Impact of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Welfare of Citizens in Nigeria

By

Olowu Olagunju Folorunso
Department of Political Science & International Relations
Faculty of Social Science, University of Abuja
olagunju.olowu@uniabuja.edu.ng

&
Uke Iro Iro
Department of Political Science & International Relations
Faculty of Social Science, University of Abuja
Uke.Iro
Uke.iro@uniabuja.edu.ng

Abstract

The May 29th 2023 inaugural speech of President Bola Ahmed Tinubu was historical and remarkable owing to the manner in which the president declared the end to subsidy era. Ever since the pronouncement, Nigerians have witnessed astronomical increase in PMS pump price with devasting impact on good and services thereby making life unbearable for both the rich and the poor in the country. It is against the backdrop that the study examined the fuel subsidy removal policy and the impacts on Nigerians welfare. In doing so, the study adopted qualitative methods and relied heavily on secondary sources of data collection. The study found that, the fuel subsidy removal has really led to food inflations as well as high transportation cost with social implications such as: increased job loss, folding up of SME, increased criminality and series of social unrest. According to the study, the subsidy removal comes with its own benefits such as availability of money to take of other critical sectors and ability of government to reduce borrowing. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended that the government should intensify efforts on the need for more provision of alternative energy sources like CNG and conversion station in order to reduce overreliance on petroleum. Salary increment to civil servants to commensurate the rising cost of food as well as provision of CNG buses to ease transportation challenges amongst others.

Keywords: Subsidy Removal, Impact, Welfare, Citizens, Nigerians

Introduction

Subsidy is a ubiquitous concept which means to reduce or make cheap certain goods and services which are essentially important to the citizens. Every serious nation offers different types of subsidies on services such as energy consumption, agriculture produce, housing and other robust social welfare are gotten relatively cheap in some countries in order to keep citizens dignity intact and provide succor for those who are not economically viable. It is the sole responsibility of government to make life better and not worse.

The final removal of Nigeria's longstanding fuel subsidy marked the beginning of a new economic reality, significantly altering the country's oil sector and leading to a sharp rise in fuel prices and inflation, with petrol prices more than doubling and inflation reaching 32.7 per cent (Afolabi, 2024).

Removing the long-standing fuel subsidy by the Federal Government has triggered profound changes in Nigeria's oil sector, marking the start of a new economic reality. The subsidy, which for years kept petrol prices artificially low at great cost to the nation's economy, was finally eliminated in 2023 under President Bola Tinubu. In his inaugural speech, the President declared, "Subsidy is gone." This announcement was swiftly followed by a surge in petrol prices nationwide. By the evening of May 29, 2023, prices had risen to N500, up from around N198, or slightly more in some areas.

As the government moves away from subsidizing fuel and allowing market forces to dictate prices, the implications are both broad and deep. The policy and the floating of the naira sharply led to a rise in the cost of commodities in Nigeria, pushing essential items beyond the reach of millions of people across Africa's most populous nation. By September, the high petrol price had pushed inflation to 32.7 per cent. Even despite the high cost of the product, availability has been an issue, with queues snaking into major roads and streets, thereby becoming a regular feature across filling stations in Nigeria.

Justifying his "off-the-record" remarks, the President explained that by the time he assumed office, there was no provision for the subsidy, as the previous administration of President Muhammadu Buhari had not allocated funds for subsidy payments in the 2023 budget. As petrol prices soared, the government introduced an intervention which was becoming bogus due to the high exchange rate. Reports of indebtedness by the Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited later surfaced. Unfortunately, the company, which had previously declared significant profits, could no longer meet its obligations.

The paper is divided into ten sections such as introduction, conceptual review, empirical review, historical overview of subsidy removal in Nigeria, theoretical framework, impact of subsidy removal, alternative way out, benefits, conclusion and recommendations.

