Available online www.unicrossjournals.com

UNICROSS JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, UJOST

RESEARCH ARTICLE VOL. 4(3) SEPTEMBER, 2025 ISSN:2814-2233

Date Approved September 30, 2025 Pages 188 – 202

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF OIL SPILL REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IN OGONI-LAND, NIGERIA

[*1]Umoren, E.S., [2]Uloh, C.O. and [3]Benson, D.N.

[1]Department of Sustainability and Environmental Management
Coventry University, Coventry, United Kingdom.
[2]Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development
University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
[3]Department of Agricultural Education
Federal College of Education (Technical), Omoku, Rivers State, Nigeria.
[*]Corresponding author's email: umorene3@coventry.ac.uk

Abstract

Oil exploration and production play a critical role in global energy security but pose severe environmental risks, particularly through oil spills that damage ecosystems, livelihoods, and public health. Effective regulatory frameworks are therefore central to mitigating these impacts and achieving environmental sustainability. This study evaluated oil spill regulatory frameworks by examining global best practices in prevention, response, and remediation, and comparing them with Nigeria's framework using the Contextual Interaction Theory (CIT) lens. A qualitative comparative case study approach was adopted, drawing on secondary data from peer-reviewed literature, policy documents, and institutional reports from countries with advanced oil spill governance, including the United States, Canada, Norway, and Australia. Findings reveal that these countries integrate strong legal regimes, institutional capacity, real-time monitoring, stakeholder engagement, and strict liability mechanisms into their frameworks, enabling rapid responses and accountability. In contrast, Nigeria's framework, particularly in Ogoni-land, is characterized by weak enforcement, underfunded institutions, limited technological adoption, and lack of community trust, resulting in persistent pollution and delayed remediation despite existing policies and UNEP recommendations. The study concluded that Nigeria's oil spill governance challenges are not due to absence of laws but systemic institutional and political weaknesses that undermine effective implementation. Based on these findings, it was therefore recommended that Nigeria strengthen institutional autonomy and capacity, introduce strict liability frameworks, fully implement the UNEP Ogoni Report, foster community participation, invest in technology and training, promote transparency, and enhance international collaboration to achieve sustainable oil spill management.

Keywords: Oil spills, Regulatory frameworks, Environmental sustainability, Ogoni-land, Contextual Interaction Theory

1.0 Introduction

Oil exploration and production have become integral to global energy supply, yet they carry profound environmental risks that require robust regulatory frameworks to ensure sustainability. Oil spills, a common byproduct of petroleum extraction and transportation, significantly disrupt ecological balance, contaminate soil and water, and threaten human and aquatic life (Asif *et al*., 2022; Adeniran, Oladunjoye and Doro, 2023). Globally, several countries have developed stringent legal, institutional, and technological measures to mitigate oil spill incidents, emphasizing preventive strategies, rapid response mechanisms, and environmental restoration (Little, Sheppard, and Hulme, 2021; Ogbu, Ozowe, and Ikevuje, 2024). These frameworks often incorporate contextual interactive approaches, integrating stakeholder participation, adaptive management practices, and continuous monitoring to enhance environmental sustainability (Dhali, Hassan, and Subramaniam, 2023). Despite international best practices, disparities remain in the effectiveness of national frameworks, particularly in developing countries, where institutional weaknesses, fragmented policies, and inadequate enforcement often exacerbate environmental degradation (Akindipe, 2023; Ignatius *et al*., 2023; Ebisi, Guo, and Soomro, 2025). Studies have highlighted that gaps in implementation, insufficient stakeholder engagement, and limited incorporation of global lessons hinder the achievement of sustainable outcomes in oil spill governance (Ukhurebor *et al*., 2021; Nathan *et al*., 2021).

