Available on: https://jefrr.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3650 P-ISSN: 3051-3642

Journal of Economic Finance Research and Review

Volume: 01 Issue: 05 November 2025

The Nigerian Naval Budget Resilience Model Adapting to Economic Shocks and Fiscal Pressures

Osuolale Ayotunde Eyitayo
Military Pensions Board, Nigeria

Published Date: November 01, 2025 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jefrr/V1E5/2025-01**

ABSTRACT: Persistent economic volatility and revenue instability in Nigeria have placed increasing pressure on the financial management systems of the Nigerian Navy. As operational demands rise and fiscal constraints deepen, there is an urgent need for a strategic framework that ensures budgeting flexibility, mission continuity, and long-term sustainability. This paper proposes the Nigerian Naval Budget Resilience Model—a comprehensive approach to enhancing fiscal agility and safeguarding naval operations against macroeconomic shocks. Grounded in principles of adaptability, redundancy, fiscal discipline, and responsiveness, the model integrates risk-based tools such as rolling forecasts, contingency planning protocols, and early warning economic indicators into the budgeting process. It also emphasizes institutional reform by addressing core challenges, including oil-revenue dependency, weak forecasting capacity, and the absence of flexible financial mechanisms. Structural components of the model support decentralized planning and evidence-based allocation while promoting alignment with national fiscal governance systems. The model offers a practical roadmap for embedding resilience within naval financial operations, supported by leadership training, policy directives, and interagency collaboration. Ultimately, this study contributes to the modernization of defense budgeting in Nigeria, fostering a culture of strategic foresight, operational stability, and institutional transparency within the Armed Forces.

KEYWORDS: Naval Budgeting, Fiscal Resilience, Defense Financial Governance, Contingency Planning, Economic Shocks, Public Sector Risk Management.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Strategic Context

Nigeria's economic structure is heavily dependent on oil exports, rendering its fiscal outlook particularly vulnerable to global commodity price fluctuations. As a result, the defense sector, including naval operations, often experiences erratic budgetary flows due to macroeconomic instability [1]. This volatility undermines the long-term planning and sustainability of naval programs critical for national security, such as maritime patrols, infrastructure maintenance, and force readiness. Moreover, global and domestic economic headwinds—from recessionary cycles to inflationary pressures—frequently lead to austerity measures that reduce available funding for the Navy's capital and recurrent expenditures [2, 3].

Given the complexity and scale of Nigeria's maritime threats, including piracy, oil theft, and illegal fishing, consistent funding is indispensable for sustained naval presence and strategic deterrence. However, economic disruptions often lead to the postponement or downsizing of mission-critical operations, impairing operational credibility [4, 5]. The Navy must, therefore, evolve from a reactive budgeting approach to one that anticipates shocks and sustains mission continuity despite financial adversity [6].

A resilient budget framework tailored to the Nigerian Navy is essential for maintaining national maritime security. Such a framework must factor in fiscal risk exposure, identify priority assets, and deploy adaptive financial planning techniques. Establishing this model would allow naval planners to buffer economic shocks, align resources with long-term strategic goals, and preserve defense posture in uncertain fiscal environments [7, 8].

1.2 Problem Statement

The Nigerian Navy faces critical challenges in achieving budgetary stability and operational efficiency amidst recurring economic disruptions. Defense budget allocations are frequently delayed, reduced, or restructured in response to shortfalls in national revenue, particularly when global oil prices slump or domestic inflation surges. This unpredictability erodes planning certainty and forces the Navy into a reactive mode, undermining long-term force development and sustainability [9].

Compounding this issue is the lack of formal contingency protocols within naval budget cycles. Without structured mechanisms to forecast fiscal shocks, reprioritize expenditures, or safeguard essential functions, the Navy often resorts to emergency adjustments that disrupt procurement schedules, compromise training programs, and delay essential maintenance. The absence of budget elasticity and poor fiscal shock preparedness diminishes the Navy's capacity to maintain high operational readiness during economic downturns [9, 10].