Conceptual Review

Subsidy

Subsidy is a sum of money granted by the state or a public body to help an industry or business keep the price of a commodity or service low. Is a benefit given to an individual, business, or institution, usually by the government. It can be directing such as payment or direct such as tax break.

Fuel Subsidies

Fuel subsidies, a common policy tool in many oil-producing countries, are aimed at making petroleum products more affordable to the public. In Nigeria, fuel subsidies were introduced in the 1970s as a way to cushion the impact of fluctuating global oil prices and ensure that the country's oil wealth benefited the populace. According to Del Granado et al. (2012), fuel subsidies can be defined as the difference between the domestic price of petroleum products and their international market price. Governments pay this difference to oil companies, enabling them to sell fuel to consumers at below-market prices.

The rationale for fuel subsidies, especially in countries like Nigeria, is rooted in a desire to protect consumers from the volatility of global oil prices, promote industrialization, and stimulate economic growth by lowering transportation and production costs. However, several studies have highlighted the economic

inefficiencies associated with subsidies. Coady et al. (2010) argue that fuel subsidies distort market prices, encourage overconsumption of fuel, and lead to significant fiscal burdens on the government. Moreover, subsidies often benefit wealthier households, who consume more fuel than poorer households, making the policy regressive rather than progressive.

In the Nigerian context, fuel subsidies have long been a source of tension between the government and the public. While the government argues that subsidies are unsustainable, many Nigerians view them as one of the few tangible benefits of the country's oil wealth. Over the years, various governments have attempted to reduce or remove the subsidy, but such moves have often been met with widespread protests and strikes. Despite the government's stance on the unsustainability of fuel subsidies, the widespread reliance on this policy has created complex socio-economic dynamics. The public's perception of subsidies as a rightful benefit stems from a longstanding view that, as an oil-producing nation, Nigeria's resources should alleviate living costs. This expectation has led to political sensitivity around subsidy removal, with past attempts often resulting in public outcry. For example, the 2012 fuel subsidy removal under President Goodluck Jonathan led to nationwide protests, known as the "Occupy Nigeria" movement, which forced the government to partially restore the subsidy.

Beyond the public's reaction, subsidy policies have led to inefficiencies and inequities in resource allocation. According to studies by organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, a significant portion of the subsidy benefits upper-income households, who own multiple vehicles and consume more fuel. This misallocation has been exacerbated by issues such as smuggling and corruption, where subsidized fuel is often diverted to neighboring countries or resold at higher prices, further draining public resources.

The decision to remove fuel subsidies in 2023 marked a pivotal moment, with the government emphasizing the need for fiscal stability and reallocation of funds toward critical areas like healthcare, education, and infrastructure. While the removal has resulted in immediate price hikes and increased living costs, it is seen as an opportunity for Nigeria to redirect funds from subsidies to investments that may yield long-term benefits for broader economic growth and equity. However,

successful implementation will require transparent governance and social support to address the hardships imposed on lower-income citizens.