In Nigeria, the Niger Delta remains the epicenter of oil-related environmental crises, with Ogoni-Land exemplifying the severe consequences of inadequate oil spill regulation. Extensive oil spillage in the region has led to soil infertility, contamination of groundwater, loss of biodiversity, and adverse public health impacts on local communities (Ewim, Orikpete, and Scott, 2023; Nkem, Devine, and Ogaji, 2024). The situation is compounded by ineffective monitoring, delayed responses, and weak enforcement of existing regulations, resulting in prolonged ecological degradation and socioeconomic distress (Omokaro, 2025). Despite national frameworks such as the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency (NOSDRA), implementation gaps persist, and lessons from global best practices remain underutilized (Akindipe, 2023; Ogbu *et al*., 2024; Sam and Zibima, 2024). Previous research has addressed the environmental impacts of oil spills in the Niger Delta and proposed technical remediation strategies (Ibukun *et al*., 2024; Adeniran *et al*., 2023), yet few studies have systematically compared Nigeria's regulatory framework with internationally recognized best practices using contextual interactive approaches. This gap underscores the need for a comparative analysis that not only identifies strengths and weaknesses but also provides evidence-based recommendations for enhancing regulatory effectiveness and promoting environmental sustainability.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study was to evaluate oil spill regulatory frameworks in the context of environmental sustainability. The specific objectives were to:

i. examine global best practices in oil spill regulatory frameworks and response mechanisms using a contextual interactive theory analysis;
ii. compare Nigeria's oil spill regulatory framework with globally recognized best practices using the same analytical lens.

2.0 Methodology

This study adopted a qualitative comparative case study approach to evaluate oil spill regulatory frameworks and response mechanisms in Nigeria and selected countries with recognized best practices, including the United States, Canada, Norway, and Australia. This approach was considered appropriate because it allows for an in-depth exploration of regulatory policies, institutional arrangements, and response mechanisms while enabling systematic comparisons across diverse national contexts (Asif *et al*., 2022; Jacob, Amadike, and Nwanesi, 2024). Data on global best practices were obtained through a comprehensive review of secondary sources, including peer-reviewed journals, government reports, policy documents, and case studies detailing effective oil spill management strategies (Ogbu, Ozowe, and Ikevuje, 2024; Dhali, Hassan, and Subramaniam, 2023). Nigerian regulatory data were similarly sourced from official policy documents, reports by the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency (NOSDRA), Environmental Guidelines and Standards for the Petroleum Industry in Nigeria (EGASPIN), and relevant UNEP assessments of Ogoni-Land (Sam and Zibima, 2024; Tokpo and Rufus, 2025).

Data analysis was conducted using the Contextual Interactive Theory (CIT), which emphasizes the interaction of institutional context, actor cognition, motivation, and capacity in shaping regulatory outcomes (Little, Sheppard, and Hulme, 2021; Ogbu *et al*., 2024). For the first objective, CIT was applied to examine global best practices, highlighting institutional arrangements, stakeholder engagement, technological innovations, and enforcement mechanisms that contribute to effective spill management. For the second objective, a comparative content analysis was employed to evaluate Nigeria's oil spill regulatory framework against the identified global best practices. This involved assessing textual data from Nigerian regulatory documents and international frameworks to identify gaps, strengths, and weaknesses in enforcement, compliance, and stakeholder inclusion (Ukhurebor *et al*., 2021; Ibukun *et al*., 2024). The analytical process facilitated the identification of areas in which Nigeria's regulatory framework could be enhanced to achieve sustainable oil spill management in Ogoni-Land.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Global Best Practices in Oil Spill Regulatory Frameworks and Response Mechanisms

The review of selected countries shows that advanced economies operate under strong regulatory frameworks that integrate prevention, response, and compensation

mechanisms. In the United States, the Oil Pollution Act provides a comprehensive system linking prevention with liability and response measures. Canada operates a federal–provincial system emphasizing spill response and environmental protection. Norway applies strict liability under the Pollution Control Act and has institutionalized real-time monitoring. Australia implements an integrated national plan coordinated by a central maritime safety authority, which has evolved through lessons from past disasters. Together, these systems illustrate a proactive approach anchored in strong institutions, clear legislation, and emphasis on preparedness.

The findings demonstrate that countries with advanced oil spill regulatory frameworks rely on strong institutional capacity, legal clarity, and a culture of accountability. This aligns with Tewari *et al*. (2024), who emphasized that Canada's environmental governance benefits from cooperative federalism and shared responsibility, which enhances inclusivity in policy implementation. Similarly, Norway's reliance on strict liability provisions and advanced monitoring reflects broader Nordic environmental ethics and high public trust in institutions (Chipangamate and Nwaila, 2024). The integration of emergency preparedness in Australia is consistent with global recognition of the role of institutional memory in shaping regulatory effectiveness (Little *et al*., 2021).