These gaps reflect a systemic weakness in fiscal governance and strategic financial planning in naval institutions. The problem is not merely underfunding but the lack of adaptive financial frameworks capable of absorbing and responding to macroeconomic pressures [7]. Addressing this

issue requires a proactive model designed to enhance budget predictability, protect critical operations, and institutionalize fiscal resilience across all levels of naval financial management.

1.3 Research Aim and Contribution

This paper aims to propose a structured and adaptive budget resilience model that strengthens the Nigerian Navy's ability to function effectively under economic stress. The model will integrate predictive fiscal analysis, contingency allocation planning, and flexible resource prioritization into naval financial operations. It draws on core principles of public financial management, defense economics, and strategic foresight to improve how the Navy allocates, adjusts, and safeguards funding during fiscal turbulence.

The proposed Nigerian Naval Budget Resilience Model (NNBRM) is designed not just to mitigate the effects of budget cuts or delays but to institutionalize financial preparedness as a core tenet of naval governance. It promotes a shift from reactive to anticipatory budgeting by embedding scenario analysis, expenditure reprioritization techniques, and mission-critical funding safeguards into the annual and medium-term planning cycles.

By doing so, this research contributes to strengthening Nigeria's defense architecture through improved fiscal discipline, strategic financial autonomy, and sustainable operational capacity. It also advances the discourse on resilience in public-sector budgeting, offering a tailored solution for one of Nigeria's most strategically vital security institutions. The model's adoption would empower naval leadership to maintain readiness and agility in the face of economic shocks while reinforcing public trust in defense resource stewardship.

2. CONCEPTUAL AND POLICY FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Public Financial Resilience and Risk Management

Public financial resilience refers to a government's capacity to anticipate, absorb, and recover from fiscal shocks while maintaining service delivery and operational effectiveness. Central to this concept are fiscal buffers—such as contingency funds and sovereign savings—that cushion the impact of revenue volatility. Equally critical are mechanisms for budget flexibility that allow reallocation of resources without undermining institutional mandates. For navies, such resilience translates into maintaining operational tempo despite national economic turbulence, particularly in countries reliant on a single export commodity like crude oil [11].

Adaptive planning is a core tool within fiscal resilience. It involves scenario-based modeling, stress testing, and the incorporation of risk variables into multi-year budget forecasts. These practices help identify vulnerabilities early and provide a basis for tiered response strategies [12]. Applied to naval budgeting, this might mean predefining scalable mission modules, creating standby procurement options, or adjusting deployment patterns in line with real-time fiscal conditions. By embedding these adaptive elements into planning, institutions can mitigate the operational shocks of sudden budget shortfalls [13, 14].

For the Nigerian Navy, the adoption of a resilience-oriented financial strategy necessitates rethinking traditional annual budgeting. Instead, the emphasis must shift to flexible, rolling frameworks that accommodate uncertainty. This requires institutional commitment to both fiscal discipline and strategic foresight, leveraging lessons from public sector risk management to fortify naval financial governance in the face of macroeconomic instability [15].

2.2 Defense Budgeting Under Volatility

Defense organizations globally have long contended with the challenge of budgeting in volatile economic environments. Countries like the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia have adopted multi-year defense spending frameworks that allow long-term planning with built-in flexibilities [16]. These systems reduce dependence on volatile annual appropriations by enabling force planners to commit to procurement and maintenance cycles with predictable funding horizons. Such stability improves cost-efficiency and enhances readiness, even under shifting political or economic climates [15, 17].

One key strategy employed is modular prioritization, which ranks programs and expenditures based on strategic relevance and their ability to scale up or down. This allows defense institutions to preserve critical capabilities while deferring non-essential projects during budget contractions [18]. Moreover, expenditure elasticity is built into budget lines—allocating portions of funds to be reprogrammable based on emergent needs or unexpected fiscal conditions. These approaches foster resilience by decoupling critical operations from the full volatility of national revenues [19].

In the Nigerian context, similar innovations are rare or underdeveloped. Defense budgeting tends to be rigid, linear, and tied to short-term political cycles. There is limited room for real-time adaptation or internal reprioritization without extensive bureaucratic delays. Introducing multi-year, mission-driven frameworks and embedded contingency planning would align Nigeria's naval budgeting approach with international best practices, creating a platform for sustained resilience in a volatile macroeconomic landscape [18].