Empirical Review

Nigeria is not the only country to remove fuel subsidy. In 1997, Indonesia removed fuel subsidy after the Asian financial crisis. The removal of fuel subsidy increased the domestic price of fuel and suddenly ignited protests and violent riots which occurred for weeks and forced the incumbent government to resign in 1998 (Chelminski, 2018). Dartanto (2013) examined the relationship between existing fuel subsidies and fiscal balance in Indonesia between 1998 and 2013 and found that removing 25 percent of fuel subsidies increased poverty by 0.259 percentage points while 100 percent removal of fuel subsidies and the reallocation of 50 percent of them to government spending decreased poverty by 0.277 percentage points. Fathurrahman et al. (2017) showed that the reallocation of subsidy payments to low-income households could slow down economic development but improve social welfare. However, removing fuel subsidy usually comes with the promise of using the money saved from subsidy to undertake targeted reform. But in Indonesia, citizens find promises to replace fuel subsidies with targeted spending less credible and would resist the reform if they believe the government is corrupt (Kyle, 2018). Other international studies have also analyzed the effect of fuel subsidy removal. Harring et al. (2023) analyzed cross-country attitudes towards fossil fuel subsidy removal and found that the public would have positive attitudes towards subsidy removal if there were optimal use of the saved fiscal revenues. In Malaysia, Chatri (2014) assessed the economy-wide effect of gas subsidy removal in the power sector and found that gas subsidy reduction led to increase in the price of electricity followed by a decline in demand for electricity by other economic sectors and a decrease in gross domestic product. Antimiani et al. (2023) showed that fossil fuels are still highly subsidized in EU countries, and there are deliberations to remove fossil fuel subsidies and reuse the revenues to foster the technological transition to a sustainable and decarbonized EU economy. Sampedro et al. (2017) also argued that fossil fuel subsidy is a barrier to tackling climate change in the EU because it diverts investment away from clean energy sources, and fossil fuel subsidies amounted to US$233 billion in 2014 which is four times the amount of subsidies allocated to promote renewable energy. However, they showed that fuel subsidy removal would give rise to only a small reduction

in CO2 because people would switch from fuel to coal and gas. Nowag et al. (2021) suggest the use of state aid to phase out fossil fuel subsidies in the EU. Erickson et al. (2017) showed that the removal of tax incentives and other fossil fuel support policies could hasten the attainment of the G20 climate commitments. Lin and Li (2012) examined the case of China and showed that fuel subsidy removal would generate negative externalities in China but would generate positive externalities to other world regions without subsidy removal. In a related study, Ouyang, and Lin (2014) showed that the economic benefits of renewable energy subsidies were lower than the economic benefits of fossil fuel subsidies in China.

Historical Perspective on Fuel Subsidy in Nigeria

In Nigeria, fuel subsidies were first introduced in the 1970s as a response to the oil price shock in 1973. Fuel subsidies were partially removed in 1986. Since then, the fuel subsidies have been in place. In 2012, the government abruptly removed fuel subsidies. The removal led to massive protests which was intended for the government to reinstate the fuel subsidy it had removed.

To understand Nigeria's fuel subsidy policy and its eventual removal, it is crucial to consider the historical context. The concept of fuel subsidies in Nigeria dates back to the 1970s, a period of economic boom following the oil price surge during the 1973 oil crisis. Nigeria, then emerging as one of the largest oil producers in Africa, introduced subsidies to stabilize fuel prices for its citizens. The subsidy was viewed as a way to ensure that ordinary Nigerians could access affordable fuel, a resource seen as their national heritage. The government intended to use the country's newfound oil wealth to protect citizens from global oil price fluctuations and support economic stability by keeping transportation and production costs low.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, fuel subsidies became entrenched as part of Nigeria's economic policy, but they also contributed to the country's rising fiscal challenges. Amid political instability and economic fluctuations, successive governments found it difficult to reduce or eliminate subsidies, as these efforts often provoked significant public backlash. Subsidy reductions or attempts at complete removal sparked protests, with citizens viewing the subsidies as one of the few direct benefits they received from the country's oil industry, which was

otherwise marred by corruption and mismanagement. This sentiment intensified under various military and civilian governments, as citizens felt marginalized by the nation's oil wealth. The idea of subsidy reduction, therefore, became politically sensitive, forcing many administrations to maintain the policy despite the rising economic burden.

In the early 2000s, as Nigeria transitioned to a democratic government, discussions around subsidy reform re-emerged, with some leaders attempting to gradually phase out subsidies in order to address the country's growing fiscal deficits. For instance, former President Olusegun Obasanjo took steps to reduce subsidies but faced resistance, highlighting the deep-seated public reliance on these subsidies as a buffer against high living costs. Successive governments, including those led by Goodluck Jonathan and Muhammadu Buhari, similarly recognized the unsustainability of subsidies but struggled with the political and social ramifications of their removal. The 2012 attempt at subsidy removal under Jonathan led to widespread protests and civil unrest, exemplifying how deeply entrenched subsidies had become in Nigeria's economic and social fabric.