In contrast, studies of Nigeria's Niger Delta have shown that weak enforcement and institutional capture hinder comparable progress (Akindipe, 2023; Omokaro *et al*., 2025). This divergence underscores that robust frameworks emerge where regulatory independence, political will, and societal pressure converge. The emphasis on prevention in these countries reflects lessons from historical oil spills that triggered significant policy reforms, whereas Nigeria has yet to institutionalize such learning processes (Jacob *et al*., 2024; Ogbu *et al*., 2024). The implication is that durable frameworks require continuous adaptation, supported by legal innovation and technical expertise.

Table 1. Overview of oil spill regulatory frameworks in selected countries

Country	Regulatory Agencies	Key Legislation	Year Enacted	Primary Focus
USA	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Coast Guard	Oil Pollution Act	1990	Prevention, response, compensation
Canada	Environment Canada; National Energy Board	Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act	1985	Spill response, environmental protection
Norway	Norwegian Environment Agency; Norwegian Coastal Administration	Pollution Control Act	1981	Strict liability; real-time monitoring
Australia	Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA)	National Plan for Maritime Environmental Emergencies	1973	Integrated emergency response

Source: Adapted from Greer (2022); Cucinelli et al. (2024); Osthagen et al. (2022); Horne et al. (2024).

The comparative analysis highlights marked differences across the four CIT dimensions. While developed countries exhibit strong institutional structures, technical capacity, and societal motivation for enforcement, Nigeria faces persistent institutional weakness, political interference, and underfunded agencies. Cognition and capacity in developed contexts are enhanced through research, training, and technological investment, while in Nigeria, oil companies dominate the knowledge space, leaving regulators and communities with limited expertise. Motivation for enforcement in developed countries is shaped by accountability mechanisms and public pressure, while in Nigeria, political and economic interests often override environmental priorities.

The comparative analysis illustrates that the gaps between Nigeria and developed countries are systemic and rooted in institutional fragility, political economy, and socio-cultural dynamics. As Akindipe (2023) observed, Nigeria's legal framework for oil spill management is fragmented and poorly enforced, leading to regulatory inertia. This is consistent with Tokpo and Rufus (2025), who argue that agencies such as NOSDRA lack both the autonomy and resources required for effective oversight. By contrast, the USA and Canada demonstrate how institutional authority, clear liability regimes, and strong inter-agency coordination can sustain regulatory effectiveness (Ekunke *et al*., 2025).

The dominance of oil companies in shaping technical knowledge in Nigeria reflects a broader political-industrial ecology, where state and corporate interests align against community concerns (Omokaro, 2024). In contrast, Norway's regulatory culture embeds environmental protection within governance structures, reflecting broader societal values (Chipangamate and Nwaila, 2024). The lack of community trust in Nigeria further deepens regulatory gaps, as observed in Ogoniland where decades of neglect have led to widespread unrest and skepticism toward government interventions (Sam and Zibima, 2024; Nkem *et al*., 2024).

These findings confirm earlier assessments that Nigeria's regulatory shortcomings are not due to the absence of legal provisions but their weak implementation and lack of enforcement motivation (Tonghan-Ekpemupolo and Gasiokwu, 2024). While developed countries have leveraged disasters as catalysts for institutional reform, Nigeria has yet to transform crisis into opportunity for systemic change (Lindén and Pålsson, 2013; Ewim *et al*., 2023). This divergence highlights that effective frameworks rely not only on technical tools but also on political will, social legitimacy, and sustained accountability mechanisms.

.