2.3 Nigerian Defense and Budgetary Policy Frameworks

The Nigerian defense sector operates under several national fiscal and policy instruments, including the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the Fiscal Responsibility Act, and the Defense Policy Document. These instruments are meant to guide defense planning and budgeting within a broader public finance framework. However, their current configuration offers limited support for real-time fiscal adaptation, largely due to institutional rigidity, implementation gaps, and weak integration of risk management tools. The absence of dynamic financial mechanisms has left naval operations particularly vulnerable to funding delays and disruptions [20, 21].

The MTEF theoretically provides a basis for multi-year budgeting and should enable strategic prioritization of defense expenditure. In practice, however, the Nigerian Navy often experiences inconsistent budget releases, delayed cash backing, and abrupt shifts in capital allocations [22]. This undermines long-term procurement plans, impairs operational readiness, and weakens the sustainability of naval capabilities. These inconsistencies highlight the disconnect between formal budgeting frameworks and the operational realities faced by frontline security institutions [23, 24].

Reforming these frameworks to incorporate fiscal resilience would involve embedding contingency protocols, establishing sector-specific stabilization funds, and improving the timeliness and predictability of fund releases. Moreover, defense budgeting must become more data-driven

and scenario-informed, with closer alignment between national economic forecasting and naval resource planning. Such reforms would significantly enhance the Navy's capacity to respond strategically—not reactively—to economic shocks [25].

3. CHALLENGES TO NAVAL BUDGET RESILIENCE

3.1 Revenue Dependence and Fiscal Rigidity

The Nigerian Navy's financial stability is significantly influenced by the broader fiscal environment of the Nigerian state, which is largely dependent on oil revenues. This mono-product economic structure introduces a high level of vulnerability to external price shocks, such as global oil price declines or production disruptions [26]. When oil revenues fall, defense allocations—often treated as discretionary spending—are among the first to be reduced. This exposes the Navy to unpredictable budget cuts, directly impairing planning, procurement, and operational readiness [27].

Moreover, the current naval budgeting framework exhibits considerable rigidity. Most expenditures are locked into fixed annual appropriations, which offer little room for reprioritization during economic downturns. Naval authorities are often unable to shift funds between capital projects and operational costs, or across departments, even in emergencies. This inflexibility leads to resource underutilization during crises and wastage during boom periods when rushed expenditures are made to absorb sudden budget increases before the fiscal year ends [28].

This rigid structure is exacerbated by a budgeting culture that prioritizes historical trends and line-item inputs over dynamic, performance-based or needs-driven budgeting. As a result, the Nigerian Navy's financial planning fails to reflect evolving threats, emerging technologies, or operational imperatives. This deeply entrenched fiscal rigidity undermines institutional agility and limits the Navy's capacity to adapt to fluctuating economic conditions with resilience or foresight [7].

3.2 Weak Institutional Planning and Forecasting Capacity

One of the most critical weaknesses affecting naval budget resilience is the underdeveloped capacity for strategic forecasting and adaptive planning within naval institutions. There is limited use of structured scenario planning to anticipate various economic futures and their potential impact on force readiness or capital projects. Without such planning capabilities, naval budget managers are often reactive rather than proactive in addressing fiscal volatility, leaving the institution vulnerable to external shocks [7, 29].

Compounding this issue is the absence of real-time economic and operational data integration into the budget planning process. Budget preparation often relies on outdated information, manual reporting systems, and fragmented databases that fail to capture comprehensive cost dynamics or asset conditions [30]. This disconnect makes it difficult to conduct timely risk assessments or adjust forecasts based on shifting conditions such as inflationary pressures, currency fluctuations, or logistics constraints [31].

Additionally, the lack of trained personnel in financial risk analysis and defense economics further weakens the institutional forecasting environment. Officers and planners are frequently promoted based on command experience rather than technical financial expertise, creating a skills gap in areas like cost-benefit modeling, economic scenario simulation, and fiscal stress testing. This institutional deficiency hampers evidence-based decision-making and leaves the Navy's financial planning processes ill-equipped to cope with uncertainty [32, 33].