In 2023, facing mounting fiscal deficits and unsustainable subsidy costs, the government under President Bola Tinubu made the decisive move to remove fuel subsidies entirely. This action represents a significant shift in Nigeria's economic policy, reflecting a growing recognition of the need for fiscal sustainability and efficient resource allocation. Unlike past attempts, the 2023 subsidy removal was framed within a broader economic reform agenda aimed at redirecting funds from subsidies to infrastructure, healthcare, and education. However, the move has also placed a strain on household incomes due to increased fuel prices, leading to renewed debates on the effectiveness of subsidy removal and the importance of transparent governance.

The historical perspective of Nigeria's fuel subsidy policy illustrates the complexities involved in managing resource wealth and the challenges in balancing economic sustainability with public welfare. The subsidy system, while initially intended to protect citizens, has over the years contributed to significant fiscal strain and economic inefficiencies. As Nigeria now shifts toward a subsidy-free regime, the lessons from this historical experience underline the importance

of transparency, public engagement, and targeted welfare policies to ensure the reform's long-term success.

Theoretical Framework

The paper adopts two theories (Keynes and Neo-liberal) to explain and justify the removal of fuel subsidy in Nigeria.

The economic rationale for subsidies is often explained through the lens of market failure. In situations where the market does not allocate resources efficiently, government intervention, such as subsidies, can help correct these inefficiencies. In the case of fuel, governments may subsidize petroleum products to address externalities such as high transportation costs, inflation, and unequal distribution of wealth. Keynesian economics, for example, supports government intervention in markets to stabilize economies during periods of recession or inflation as such, the removal of fuel subsidy and the attendant money accrue form the savings of subsidy shared among states can be justified from this perspective.

However, many economists argue that subsidies, particularly fuel subsidies, lead to economic distortions. According to neoclassical economic theory, subsidies disrupt the natural pricing mechanism of the market, leading to overconsumption and misallocation of resources. By keeping fuel prices artificially low, subsidies encourage the excessive use of fossil fuels, contributing to environmental degradation and energy inefficiency. Moreover, the fiscal burden of subsidies can divert government resources away from critical areas such as healthcare, education, and infrastructure development.

In Nigeria, fuel subsidies have been criticized for promoting rent-seeking behavior and corruption. A study by Ogbu (2012) found that the opaque nature of the subsidy regime allowed for widespread fraud, with billions of dollars lost annually due to inflated subsidy claims by oil marketers. This has led to calls for a more transparent and targeted approach to government spending, where subsidies are replaced with direct transfers to the poor or investments in infrastructure that benefit all citizens. The argument for removing fuel subsidies in Nigeria has become increasingly compelling, especially in light of the economic inefficiencies and corruption that have marred the policy for decades. As noted,

subsidies can encourage over-reliance on fossil fuels and distort market signals, deterring investment in renewable energy and more efficient public transport options. The cost of maintaining subsidies has placed a heavy burden on Nigeria's fiscal resources, limiting the government's ability to invest in essential sectors that could provide long-term economic stability and growth. As such, the government's recent efforts to redirect funds toward sectors like healthcare, education, and infrastructure are seen as an attempt to restructure the economy toward sustainable development.

Moreover, the subsidy structure in Nigeria has often disproportionately favored wealthier households, who consume more fuel. Research suggests that targeted social welfare programs or direct cash transfers could more effectively support low-income households without contributing to inefficiency. Such reforms are in line with the ideas of economists advocating for "smart subsidies," where government support is directed at areas with clear developmental impacts rather than blanket subsidies that fail to address underlying economic issues.

