy. The IEA's World Energy Outlook 2020 projected that global energy demand would fall by about 5% in 2020, energy-related CO_2 emissions by 7% and energy investment by 18% (IEA, 2020). The crisis therefore created both risks and opportunities. For oil-producing economies, lower oil revenues made economic diversification more urgent.

For governments, recovery packages created an opportunity to support renewable energy, energy efficiency and clean infrastructure. However, the relationship was not automatic. Low oil prices can also make petroleum products cheaper relative to clean-energy alternatives, potentially reducing the short-term economic incentive to switch.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES IN OIL DEMAND AFTER 2020

The long-term effects of the 2020 crisis became clearer after the immediate recovery. The initial collapse in oil demand was followed by a strong rebound as economies reopened. However, not all forms of oil consumption returned to their previous trajectory. Remote working reduced some commuting. Electric vehicles became increasingly important. Energy-efficiency improvements continued. Air travel eventually recovered but took time. The IEA's later research shows that oil demand growth has slowed considerably. In 2024, global oil demand increased by approximately 0.8%, compared with 1.9% in 2023. The IEA attributed the slowdown partly to the end of the post-pandemic mobility rebound, weaker industrial growth and the growing impact of electric vehicles (IEA, 2025). The IEA's 2025 outlook estimates that global oil demand will reach a plateau around 105.5 mb/d toward the end of the decade under current policy settings and market trends. It also estimates that electric vehicles could displace around 5.4 mb/d of oil demand by 2030. These developments suggest that the 2020 crisis may have accelerated some trends that were already underway.

NEW EVIDENCE: WHAT LATER STUDIES TELL US ABOUT THE 2020 CRISIS

Research published after the crisis provides a more complete understanding of what happened.

One important finding is that the oil-price collapse cannot be explained by COVID-19 alone.

Le, Le and Le (2021) found that COVID-19 cases, economic-policy uncertainty and expected stock-market volatility contributed to falling WTI prices. Their research also identified the Saudi-Russian oil-price conflict and oil-futures speculation as important factors (Le et al., 2021).

A second strand of research focuses on financial contagion. Heinlein, Legrenzi and Mahadeo (2021) found that oil and stock markets became more closely connected during the crisis, particularly in oil-exporting countries. A third strand examines the longer-term effects on oil-producing economies. Research on Gulf economies suggests that the combination of COVID-19 and low oil prices exposed the risks of continued dependence on hydrocarbons and increased the importance of economic diversification (Al-Kibsi et al., 2022). More recent IEA evidence adds another dimension. The oil market has recovered from the immediate 2020 shock, but demand growth has become slower and more structurally uncertain. In 2024, advanced-economy oil demand remained 5.4% below its 2019 level, with road transport demand particularly affected by efficiency improvements and the growing share of electric vehicles (IEA, 2025). Taken together, these studies suggest that the 2020 crisis should be viewed as both a short-term market collapse and an event that accelerated longer-term changes in the energy system.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPING ECONOMIES

Developing economies experienced the oil-price crisis in very different ways. Oil-exporting developing countries suffered from falling export revenues and government income. Countries dependent on petroleum exports were forced to reconsider their fiscal strategies. Oil-importing developing economies, on the other hand, could benefit from cheaper energy. For countries such as India, lower crude prices can reduce the import bill and improve the external balance, although the final effect depends on exchange rates, domestic fuel taxation and the broader economic environment. The crisis therefore demonstrates that the same global commodity shock can have completely different consequences depending on a country's position in international markets. For developing economies, diversification remains particularly important. An economy that depends heavily on one commodity is vulnerable not only to changes in price but also to changes in technology and global demand. The energy transition makes this issue even more important because long-term demand for petroleum products may grow more slowly than in previous decades.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The 2020 crisis provides several lessons for economic policy.

1.Maintaining Fiscal Buffers- Oil-exporting governments need sufficient fiscal reserves to manage periods of low prices. Sovereign wealth funds, stabilization funds and conservative fiscal planning can reduce the need for abrupt spending cuts during crises.