3.3 Lack of Strategic Reserves and Flexibility Mechanisms

Another central challenge to achieving budgetary resilience is the limited use and development of strategic financial reserves or shock-absorbing mechanisms within the Nigerian Navy's financial architecture. Unlike advanced defense organizations that maintain contingency funds to manage sudden spikes in operational demand or economic downturns, the Nigerian Navy operates without a structured reserve system. This leaves it heavily exposed to disruption when allocations are delayed, reduced, or redirected due to national fiscal stress [34].

Furthermore, there are no robust mechanisms for programmatic scaling or reallocation based on economic conditions [35]. Budget planning is often executed as a rigid, annual exercise with minimal mid-year corrections [36]. Programs continue to receive funding based on outdated assumptions, even when underlying conditions change significantly. This results in misalignment between strategic objectives and available resources, leading to project delays, underfunded operations, or abandoned capital expenditures [37].

Institutional rules and legislative constraints also limit the ability of the Navy to reallocate internal budgets quickly to emerging priorities. For instance, shifting funds from procurement to sustainment or training requires lengthy bureaucratic approval, often rendering the intervention irrelevant by the time it is approved [38].

4. THE NIGERIAN NAVAL BUDGET RESILIENCE MODEL

4.1 Design Principles and Model Objectives

The Nigerian Naval Budget Resilience Model is underpinned by four strategic design principles: adaptability, redundancy, fiscal discipline, and responsiveness. Adaptability refers to the Navy's ability to shift budgetary priorities quickly in response to economic or operational shocks, while redundancy ensures that mission-critical capabilities are not compromised due to single points of fiscal failure. Fiscal discipline mandates the prudent use of resources to reduce waste and promote long-term sustainability, and responsiveness guarantees timely decisions through decentralised financial empowerment supported by central oversight.

The model's overarching objective is to ensure the Navy's ability to maintain core functions—such as maritime patrols, asset maintenance, and personnel readiness—even in periods of economic volatility or budgetary contraction. It aims to shield strategic priorities from sudden funding shortfalls by embedding mechanisms that allow for reprioritization and targeted resource allocation. In doing so, the model seeks to improve the reliability of naval operations regardless of wider fiscal instability.

Strategic goals also include fostering a culture of financial foresight within the service, reducing dependency on emergency appropriations, and establishing long-term sustainability in capital investments. The model encourages a paradigm shift from reactive budgeting to proactive fiscal planning that aligns operational realities with economic trends. It positions the Nigerian Navy to operate with resilience under uncertain fiscal conditions while maintaining alignment with national defense priorities.

4.2 Structural Components and Risk Management Tools

At the core of the resilience model are structural components designed to embed flexibility and risk awareness within the budgetary process. A critical element is the institutionalization of contingency planning protocols, which require each major command to prepare scalable budget scenarios linked to economic conditions. These plans must outline how operations would be adjusted under low, moderate, or severe fiscal contractions, ensuring preparedness for funding volatility without impairing mission-critical tasks.

Complementing these are rolling forecasts, which replace static annual projections with quarterly or semi-annual reviews of budgetary assumptions, cost drivers, and revenue forecasts. This allows the Navy to recalibrate its resource allocation in real time, respond to economic warning signs, and avoid rigid commitments to outdated plans. Additionally, the model introduces adaptive budgeting tiers, allowing for partial execution of non-essential programs when revenue falls below predetermined thresholds—preserving core functions while containing fiscal exposure.

A vital innovation in this framework is the use of early warning economic indicators. These may include commodity price indices, exchange rate fluctuations, fiscal deficit projections, and national debt servicing ratios. By systematically monitoring such indicators, naval budget planners can anticipate fiscal pressures and activate mitigation strategies early. Coupled with risk-sensitive financial dashboards and decision support tools, these mechanisms strengthen the Navy's ability to make informed, timely adjustments in budget planning and execution.

