WEST AFRICAN JOURNAL ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

PRIVATIZATION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN THE NIGERIAN POWER SECTOR: AN EXPOSITION ON EEDC

[1]Oguegbe, F.C , [2]Okeke, M.I & [3]Oguegbe, T.M

[1,2]Department of Political science, Facukty of Social Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

[3]Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Corresponding mail: funmifrancis96@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In the search for solutions to improve the performance of state-owned enterprises, several developing countries including Nigeria have embarked upon extensive privatization programmes within the framework of macroeconomic reform and liberation. Privatization of the power sector in Nigeria was premised on the fact that there were problems with the state owned power enterprises and privatization was part and parcel of a reform agenda to turn around these enterprises so that they can deliver electricity more efficiently and effectively. As revealed in the work, this kind of reasoning is ideologically loaded but cannot be substantiated by the existential reality of Nigeria. This paper hinges on Karl Marx's theory of dialectical materialism in tandem with the structural functional theory focused on the effects of privatization with reference to the performance of EEDC in their service delivery functions. Using documentary sources of information and descriptive analysis, findings revealed among others that there has been little or no synergy between privatization and improvement in the level of power supply in Awka South Local Government. The nation still lacks the capacity to generate and transmit enough electricity to these distribution companies and the distribution companies in turn due to lack of technical expertise still record a lot of distribution losses. More disturbing is the exorbitant increase in the electrical bills and the continued menace of the arbitrary estimated billing system. The author recommends among others the need for more investors in the industry in order to level the competitive playing field and the recruitment of adequate manpower with the necessary technical knowledge.

KEYWORDS: Privatization, Service delivery, Power sector. EEDC, Awka South

INTRODUCTION

Available evidence has shown that in the area of performance and service delivery, the Nigerian power sector has yet to meet the expectation the citizens. Electric power within the nation has remained so epileptic that the description of the Nigerian economy as a generator economy by Ekpo, 2009 still holds water. Distribution companies such as the EEDC ‘s technical distribution loses further decreases the number of hours of electricity available to consumers (Onyishi and Ofualagba, 2021) A series of power sector polls conducted by NOI Polls Ltd for the second quarter of 2017 revealed that about 130 million, representing 75 per cent of Nigerians generated their own electricity through alternative sources to make up for irregular power supply, thereby spending billions of naira cumulatively per annum (vanguard , January 28, 2017). This situation has had very little improvement over the years. **Nigeria’s national grid has been plagued with challenges in the transmission and distribution subsectors, which has made it difficult to evacuate the available generation capacity through the grid. The Nigeria Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC), based on data obtained in 2021, reported that power distribution in the year, averaged 4,094.09 megawatt (MW), despite available generation capacity of about 8,000** (https://kpmg.com).

It is further believed that service efficiency mechanism and or reforms like SERVICOM (service compact) which ensures citizens centered service delivery, has not been extended to all areas of public interest like the privatized institutions (Ewuim, Agbodike, Ukeje, Ogbulu, Onele & Ojogbane, 2020). The quality of public service delivery by the Enugu Electricity Distribution Company is characterized by combined evils of inefficiency and capitalism (Ukeje, Ndukwe, Chukwuemeka,

Ogbulu & Onele, 2019). The privatization of the power sector in Nigeria has suffered setbacks due to lack of good maintenance culture which has resulted in several situations whereby the industry has remained unviable to investors (Oluseyi, Akinbulire and Awosope, 2007) as well as lack of regular staff training(Ukeje,2019). The human factor accounts for a great deal of the power sector's current debilitating condition (Awosope, 2003; Abubakar, 2011). This is aggravated by the unavailability of specialized engineers and technicians for certain tasks as well as unpreparedness of the industry to pay an equitable amount as hazard allowance and insurance policy attached to the workers. As one opinion suggested: „The privatization of the power sector, while transparently conducted, was fraught with several missteps and set to go wrong from the start of the process. Years after, the privatization has proven to be problematic and has resulted in a sovereign debt burden for Nigeria and Nigerians. The time has come for the government to be strict on ensuring that the privatization of the power sector is not derailed‟ (Omonfoma, Premuim Times, 2017).

Moreso, government has not faithfully implemented the competitiveness component of the privatization programme leading to the emergence of new monopolies evidenced by the pattern of ownership of the stakes in the electricity sub-sector where division and allocation are somewhat regionalized. Government at all times should be prepared to demonstrate the political will to enforce as well as implement policy reforms (Okpata & Ukeje, 2017; Ukeje, 2019). Absence of alternatives or competition (substitutes) is responsible for customer incapacitation and non-responsiveness of EEDC to service atonement and service appeals. Poor employee motivation and inadequate staffing also are contributing factors.

Availability of power is a sine-qua-non for the much-desired industrialization in Nigeria. The problem, however, remains how to improve the capacity of EEDC for enhanced

and sustainable service delivery in the sector.