2.Economic Diversification- Oil-dependent economies need to develop alternative sources of income. Diversification can involve manufacturing, tourism, financial services, technology, logistics and renewable energy.

3.The Gulf-region research discussed above suggests that diversification is particularly important when oil-price volatility is combined with a long-term energy transition (Al-Kibsi et al., 2022).

4.Strategic Oil Reserves-Oil-importing countries need sufficient strategic reserves to protect themselves against sudden supply disruptions. The 2020 crisis demonstrated that physical storage is not only a commercial issue. It is also a matter of energy security.

5.Better Market Regulation- The negative WTI event showed the importance of understanding the relationship between futures markets, physical delivery and storage capacity. Regulators need to ensure that financial markets remain transparent and that market participants understand the physical constraints underlying commodity contracts.

6.Investment in the Energy Transition- Governments should use periods of low oil prices to strengthen energy efficiency and alternative energy infrastructure.

The objective should not simply be to reduce oil consumption immediately. It should be to create an energy system that is less vulnerable to extreme commodity-price fluctuations.

LESSONS FOR THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

The 2020 oil crisis offers several broader economic lessons.

1.First, commodity markets cannot be separated from macroeconomic conditions. Oil prices depend heavily on global economic activity.

2.Second, demand shocks can be more powerful than supply shocks. The 2020 collapse was unusual because demand disappeared extraordinarily quickly.

3.Third, storage matters. Physical infrastructure can influence financial-market prices, especially when markets become severely imbalanced.

4.Fourth, oil-exporting economies remain vulnerable to external shocks unless they diversify.

5.Fifth, oil-price declines are not always economically positive for oil importers. When lower prices reflect a global recession, the benefits of cheaper energy may be outweighed by falling income and employment.

6.Sixth, energy investment responds to price expectations. Large investment cuts during a downturn can create future supply risks.

Finally, the energy transition changes the meaning of an oil-price crisis. In previous decades, an oil-price collapse was primarily interpreted as a temporary business-cycle event. Today, it must also be considered in relation to electric vehicles, renewable energy, energy efficiency and climate policy.

FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR THE GLOBAL OIL MARKET

The oil market that emerged after 2020 is not the same market that entered the crisis. The IEA's Oil 2025 report describes a market undergoing fundamental transformation. It projects global oil demand to rise only modestly through 2030, reaching a plateau around 105.5 mb/d. At the same time, electric vehicles and other technologies are reducing oil demand in road transportation (IEA, 2025).

The United States has become a major source of global supply growth, while countries such as Brazil and Guyana have increased production. The IEA reports that the United States accounted for approximately 90% of the increase in global oil supply between 2015 and 2024 (IEA, 2025).

China is also changing. For many years, China was one of the most important sources of incremental global oil demand. However, the IEA reports that China's oil demand grew only 0.8% in 2024, compared with 8.7% in 2023. Electric vehicles, high-speed rail, natural-gas trucks and structural changes in the Chinese economy have contributed to slower oil-demand growth (IEA, 2025). These developments could make future oil markets more difficult to predict. On one side, geopolitical conflicts can cause sudden supply disruptions. On the other, technological change can reduce demand faster than expected.

CONCLUSION

The global oil-price crisis of 2020 was an extraordinary event that demonstrated how closely energy markets are connected to the wider economy.

The crisis began with a sudden collapse in oil demand caused by COVID-19. Lockdowns, travel restrictions and declining industrial activity dramatically reduced the consumption of petroleum products. According to the IEA, global oil demand fell by 8.5 mb/d in 2020, the largest annual decline in oil demand ever recorded (IEA, 2021).

The situation was made significantly worse by the breakdown of OPEC+ negotiations in March 2020. Saudi Arabia increased production while demand was collapsing, creating an exceptional imbalance between supply and demand (World Bank, 2020). The resulting oversupply overwhelmed storage capacity and produced one of the most extraordinary events in commodity-market history. On 20 April 2020, WTI futures settled at approximately −US$37.63 per barrel. Research subsequently demonstrated that the collapse reflected a combination of pandemic developments, economic uncertainty, financial-market volatility, the Saudi-Russian oil-price dispute and futures-market dynamics (Le et al., 2021).