The transition away from fuel subsidies also aligns Nigeria with global trends toward reducing fossil fuel reliance and addressing environmental concerns. This shift reflects a growing awareness of the need for sustainable energy practices and a more resilient economic framework. However, successful reform will require clear communication and public engagement to mitigate the immediate impacts on the populace and prevent further public resistance, while ensuring that future investments yield visible, tangible benefits for the broader population.

Impact of Fuel Subsidy Removal

The immediate effects of full deregulation have been far-reaching, but so are the long-term implications. The pump price of petrol has further increased by over 100 per cent, as petrol now sells between N998 and N1,100 and even N1,200 at some fuel stations. At the moment, Nigerians are grappling with the shift while awaiting the expected benefits of deregulation, with the foreign exchange starring them in the face. With the new pump price adjustment across the country, the Nigeria Labour Congress called for a reversal of the pump price hike, arguing that the new cost of the commodity will further "deepen poverty as production capacities dip." It said, "In light of this, we urge the government to immediately reverse this rate

hike as previous increases did not produce any good results. People only got poorer." (Afolabi, 2024).

Transportation cost: The removal of fuel subsidies has a direct impact on transportation costs, as fuel is a major input in the transportation sector. In Nigeria, where the majority of people rely on public transportation, the increase in fuel prices following subsidy removal has led to a corresponding increase in transport fares. A study by Olarewaju (2023) found that transportation costs in Lagos increased by an average of 60% within three months of the subsidy removal, with similar trends observed in other major cities. The impact of higher transportation costs is particularly pronounced in rural areas, where access to affordable transportation is already limited. In many rural communities, the cost of transportation has doubled, making it more difficult for people to travel to markets, schools, and healthcare facilities. This has had a knock-on effect on the prices of goods and services, as traders pass on the higher cost of transportation to consumers.

Several studies have examined the broader economic implications of higher transportation costs. Ajakaiye et al. (2015) argue that increased transportation costs lead to higher inflation, as the cost of moving goods from one location to another rises. This is particularly problematic in Nigeria, where a large proportion of goods are transported by road. The increase in transportation costs has also affected the informal sector, which accounts for a significant portion of the Nigerian economy. Many small business owners, particularly those in the transportation and retail sectors, have been forced to raise prices or cut back on operations due to the higher cost of fuel.

The ripple effects of increased transportation costs extend beyond consumer prices, influencing productivity and access to employment. For many workers, particularly those in urban areas, rising transport fares have made commuting to work more costly and burdensome, leading to an increased financial strain on households already facing economic challenges. In rural areas, where alternatives to fuel-dependent transport are limited, the impact is even more severe, with some individuals reducing travel frequency to essential trips only, thereby limiting access to economic opportunities and social services.

Food inflation: Additionally, higher transportation costs have influenced food security, as much of Nigeria's food supply is transported from rural agricultural areas to urban centers. Farmers, now burdened by elevated transportation costs, have been forced to increase the prices of produce to offset the expenses, which in turn contributes to food price inflation in urban markets. A World Bank report (2023) highlighted that food prices in Nigeria have risen by over 30% in some areas since subsidy removal, intensifying food insecurity among low-income households.

Folding up of SME: The overall economic climate has also been affected, as increased operational costs have pressured small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that rely on road transport for logistics. For many SMEs, profit margins have shrunk due to higher transportation expenses, leading some businesses to cut back on staffing or reduce output. The ongoing challenge for the Nigerian government is to create compensatory measures, such as targeted subsidies or direct financial aid, to support vulnerable groups and foster economic resilience amid the transition away from fuel subsidies.

Social implication: The removal of the fuel subsidy has also had significant social implications, particularly for low-income households. A study by Umar and Umar (2024) found that the increase in transportation costs has disproportionately affected the poor, who spend a larger share of their income on transportation. In urban areas, many low-income earners have been forced to walk long distances or cut back on other essential expenditures, such as food and healthcare, to afford transportation.