4.3 Integration Pathways and Governance Support

To successfully implement the model, it must be institutionally integrated into the Navy's strategic planning, budgeting, and procurement processes. This requires embedding resilience protocols within the Budget Planning and Monitoring Department, operational commands, and logistics divisions. Each unit would be mandated to adopt adaptive budget frameworks aligned with the overall strategic financial objectives, guided by Navy Headquarters directives and supported by cross-departmental coordination.

Governance support is essential for credibility and effectiveness. The model proposes oversight by a Defense Financial Resilience Task Force, comprising representatives from the Ministry of Defence, the Office of the Accountant-General, and the Budget Office of the Federation. This body would be responsible for validating resilience metrics, monitoring compliance, and issuing guidelines for risk-based financial planning within the Navy. Their endorsement would also help secure buy-in from legislative bodies, thereby smoothing the appropriation process during periods of adjustment [39].

Finally, regulatory alignment is critical to institutionalizing resilience practices. This includes advocating for amendments to the Defence Appropriation Guidelines that would allow for flexible reallocations within sub-heads, mid-year budget adjustments, and multi-year programming based on performance and need. Such reforms, supported by capacity building in risk-based public financial management, will ensure that the Navy's budget resilience model is not only theoretically sound but practically sustainable within Nigeria's evolving fiscal landscape [40, 41].

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of Strategic Benefits

The Nigerian Naval Budget Resilience Model provides a structured approach to managing fiscal uncertainty while preserving the operational integrity of the Navy. By emphasizing adaptability, rolling forecasts, and risk-based contingency planning, the model ensures funding predictability for mission-critical operations. This significantly reduces the disruptive impact of budget shortfalls, delays in capital procurement, and inconsistent operational funding, which have historically undermined readiness and effectiveness.

Moreover, the model promotes operational continuity by aligning budget planning with real-time economic indicators and strategic priorities. Through the incorporation of adaptive budgeting tiers, units can scale operations according to available resources without compromising core functions. This embedded flexibility empowers commanders to make informed resource decisions in dynamic financial environments. It also improves accountability by linking budget execution to transparent and traceable performance metrics.

Finally, the integration of early warning tools and scenario planning ensures that the Nigerian Navy becomes more proactive rather than reactive in its financial strategy. These tools facilitate timely decision-making and increase the institution's capacity to mitigate fiscal risks before they evolve into crises. Taken together, these components embed resilience into naval financial systems, enabling long-term sustainability, greater confidence among stakeholders, and enhanced responsiveness to both domestic and global economic shifts.

5.2 Implications for Defense Financial Governance

The adoption of this model has significant implications for reforming the broader culture of budgeting within Nigeria's defense architecture. First, it challenges the traditionally rigid and reactive budgeting mindset by introducing forward-looking, data-driven processes. This shift encourages military planners and budget officers to base their financial decisions on empirical analysis, projected fiscal trends, and risk assessments, rather than on static allocations and historical precedents.

Institutional agility also stands to benefit from this paradigm. The framework's emphasis on decentralization and unit-level planning capacity supports faster adaptation to changing circumstances. Naval planners will gain the autonomy to develop multiple budget scenarios and operationalize them with minimal bureaucratic friction. This not only accelerates decision-making but also builds a culture of financial accountability where units are empowered—and obligated—to act in alignment with both strategic and economic realities.

At a systemic level, the model also fosters greater civil-military coordination in financial management. By aligning the Navy's internal planning systems with national fiscal risk management protocols, defense institutions will become more transparent, efficient, and resilient contributors to national stability. Moreover, such alignment enhances trust with oversight institutions, including the Ministry of Finance, Budget Office, and National Assembly Committees, ultimately paving the way for more constructive engagement and informed budget approvals.

5.3 Recommendations for Policy and Leadership Action

To successfully embed this resilience model, concrete steps must be taken by defense leadership and national policymakers. First, policy updates are essential. The Ministry of Defence should issue revised guidelines mandating adaptive budget frameworks and institutionalizing rolling

forecasts, scenario planning, and early warning systems within the Navy's financial planning architecture. These directives must also include provisions for real-time budget tracking and performance-linked allocations.