The consequences extended well beyond oil markets.

Oil-exporting economies suffered major losses in government revenue and export earnings. Oil-importing countries benefited from cheaper energy but could not fully exploit these benefits because the price collapse occurred during a severe global recession. Financial markets also became more closely connected with oil prices during the crisis, particularly in oil-exporting countries (Heinlein et al., 2021).

The 2020 collapse reduced investment in new oil production. It also encouraged governments and companies to reconsider energy security and economic diversification. At the same time, the crisis occurred during a period of accelerating technological change in electric vehicles, renewable energy and energy efficiency. Later evidence suggests that some of these changes have become structural. Global oil-demand growth slowed in 2024, and advanced-economy oil demand remained below its 2019 level. The IEA now expects global oil demand to approach a plateau toward the end of the decade, while electric vehicles are expected to displace a substantial amount of oil demand by 2030 (IEA, 2025).

The 2020 crisis therefore needs to be understood at two levels. In the short term, it was a dramatic market failure caused by an extraordinary demand shock, excess supply and limited storage capacity. In the longer term, it became a catalyst for changes in investment, fiscal policy, energy security and the global transition away from fossil fuels.

For oil-exporting countries, the experience demonstrates the risks of excessive dependence on hydrocarbon revenues. For oil-importing countries, it demonstrates the value of diversified energy systems and strategic reserves. For policymakers globally, it highlights the importance of maintaining financial stability, resilient energy infrastructure and flexible economic policies.

The central lesson is that oil prices are not determined by supply and demand alone. They are shaped by economic activity, geopolitics, expectations, financial markets, infrastructure and technological change. The events of 2020 brought all of these forces together in an unusually dramatic way.

The future oil market is therefore likely to be more uncertain than the market that existed before the pandemic. Demand growth is slowing, new producers are entering the market, geopolitical risks remain significant and the transition toward cleaner technologies is accelerating. The challenge for policymakers is to manage these changes without sacrificing energy security, economic stability or long-term sustainability.

The 2020 oil-price crisis was more than a temporary collapse in the price of crude oil. It was a major economic event that exposed the vulnerabilities of the global energy system and accelerated a debate about what the world's energy economy should look like in the decades ahead.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Kibsi, G., et al. (2022). Modeling long-term impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and oil price declines on Gulf oil economies. Economic Modelling, 112, 105849.
2. Heinlein, R., Legrenzi, G. D., & Mahadeo, S. M. (2021). Crude oil and stock markets in the COVID-19 crisis: Evidence from oil exporters and importers. The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 82, 223–229.
3. International Energy Agency. (2020). Global Energy Review 2020. IEA, Paris.
4. International Energy Agency. (2020). Oil 2020: Analysis and forecast to 2025. IEA, Paris.
5. International Energy Agency. (2020). World Energy Outlook 2020. IEA, Paris.
6. International Energy Agency. (2020). World Energy Investment 2020: Fuel supply. IEA, Paris.
7. International Energy Agency. (2021). Global Energy Review 2021: Oil. IEA, Paris.
8. International Energy Agency. (2021). Oil 2021: Analysis and forecast to 2026. IEA, Paris.
9. International Energy Agency. (2024). Oil 2024: Analysis and forecast to 2030. IEA, Paris.
10. International Energy Agency. (2025). Global Energy Review 2025: Oil. IEA, Paris.
11. International Energy Agency. (2025). Oil 2025: Analysis and forecast to 2030. IEA, Paris.
12. International Monetary Fund. (2020). World Economic Outlook, April 2020: The Great Lockdown. IMF.
13. 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2021.101489
14. World Bank. (2020). Coping with a Dual Shock: COVID-19 and Oil Prices. World Bank.
15. World Bank. (2020). Commodity Markets Outlook: Implications of COVID-19 for commodities. World Bank.