Increase poverty level: The World Bank (2022) estimates that the removal of fuel subsidies in developing countries often leads to an increase in poverty rates, as the poorest households are least able to absorb the higher costs of living. In Nigeria, where over 40% of the population lives below the poverty line, the removal of the fuel subsidy has further exacerbated income inequality and social unrest. Protests and strikes organized by labor unions and civil society groups have become a common response to the rising cost of living.

Moreover, the removal of fuel subsidies has led to concerns about the government's ability to provide social safety nets for the most vulnerable populations. While the government has promised to use the savings from the subsidy removal to invest in infrastructure and social programs, many Nigerians remain skeptical, given the country's history of corruption and mismanagement of public funds.

Benefits of Fuel Subsidy Removal

All hope is not lost as the subsidy removal comes with lots of benefits which will be experienced in a short while.

Financial resources are freed up for the development of other sectors: Other studies suggest that the savings from fuel subsidy removal could be channeled for the development of other sectors of the economy (Gidigbi and Bello, 2020; Ogunode, Ahmed and Olugbenga, 2023). In addition to developing Nigeria's critical public infrastructure, the removal of fuel subsidy can free up financial resources for the development of other sectors that require significant government intervention and funding.

Budget deficit: the removal of fuel subsidy could generate a budget surplus in the near future. Another positive macroeconomic implication of the removal of fuel subsidy is that the funds would be used to fund the current budget deficit. Existing studies show that fuel subsidy contributes to Nigeria's rising fiscal deficit and call for the need to remove fuel subsidy (Harun et al, 2018; Adagunodo, 2022). Historically, Nigeria has had a budget deficit in the last 10 years. Figure 2 shows that Nigeria's budget to GDP ratio has remained in negative territory for over a decade. More recently, the petrol subsidy was billed to consume ₦4 trillion in 2022 and a whooping ₦17 trillion in 2023 (see figure 3), meanwhile the approved 2023 budget was only ₦21.83 trillion.

Reduced government borrowing: There have been debates about the adverse effect of fuel subsidy payments on government borrowing (Okongwu and Imoisi, 2022). Since the start of the fuel subsidy regime, the Nigerian government has been borrowing, and the borrowing worsened during the 2016 recession and the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic (Ozili, 2022). Recently, in 2022, the government constantly

borrowed from the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) through the ways and means provision for debt repayment and subsidy payment.

Increase in employment another positive macroeconomic: Implication of the fuel subsidy removal is that it would create jobs. The total deregulation of the downstream sector will allow more companies to import fuel at competitive rates (Olujobi, 2021). These companies will hire workers, thereby creating jobs. Also, the reinvigoration of domestic refineries in Nigeria will lead to job creation.

Policy Alternatives and Way Out of Fuel Subsidies

How the full deregulation of the oil sector was carried out demonstrated that the government would be resolute. The way it quelled uprisings against the fuel hike and the attendant harsh economy is worth studying. The President, in some of his campaign outings, stated that no matter how long the protests held, he would remove subsidies, and he had done so. Nigerians should, however, brace up and face realities.

In the wake of rising petrol prices, the government has been promoting alternatives like Compressed Natural Gas through the Presidential CNG Initiative. CNG is a cleaner and more affordable alternative to petrol, and it is priced significantly lower, offering immediate relief to consumers. The government has initiated a "convert-now-pay-later" scheme to help vehicle owners switch to CNG, and more CNG stations are being set up across the country.

CNG adoption is expected to reduce transportation costs and decrease Nigeria's dependence on petrol. The shift to cleaner energy sources also aligns with global trends toward reducing carbon emissions and promoting environmental sustainability. This diversification will provide Nigerians with more energy options and help mitigate the impact of volatile global oil prices.

Nigerians should hope for more investments in critical infrastructure as the government pledged to use the savings from subsidy removal for developmental projects. Now, the citizens must hold the government accountable for how these funds are spent, ensuring that they are used to improve essential services and the quality of life for all citizens.