PRIVATIZATION

Privatization implies permanent transfer of ownership right from a pubic agency to the private sector .it would also be seen as the sale of government - owned assets, the opening of certain markets to private sector (Dickson, 2007:p1). Privatization can also be described as the systematic transfer of appropriate functions, activities or property from the public to the private sector, where services (production and consumption) can be regulated more efficiently by the market and price mechanism. (Tsunabaryon & Ogbole, 2017) It refers to the process of transforming state owned enterprises to private individuals. It means any shift in activities or functions from the state to the private sector, (Agabi & Orokpo, 2014). Higgings (2015) elucidates the definition of privatization summed up by the Florida house of representatives committee on governmental operations as involving the private sector in the provision of services or facilities that are generally viewed as public sector responsibilities, moving from publicly produced goods and services to those that are privately produced, the transfer of public management, functions or assets and service delivery to the private sector; aimed at mitigating impediments towards the efficiency of public organizations by submitting them to the operations of the private market.

Jerome (2008) describes privatization as the permanent transfer of control, as a consequence of transfer of ownership right from the public to the private sector. Therefore, Privatization also entails a transfer of the provision of a good or service from public to private sector, with the government retaining the ultimate responsibility from providing the service. And the prime examples of this type of privatization according to him are subcontracting; management contracts, leases and concessions, as well as build operate and transfer schemes. Anyebe (2011) saw privatization as a process of returning

public owned assets to the private sector usually where control of an activity is passed from the public sector to the private sector by means of issue of shares. He went further to describe privatization as a reduction in production, provision, subsidies or regulation or indeed any combination of these instruments, while Ogundiya, Olutayo and Amzat (2011) viewed privatization as the incidence or process of transferring ownership of business from the public sector to the private sector. In the opinion of Ezeani (2014), the concept is a deliberate government policy of stimulating economic growth and efficiency by reducing state interference and broadening the scope of private sector activity through one or all of the following strategies. Transfer of state owned assets to private ownership through the sales of shares, private control or management of state owned assets, encouraging private sector involvement in former public activity and shifting decision making to agents operating in accordance with market indicators. Solanke (2012) sees it as involving the sale of operation, granting vouchers to serve recipient or contracting out which ever ways it is defined the main idea is the changing of business status service, industry from government or state or public to private ownership or control. It could be full or partial. Full or complete privatization would mean the complete transfer of ownership and control of a government enterprise or assets to the private sector. In addition, Abdullahi (2014) notes that privatization as the divestment from state-owned enterprises and transfer of ownership to private holding by government as a consequence of their poor economic performance and provision of inefficient services. He argues that privatization of public enterprises is based on the premise that private sector is an instrument for realizing productive; allocate efficiency and higher economic growth in a society. Savas (2000) points out that the primary goal of any privatization effort is, or should be, to introduce competition and market forces in the delivery of public services. Studies have

shown that privatization which refers to the divestment of the government of its ordinary shareholding from a state-owned enterprise promises better provision of goods and services at lower cost in a society (Devroye, 2013: Slyke, 2013: Nwokoma, 2015).

Privatization could be partial or total. It is total when government decided to completely divest its holdings from an enterprise and leave same in the hands of the private sector to manage. It becomes partial privatization when government decides to transfer majority shares of state-owned enterprise to the private sector management while still retaining part ownership of the enterprise (Gberevbie, 2016).

From the perspective of partial ownership and control, stair (1988) views privatization as the withdraw from public aspects of endeavor, the whole from the part. It presupposes that the government does not totally transfer ownership of the public sector to the private sector but withdraws from some aspects of production while maintaining control through public policy functions (Oluye, Gbererbie & Ibietan, 2016). The end product of privatization is thus a significant change in the relationship between the government and the private sector, with the role or the level of involvement of the state in the economy being reduced as more of the functions get shifted to the private sector. According to Kay and Thompson (1986) such a reduction in the level of state involvement will in turn relieve the state not only of the burden of running the enterprises but also remove the accompanying budgetary obligation.

Privatisation as a tool for economic management came to the front burner when Chile became the first country to turn public assets/businesses to private operations in the early 1970s since then, over 140 countries (both developed and developing) have embraced privatization as a route to economic growth and prosperity while the details and strategies of the privatization exercise may vary in each of these countries, the ultimate objective is to liberalize the

economics through increasing private sector involvement and capacity utilization.

SERVICE DELIVERY; THE SERVQUAL DIMENSION

The SERVQUAL Dimension is a service quality delivery model mainly used in service marketing to evaluate consumers' perceptions and expectation of service quality. There are five basic dimensions of; Reliability, Tangibility, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy. SERVQUAL dimension appraises performance covering these five dimensions by juxtaposing customer expectations and customer perceptions (Van Iwaarden, van der Wiele, Ball, & Millen, 2003; Gabbie & O'neill, 1996).