Table 2. Comparative analysis of global best practices in oil spill regulatory frameworks and response mechanisms using contextual interaction theory (CIT)

CIT Dimension	Nigeria	USA	Canada	Norway	Australia
Context (Institutional, political, cultural, environmental factors)	Weak regulatory institutions; history of poor enforcement; politicisation of oil sector; Niger Delta environmental crises; community agitation and unrest	Strong legal and institutional frameworks (e.g., Clean Water Act); well-established disaster response systems; political will to enforce laws	Shared federal–provincial responsibility; progressive environmental policies; local inclusion in decision-making; stable political environment	Strategic environmental standards; strong Nordic environmental ethics; transparent governance; high institutional trust	Federal–state–local collaboration; strong marine protection focus; integrated coastal management; lessons from Montara spill
Cognition (Actors' understanding of problems and regulatory tools)	Limited technical knowledge among local communities; regulators may lack expertise; oil companies dominate knowledge spaces	High cognitive capacity across agencies; continuous research and training; strong public awareness	Strong regulatory expertise; clear stakeholder guidelines; high public environmental consciousness	Deep understanding of ecological risks; investment in R&D; regulators and industry possess advanced knowledge	Sophisticated risk assessment models; institutional memory of past disasters; strong use of science in planning
Motivation (Values, will, and priorities for regulation)	Driven by political interests; low enforcement motivation; companies profit-driven; communities driven by survival and restitution	Strong motivation from public pressure and liability laws; environmental protection prioritized	Motivation rooted in climate and biodiversity protection; strong demand for accountability	High motivation from public and state; environmentalism embedded in national identity	Strong political and civil society motivation; proactive risk management by regulatory bodies
Capacity (Resources,	Underfunded agencies (e.g.,	Well-funded agencies (e.g.,	Strong technical and	Well-equipped regulatory	Strong federal agencies (e.g.,

authority, institutional ability)	NOSDRA); overlap and conflicts (DPR, NNPC, NESREA); limited monitoring equipment; poor spill-response infrastructure	EPA, USCG); robust inter-agency coordination; advanced spill-response technology	financial capacity; collaboration between federal and provincial bodies; modern equipment	institutions (e.g., PSA); adequate staffing and autonomy; effective enforcement	NOPSEMA); comprehensive legal frameworks (e.g., OPGGS Act); high emergency preparedness

Source: Authors' compilation (2025).

3.2 Compare Nigeria's Oil Spill Regulatory Framework with Globally Recognized Best Practices in Enforcement and Compliance

The comparative analysis highlights significant gaps between Nigeria's oil spill regulatory framework and global best practices. In Nigeria, the regulatory context is marked by decades of oil exploitation, weak enforcement, and persistent community distrust. While agencies such as NOSDRA and NESREA exist and the UNEP report provides guidance, implementation remains delayed and politicized. Regulatory transformation is constrained by limited institutional capacity, weak liability mechanisms, and poor transparency. The outcome has been ongoing pollution, slow remediation, and distrust in governance structures.

In contrast, Canada, Norway, Australia, and the USA demonstrate stronger governance, clear liability systems, robust enforcement, and rapid response mechanisms. Their frameworks emphasize transparency, stakeholder engagement, and integration of environmental sustainability into oil sector regulation. The Nigerian case shows a lack of alignment with these global standards, underlining the need for reforms in enforcement culture, institutional capacity, liability regimes, and community participation.

The findings reveal that Nigeria's oil spill regulatory framework in Ogoni-land remains poorly aligned with global best practices, largely due to weak enforcement, inadequate institutional capacity, and lack of community trust. This reflects the broader pattern of institutional and governance failures documented in the Niger Delta, where weak implementation of environmental regulations has undermined sustainability efforts (Omokaro *et al*., 2025; Tokpo and Rufus, 2025). In contrast, countries such as Norway and Canada have established strict liability regimes and transparent monitoring systems, which ensure accountability and foster trust between regulators, companies, and communities (Tewari *et al*., 2024).

The persistence of pollution in Ogoni-land despite the UNEP report and ongoing

regulatory reforms highlights the problem of poor implementation rather than absence of legislation, echoing the arguments of Makinde (2020) and Lawuyi (2022) that enforcement deficits are central to Nigeria's regulatory weakness. This stands in sharp contrast with countries like the USA, where strong legal deterrence and advanced monitoring technologies have enhanced compliance (Ogbu *et al*., 2024; Ekunke *et al*., 2025).

A key trend is the limited role of community engagement in Nigeria's regulatory system, which has contributed to deep mistrust and social conflict. This finding supports earlier work showing how exclusion from decision-making has perpetuated resistance and hindered environmental restoration in Ogoni-land (Sam and Zibima, 2024; Nkem *et al*., 2024). In contrast, global best practices embed indigenous and community rights into regulatory processes, creating more inclusive and effective governance systems (Sam *et al*., 2024).