The real economic gains will be how local refining contributes to industrialization, job creation, and infrastructure development. Dangote Refinery and other local refiners will help drive investment in downstream infrastructure which has stagnated for over four decades. Thousands of jobs will be created across the value chain, from refining to distribution, and the overall economic environment will improve.

Also, local refining will significantly reduce Nigeria's dependence on imported petroleum products. This has the potential to stabilize the country's forex market and strengthen the Naira. By producing and refining oil domestically, Nigeria can retain more of its economic value within the country, reducing the demand for foreign currency and ultimately helping to curb inflation. In the future, Nigeria's ambition to become a net exporter of petroleum products will not only earn forex but will also bolster its standing in global markets.

Other alternative approaches include:
In response to the challenges posed by the removal of fuel subsidies, several policy alternatives have been proposed. One common approach is to replace subsidies with targeted cash transfers to low-income households. This approach has been successfully implemented in countries like Iran and Indonesia, where the government provided direct payments to offset the higher cost of fuel. In Nigeria, however, attempts to implement cash transfer programs have been met with logistical challenges, including difficulties in identifying and reaching the most vulnerable populations.

Another policy response is to promote investment in public transportation as a way to reduce dependence on private vehicles and mitigate the impact of higher fuel prices. In countries like Brazil and Mexico, governments have invested in metro systems and bus rapid transit (BRT) networks to provide affordable transportation alternatives to low-income earners. In Nigeria, the government has made similar promises, but progress has been slow due to budgetary constraints and bureaucratic inefficiencies.

Finally, some economists have called for the development of renewable energy sources as a long-term solution to the country's energy challenges. By investing in

solar, wind, and hydroelectric power, Nigeria could reduce its dependence on fossil fuels and create a more sustainable and diversified energy sector. However, the transition to renewable energy requires significant upfront investment and political will, both of which have been lacking in Nigeria's energy policy.

Conclusion/Recommendations

The paper has demonstrated that subsidy removal policy is not limited to Nigeria alone as other countries too went through the phase. In analyzing the fuel subsidy removal, Keynes and neo-liberal economic theories were adopted to explain both the force of market as well as the role of government in few interventionist policies. Removal of fuel subsidy came with lots of suffering and pains to Nigerians as the paper as enumerated but if the savings from the removal of the fuel subsidy is judiciously managed the Nigerians can at a long time be the beneficiary of such gains.

It is however recommended that, before such critical and sensitive policy like subsidy of fuel is removed, government ought to have provide alternatives to fuel, put palliative measure in place to cushion the attendant consequences of such removal but reverse was the case in Nigeria where it was hurriedly removed without corresponding alternative provisions. And that, government should expedite actions on the provision of convertible centers for CNG as well as encourage CNG public buses to ease transportation problems among civil servants.

References

Afolabi Laou (2024) Grappling with tough economic implications of total fuel subsidy removal. Retrieved from https://punchng.com/grappling-with-tough-economic-implications-of-total-fuel-subsidremoval/#:~:text=The%20subsidy%2C%20which%20for%20years,surge%20in%20petrol%20prices%20nationwide.

Coady, D., Grosh, M., & Hoddinott, J. (2010). Targeting Transfers in Developing Countries: Review of Lessons and Experience. The World Bank. DOI: 10.1596/978-0-8213-8098-5

Del Granado, J. A., Coady, D., & Gillingham, R. (2012). The Unequal Benefits of Fuel Subsidies: A Review of the Evidence and Policy Options. The World Bank. DOI: 10.1596/978-0-8213-9622-

Olarewaju, T. (2023). Impact of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Transportation Costs in Nigeria: An Empirical Analysis. Journal of Transport Economics and Policy, 57(1), 35-55.

Ajakaiye, O., et al. (2015). The Impact of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Inflation and the Cost of Living in Nigeria. Nigerian Economic Society.