Second, there must be an investment in leadership training that emphasizes fiscal resilience. This includes specialized workshops and certifications in financial risk management, economic forecasting, and adaptive planning for senior naval officers and budget administrators. Training should be conducted in collaboration with national institutions such as the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies, and reinforced through continuous professional development across all command levels.

Finally, the model must be integrated with Nigeria's broader fiscal governance systems. This means synchronizing naval financial processes with national frameworks such as the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework, Fiscal Risk Statement, and the Treasury Single Account. Cross-agency platforms can facilitate this integration, ensuring that defense budget resilience does not operate in isolation but as part of a holistic national approach to economic stability. These steps will institutionalize the Nigerian Naval Budget Resilience Model as a strategic asset for military effectiveness and national fiscal security.

REFERENCES

1) U. Israel, "DEBT DEPENDENCY AND SOVEREIGNTY: EXAMINING NIGERIA'S ECONOMIC VULNERABILITY AMIDST RISING NATIONAL DEBT."
2) A. A. Ikein, "Nigeria oil & external exposure: the crude gains and crude pains of crude export dependence economy," *The Business & Management Review*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 396, 2017.
3) M. L. Ross, "Nigeria's oil sector and the poor," *Position Paper for DFID-Nigeria, UCLA, Los Angeles*, 2003.
4) E. A. Olusegun, "Assessing the Effects of Revenue and Budget Risk Factors on Capital Expenditure of Federal Government in Nigeria," 2023.
5) J. O. Alabi, "The dynamics of oil and fiscal federalism: challenges to governance and development in Nigeria," University of Leeds, 2010.
6) J. F. Gilbert, "Budgeting under critical mass for the Navy: an approach to planning for a steady state defense budget," Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School, 1988.
7) I. D. Battung and C. Matei, "ASSESSING THE MILITARY READINESS OF THE PHILIPPINE NAVY THROUGH YEARLY BUDGET ALLOCATION," 2023.
8) N. R. Council, D. o. Engineering, P. Sciences, N. S. Board, and C. o. C. S. o. U. N. Forces, *Responding to capability surprise: a strategy for US naval forces*. National Academies Press, 2013.
9) S. A. Sule and M. Mulyanto, "Comparative Analysis of Budget Performance in Nigeria: Pre and Post-Covid-19 Impact," *The Es Accounting And Finance*, vol. 2, no. 02, pp. 87-106, 2024.
10) T. F. Abiodun, A. A. Asaolu, and A. I. Ndubuisi, "Defence Budget and Military Spending on War Against Terror and Insecurity in Nigeria: Implications for State Politics Economy and National Security," *Journal DOI*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 344-351, 2020.
11) A. Ajodo-Adebanjoko, "Political economy and national security implications of resource-based conflicts in Nigeria," *African security review*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 56-71, 2019.
12) I. B. Ridwan, "Dynamic strategic foresight using predictive business analytics: Strategic modeling of competitive advantage in unstable market and innovation ecosystems," 2025.
13) J. Agyemang, J. Azure, D. Kimani, and T. Arun, "Governmental financial resilience during pandemics: the case of West Africa," *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 385-414, 2023.
14) C. Barbera, M. Jones, S. Korac, I. Saliterer, and I. Steccolini, "Governmental financial resilience under austerity in Austria, England and Italy: how do local governments cope with financial shocks?," *Public Administration*, vol. 95, no. 3, pp. 670-697, 2017.
15) R. A. Bitzinger, *The modern defense industry: political, economic, and technological issues*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2009.
16) M. Bachtiar, I. Ahmad, and Z. A. Sahabuddin, "Understanding Global Defense Budgeting Dynamics: A Systematic Literature Review on Economic and Geopolitical Factors," *Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis dan Manajemen (JABM)*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 242-242, 2024.
17) D. J. Murray and P. R. Viotti, *The defense policies of nations: a comparative study*. JHU Press, 1994.
18) P.-A. Julien, "A theory of local entrepreneurship in the knowledge economy," in *A Theory of Local Entrepreneurship in the Knowledge Economy*: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2007.
19) N. Hensel, "The defense industry: Tradeoffs between fiscal constraints and national security challenges," *Business Economics*, vol. 51, pp. 111-122, 2016.
20) O. Monday and W. C. George, "Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks and Economic Management and Sustainability in Africa: Nigeria in Perspective," *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 178-184, 2023.
21) G. I. Ayogu, M. Atakpa, and P. Mba, "Fiscal Discipline in Nigeria: The Medium Term Expenditure Framework Option," *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 41-46, 2022.
22) J. Osifo and S. Ahunanya, "An Assessment of Defense Budgetary Allocation on Military Operational Capability in Africa," *LWATI: A Journal of Contemporary Research*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 256-274, 2020.
23) I. LAMBE and G. A. DADU, "Impact of Medium-Term Expenditure Framework on Budget Implementation in Nigeria," 2020.
24) K. Ogujiuba, B. Ezema, and O. Sola, "Medium term expenditure and fiscal management in Nigeria: A review of the (2005-2008) framework," *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 291-306, 2013.
25) E. scrutiny Unit, "Addressing the challenges of smart, sustainable, and inclusive growth in national Recovery and Resilience Plans."