Another finding is Nigeria's lack of transparency in data and enforcement processes, which reduces accountability and enables corporate impunity. Akindipe (2023) and Tonghan-Ekpemupolo and Gasiokwu (2024) similarly emphasize the inadequacy of liability structures and the failure to impose effective sanctions. This is at odds with Canada's and Norway's transparent reporting frameworks, where enforcement outcomes are made public, thereby deterring non-compliance.

The analysis also suggests that technological adoption remains limited in Nigeria compared to advanced monitoring, satellite surveillance, and integrated emergency systems used in developed jurisdictions (Ekunke *et al*., 2025). This gap may be attributed to chronic underfunding of regulators and political interference in enforcement, consistent with the broader governance challenges described by Omokaro (2024) and Bodo (2019).

The implications of these findings are significant for environmental sustainability. Without stronger enforcement mechanisms, community participation, and alignment with international standards, remediation in Ogoni-land may remain ineffective and mistrust between communities and the state may persist. These results reinforce earlier warnings that Nigeria's regulatory failures are not only technical but deeply rooted in political and institutional dynamics that continue to obstruct sustainable development in the Niger Delta (Lindén and Pålsson, 2013; Ukhurebor *et al*., 2021).

Table 3. Comparative analysis of Nigeria's oil spill regulatory framework and globally recognized best practices in enforcement and compliance (Using CIT Model)

CIT Component	Nigeria (Ogoni-Land)	Canada	Norway	Australia	USA
Context	• Heavy oil exploitation since 1950s (mainly Shell) • Severe environmental degradation, land/water contamination • Weak enforcement, corruption, community distrust • Ogoni crisis and activism (Ken Saro-Wiwa)	• Oil and gas mainly in Alberta • Strong environmental consciousness • Indigenous rights and transparent governance	• Major offshore oil producer (North Sea) • Oversight via Petroleum Safety Authority (PSA) • Sustainable extraction emphasis	• Rich offshore petroleum reserves • Integrated emergency/spill response • Balanced development and environment	• Large oil producer and consumer • Major historical spills (e.g., Deepwater Horizon) • Strong legal framework and rapid response
Input	• NESREA, NOSDRA, DPR (now NUPRC) • EGASPIN standards • UNEP (2011) Ogoni report on cleanup	• Canadian Environmental Protection Act • Canadian Energy Regulator • National Oil Spill Preparedness and Response Regime	• Petroleum Act • Norwegian Environment Agency and PSA • Regular Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs)	• Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Act • NOPSEMA • Independent oversight mechanisms	• Oil Pollution Act (1990), Clean Water Act • EPA, NOAA, Coast Guard • National Response Center coordination

Transformation	• Weak enforcement of laws • Limited NOSDRA capacity • Politicized regulatory processes • Delayed UNEP cleanup implementation • Poor transparency and community involvement	• Strong industry–regulator collaboration • "Polluter Pays" principle • Effective liability system • Regular audits and inspections	• Strict liability regime • Daily offshore monitoring • Strong whistleblower protections • High worker safety standards	• Risk-based, independent oversight by NOPSEMA • Operators must prove capacity before drilling • Transparent publication of incident data	•Civil/criminal penalties for non-compliance • Joint EPA–USCG enforcement • Satellite and remote sensing for spill detection • Public violation databases
Outcomes / Impact	• Ogoni still heavily polluted • Slow, politicized responses • Persistent community distrust • Limited recovery progress	• Low spill rates • Strong community/indigenous trust • Rapid cleanup responses	• Among world's lowest spill rates • Sustainable practices integrated • High compliance levels	• Strong safety culture • Integrated spill response minimizes damage • Ongoing investment in environmental technology	• Post–Deepwater Horizon improvements • Advanced research on spill prevention • Strong deterrence via fines and prosecutions
Key Gaps in Nigeria	• Weak enforcement culture • Underfunded regulators	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL

	• No strong liability system • Poor community engagement • Lack of data transparency				
Recommendations	• Fully implement UNEP report • Strengthen NOSDRA capacity • Introduce strict liability • Foster community participation • Align laws with global standards	• Enhance stakeholder engagement • Expand technology adoption	• Maintain strict standards • Share best practices internationally	• Share spill-response frameworks with developing states	• Provide training and technical support to Nigerian regulators

Source: Author's compilation (2025).