World Bank. (2023). Nigeria: The Effects of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Economic Growth and Poverty. World Bank Publications. DOI: 10.1596/978-1-4648-1699-1

International Monetary Fund. (2023). Fuel Subsidy Reforms in Nigeria: An Analysis of Impact and Policy Options. IMF Working Papers. DOI: 10.5089/9781513598946.001

Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2024). Economic Bulletin: Inflation and Transportation Costs Post-Fuel Subsidy Removal. CBN Publications, Vol 9, pp. 45-58.

International Monetary Fund (IMF) (2023). Nigeria's Fuel Subsidy Reforms: Economic Implications and Policy Recommendations. IMF Policy Papers, No. 22-145, Washington, D.C.

Gidigbi, M. O., & Bello, K. M. (2020). Petroleum Subsidy Reduction and Poverty in Nigeria: A Choice between Maintaining the Subsidy or Providing Infrastructural Services Equivalent to the Deadweight Loss. Asian Development Perspectives (ADP), 11(1), 70-8

Ogunode, N. J., Ahmed, I., & Olugbenga, A. V. (2023). Application of Petrol Subsidy Funds to Address the Problems of Universal Basic Education for Sustainable Development in Nigeria. Web of Scholars: Multidimensional Research Journal, 2(1), 1-9.

Okongwu, C. J., & Imoisi, S. E. (2022). Removal of Petrol Subsidy: Legal Implications for the Nigerian Economy. Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence, 13(2), 135-139.

Harun, M., Mat, S. H. C., Fadzim, W. R., Khan, S. J. M., & Noor, M. S. Z. (2018). The effects of fuel subsidy removal on input costs of productions: Leontief input-output price model. International Journal of Supply Chain Management, 7(5), 529-534.

Adagunodo, M. (2022). The Effect of Oil Receipts and Fuel Subsidy Payment on the Current Account Deficit in Nigeria and Venezuela. Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series, 22(1), 137-152

Okongwu, C. J., & Imoisi, S. E. (2022). Removal of Petrol Subsidy: Legal Implications for the Nigerian Economy. Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence, 13(2), 135-139. Olujobi, O. J. (2021). Deregulation of the downstream petroleum industry: An overview of the legal quandaries and proposal for improvement in Nigeria. Heliyon, 7(4), e06848.

Ozili, P. K., & Ozen, E. (2021). Global energy crisis: impact on the global economy. In Proceedings of IAC in Budapest 2021 (Vol. 1, pp. 85-89). Czech Institute of Academic Education.

Umeji, G., & Eleanya, E. (2021). Assessing the Impact of Fuel Subsidy Removal in Nigeria on the Poor in the COVID-19 Era. SERBD-International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences.

Chelminski, K. (2018). Fossil fuel subsidy reform in Indonesia. The politics of fossil fuel subsidies and their reform, 193-211. Couharde, C., & Mouhoud, S. (2020). Fossil fuel subsidies, income inequality, and poverty: Evidence from developing countries. Journal of Economic Surveys, 34(5), 981-1006. Dartanto, T. (2013). Reducing fuel subsidies and the implication on fiscal balance and poverty in Indonesia: A simulation analysis. Energy policy, 58, 117-134.

Antimiani, A., Costantini, V., & Paglialunga, E. (2023). Fossil fuels subsidy removal and the EU carbon neutrality policy. Energy Economics, 119, 106524. Asare, J., Reguant, M., Saab, M., & Sacchetto, C. (2020). Low oil prices during COVID-19 and the case for removing fuel subsidies. Internation Growth Centre, August, 1-15.

Harring, N., Jönsson, E., Matti, S., Mundaca, G., & Jagers, S. C. (2023). Cross-national analysis of attitudes towards fossil fuel subsidy removal. Nature Climate Change, 13(3), 244-249

Ouyang, X., & Lin, B. (2014). Impacts of increasing renewable energy subsidies and phasing out fossil fuel subsidies in China. Renewable and sustainable energy reviews, 37, 933-942