26) M. Schur, D. Manukyan, and V. Melikyan, "Climate Resilient Fiscal Planning in Armenia," ed: < bound method Organization. get_name_with_acronym of< Organization: Asian …, 2023.
27) G. IT, P. CY, D. IRL, and A. HR, "European economies face significant strains on their public finances. The pandemic and subsequent policy interventions to support economies and protect livelihoods in the face of the energy shock added a heavy fiscal burden to the already-high levels of deficits and public debt in many European economies (Figure 1). Fiscal consolidation is needed in many countries—and mandated for European Union (EU) member states by new fiscal rules—to ensure fiscal sustainability and rebuild fiscal buffers."
28) R. Wedger and J. Korengold, "Enhancing Marine Corps Budgeting Practices: Optimizing O&M Fund Efficiency Through Refined Budget Formulation Standards," Acquisition Research Program, 2024.
29) S. Jaffry and N. Capon, "Alternative methods of forecasting risks in Naval manpower planning," *International journal of forecasting*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 73-85, 2005.
30) A. Dhadwal, "Aligning ICT with Financial Budgeting and Forecasting Business Process," 2015.
31) N. H. Rasmussen, C. J. Eichorn, C. S. Barak, and T. Prince, *Process improvement for effective budgeting and financial reporting*. John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
32) M. Mohsendokht, C. Kontovas, C.-H. Chang, Z. Qu, H. Li, and Z. Yang, "Resilience analysis of seaports: a critical review of development and research directions," *Maritime Policy & Management*, pp. 1-36, 2025.
33) J. Correia, "Military capabilities and the strategic planning conundrum," *Security and Defence Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 21-50, 2019.
34) B. Pinto, *How does my country grow?: economic advice through storytelling*. OUP Oxford, 2014.
35) J. L. McCaffery and L. R. Jones, "Reform of program budgeting in the Department of Defense," *International public management review*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 141-176, 2005.
36) E. J. Latessa and B. Lovins, *Corrections in the community*. Routledge, 2019.
37) M. J. Diamond, *From program to performance budgeting: The challenge for emerging market economies*. International Monetary Fund, 2003.
38) A. T. K. Ho, "From performance budgeting to performance budget management: theory and practice," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 78, no. 5, pp. 748-758, 2018.
39) I. Okromtchedlishvili, "Building Resilience: Advancing Defense Acquisition Capabilities in Georgia," *Journal of Defense Resources Management (JoDRM)*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 5-34, 2024.
40) S. K. Shandilya, A. Datta, Y. Kartik, and A. Nagar, "Navigating the regulatory landscape," in *Digital Resilience: Navigating Disruption and Safeguarding Data Privacy*: Springer, 2024, pp. 127-240.
41) M. A. Heldeweg, "Normative alignment, institutional resilience and shifts in legal governance of the energy transition," *Sustainability*, vol. 9, no. 7, p. 1273, 2017.