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

This study shows that Nigeria's oil spill regulatory framework, particularly in Ogoni-land, remains weak when compared with global best practices. While countries such as the USA, Canada, Norway, and Australia demonstrate strong institutions, clear liability regimes, advanced monitoring systems, and community-inclusive governance, Nigeria continues to struggle with weak enforcement, underfunded agencies, limited technical capacity, and low community trust. The persistence of pollution despite existing legislation and UNEP recommendations reflects systemic governance failures rather than the absence of laws. Without addressing institutional fragility, political interference, and enforcement deficits, environmental sustainability in Ogoni-land will remain elusive. Based on the findings, the following actions are recommended:

1. Strengthen Institutional Capacity and Autonomy – Enhance the technical, financial, and operational capacity of NOSDRA and related agencies, ensuring they operate with independence from political and corporate interference.
2. Introduce and Enforce Strict Liability Mechanisms – Adopt and implement robust liability frameworks similar to those in Norway and Canada, ensuring polluters bear full responsibility for remediation and compensation.
3. Fully Implement the UNEP Ogoni Report – Accelerate the cleanup process with transparent timelines, measurable outcomes, and independent oversight to rebuild community trust.
4. Enhance Community Participation – Institutionalize the inclusion of local and indigenous communities in decision-making, monitoring, and enforcement processes, following best practices in Canada and Australia.
5. Promote Transparency and Accountability – Establish open-access databases for oil spill incidents, regulatory actions, and enforcement outcomes to improve accountability and deter corporate impunity.
6. Invest in Technology and Training – Introduce modern spill detection and response technologies, including satellite surveillance and real-time monitoring, coupled with regular training for regulators and first responders.
7. Foster International Collaboration – Leverage partnerships with countries such as the USA, Norway, and Australia to share best practices, capacity-building programs, and technological expertise for improved spill management.

References

Adeniran, M. A., Oladunjoye, M. A. and Doro, K. O. (2023). Soil and groundwater contamination by crude oil spillage: A review and implications for remediation projects in Nigeria. *Frontiers in Environmental Science, 11*, 1–9.

Akindipe, I. (2023). The shoddy legal framework on oil spill in Nigeria: A

call for a potent approach. *Journal of Environmental Law & Policy, 3*, 27–54.

Asif, Z., Chen, Z., An, C. and Dong, J. (2022). Environmental impacts and challenges associated with oil spills on shorelines. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering, 10*(6), 762–781.

Bodo, T. (2019). Deep issues behind the crisis in the Niger Delta region: The case of oil exploration in Ogoniland, Rivers State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Geographical Research, 2*(1), 1–12.

Chipangamate, N. S. and Nwaila, G. T. (2024). Assessment of challenges and strategies for driving energy transitions in emerging markets: A socio-technological systems perspective. *Energy Geoscience, 5*(2), 1–15.

Cucinelli, J., Goerlandt, F. and Pelot, R. (2024). Exploring risk governance deficits for marine oil spill preparedness and response in Canada. In *Area-Based Management of Shipping: Canadian and Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 227–260). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

David, I. L., Sheppard, S. J. and Hulme, D. (2021). A perspective on oil spills: What we should have learned about global warming. *Ocean & Coastal Management, 202*, 1–19.

Dhali, M., Hassan, S. and Subramaniam, U. (2023). Comparative analysis of oil and gas legal frameworks in Bangladesh and Nigeria: A pathway towards achieving sustainable energy through policy. *Sustainability, 15*(21), 15228–15236.

Ebisi, E. A., Guo, Y. and Soomro, Z. A. (2025). Environmental conservation and corporate social responsibility (CSR): Insights from Nigerian oil and gas industry using stakeholder and environmental justice theories. *Administrative Sciences, 15*(7), 275–284.

Ekunke, V., Odor, E., Sani, S., Ojeilua, C., Attairu, M., Ahmed, M. and Elabor, I. (2025). A review of modern technologies and best practices for oil spill containment and response. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 25*, 2117–2128.

Ewim, D. R. E., Orikpete, O. F. and Scott, T. O. (2023). Survey of wastewater issues due to oil spills and pollution in the Niger Delta area of Nigeria: A secondary data analysis. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre, 47*, 116–128.

Horne, R., Humphries, F. and Tranter, K. (2024). Autonomous vessels and the Australian domestic maritime regulatory framework. *University of Tasmania Law Review, 43*(1), 83–130.

Ibukun, O., Drebenstedt, C., Burgess, R. M., Mensah, M., Hoth, N. and Külls, C.

(2024). Remediating oil contamination in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria: Technical options and monitoring strategies. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, *17*, 1–15.

Ignatius, G., Mohd Nawawi, M. G., Mohd, Z. and Farah, B. (2023). Environmental effects from petroleum product transportation spillage in Nigeria: A critical review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 31*, 1–29.

Jacob, O. J., Amadike, M. P. and Nwanesi, F. O. (2024). Oil spillage in Nigeria's coastal waters: Review of causes, effects and mitigation. *IIARD International Journal of Geography & Environmental Management (IJGEM), 10*(3), 370–388.

Lawuyi, R. (2022). Corporate governance compliance and enforcement in Nigeria. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 1–12.

Lindén, O. and Pålsson, J. (2013). Oil contamination in Ogoniland, Niger Delta. *Ambio, 42*(6), 685–701.

Makinde, O. (2020). The Nigerian corporate governance challenge: Inadequacy of laws or question of enforcement? *The Gravitas Review of Business and Property Law*. *12*, 45–58.

Nathan, A., Bennett, J., Le Billon, P., Green, S. J., Cisneros-Montemayor, A. M., Amongin, S., Gray, N. J. and Sumaila, U. R. (2021). Oil, fisheries and coastal communities: A review of impacts on the environment, livelihoods, space and governance. *Energy Research & Social Science, 75*, 1–15.

Nkem, A. C., Devine, S. and Ogaji, D. S. (2024). Economic exclusion and the health and wellbeing impacts of the oil industry in the Niger Delta region: A qualitative study of Ogoni experiences. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 23*, 183–197.

Ogbu, A., Ozowe, W. and Ikevuje, A. H. (2024). Oil spill response strategies: A comparative conceptual study between the USA and Nigeria. *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 20*, 208–227.

Omokaro, G., Efeni, O., Adeyanju, O., Obomejero, J. and Akpotu, E. (2025). Oil spillage in the Niger Delta: Impacts, institutional failures, and policy reforms. *Academia Environmental Sciences and Sustainability, 2*. 1–12.

Osthagen, A., Rottem, S. V., Inderberg, T. H. J., Colgan, C. and Raspotnik, A. (2022). Blue governance: Governing the blue economy in Alaska and North Norway. *AlaskaNor Work Package. 15*, 67–82.

Sam, K. and Zibima, T. (2024). Inclusive environmental decision-making in a developing nation: Insights from the Ogoni remediation project, Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Environmental Management, 73*, 323–337.

Sam, K., Zabbey, N., Vincent-Akpu, I. F., Komi, G., Onyagbodor, P. O. and Babatunde, B. B. (2024). Socio-economic baseline for oil-impacted communities in Ogoniland: Towards a restoration framework in Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research International, 31*(17), 25671–25687.

Tewari, S., Pandey, N. and Dong, J. (2024). Air quality legislation in Australia and Canada—A review. *Challenges, 15*(4), 43–62.

Tokpo, C. E. and Rufus, A. (2025). Environmental policy and sustainable development in Nigeria's Niger Delta: A critical look at the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency (NOSDRA). *International Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences, Environmental Studies & Technology, 9*(1), 87–102.

Tonghan-Ekpemupolo, E. and Gasiokwu, P. I. (2024). The legal challenges of combating oil spillage in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *Global Journal of Politics and Law Research, 12*(5), 52–66.

Ukhurebor, K., Hussain, A., Adetunji, C., Aigbe, U., Onyancha, R. and Abifarin, O. (2021). Environmental implications of petroleum spillages in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria: A review. *Journal of Environmental Management, 293*, 1–21.

.