Dimensions of quality Service delivery

There are five basic determinants of quality service delivery according to(Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988), it is based on these dimensions that customers use as a yardstick to evaluate the quality of any service experience, and they are; reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles.

i. **Reliability**: This dimension explains the capacity to execute promised services efficiently, conscientiously and consistently by delivering trustworthy and dependable as well as affordable services at all times on a regular basis(Blery, Batistatos, Papastratou, Perifanos, Remoundaki, & Retsina 2009). It is worth noting that, a reliable service delivery enhances customer expectation of the service before it is delivered as promised timely, without fail at any point on a consistent basis anytime the service is offered.

ii. **Tangibility:** This describes the availability of physical infrastructural facilities, plants, machines, equipment, human

resources that is needed to accomplish its broad objectives on service delivery. The environmental circumstance and conditions is a clear cut prove of the level of circumspection to the detail as publicized by the service provider (Blerry et al., 2009). In retrospect, tangibility refers the physical state of the environment where services are delivered such as; atmosphere, aura, impression, fittings, air-conditioning, seating accommodation and the human resource to deliver the service.

iii. **Responsiveness:** This give an explanation for the service providers desire to offer timely service delivery (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Whenever service delivery isnot done promptly, it creates a sense of apprehension amongst customers on the quality of service. This sense of apprehension heightens if eventually there is service failure, the ability of the firm to get back on track could re-ignite a positive sense of customers' perceptions of service quality delivery. Most often, delays in service delivery could be due to few numbers of personnel handling a huge number of customers, the firm ability to craft out a strategy of satisfying all the customers connotes its responsiveness.

iv. **Assurance:** This refers to the level of courteousness exhibited by the firms' personnel to handle customers'issues assuredly, without any iota of doubt/suspicion and with the highest sense of confidentiality (Blerry et al., 2009). This dimension entail the ability of the firm to accomplish

set service task, mannerly conducts amongst customers, effectual interface with the firm's customers, and a robust interrelationship that portrays the firms deep interest for its customers.

v. **Empathy**: This dimension explains in depth personalized care towards the firms' customers request (Blerry et al., 2009). This dimension entails the level of closeness between firms' personnel and customers, susceptibleness and pr oactive attempt to perceive the needs of customers. This also entails how swift customers' complaint are resolved.

Quality service delivery within the power sector could be described as the process which could aid power generating firms in Nigeria to maximize its profits through value added services. It is evident that if the power generating sub-sector provides quality service to her customers and continue to meet and exceed their expectations, the relationship between the firm and it customers will be enhance, this will lead to a strong sense of loyalty amongst its customers, better services enjoyed by the customers will empower them to refer the service provider to other customers through word of mouth (WOM), this could eventually lead to improved corporate image and increased level of market share, profitability and retention of such customer (Idongesit, 2022)

PRIVATIZATION OF THE POWER SECTOR; THE NIGERIAN EXPERIENCE

Electric power came to Nigeria in 1898 with the establishment of the first generating plant by the British colonial government (Okoro & Chikuni, 2007 in Okolobah & Ismail, 2013). The management of the generating plant was named the Public Works Department (PWD).Thereafter, the then Federal Government of Nigeria passed an ordinance in 1950, establishing the Electricity

Corporation of Nigeria (ECN) saddled with the responsibility of generating, transmitting, distributing and sale of electricity in Nigeria. Other bodies like the Native Authorities and the Nigeria Electricity Supply Company (NESCO) had licenses to produce electricity in some locations in Nigeria (Okobolo and Ismail, 2013). In 1962, the Federal Government by an act of Parliament established the Niger Dam Authority (NDA).

The authority was responsible for the construction and maintenance of dams and other works in the River Niger and elsewhere, generate electricity by water power, improve navigation and promote fisheries and irrigation. The electricity produced by NDA is being sold to ECN for distribution and sales at utility voltages. In April 1972, by a decree, Electricity Corporation of Nigeria and Niger Dam Authority were merged to form National Electric Power Authority (NEPA). The reasons given for this merger include: vesting of production and distribution in one company and that it will bring about more efficient utilization of the human, financial and other resources available to the electricity supply industry in the country (Babatunde,. & Shaibu, 2008). In 1973, NEPA became operational and was responsible for generating, transmitting and distributing of electricity to all parts of the federation. Starting with only four power stations namely Ijora, Delta, Afam thermal stations and Kainji hydro power station with a total installed capacity of 532.6MW serving more than two million customers, which has grown to 5,958MW in year 2000 with the establishment of additional power stations namely Jebba, Shiroro hydro power station Egbin, Sapele, Delta thermal power station in the early eighties having a combined installed generating capacity of 2940MW (PHCN, 2010. Nigeria @ 50: Status of Power sector). In 1988 NEPA was partially commercialized supported by an upward review of the tariffs. This was aimed at attracting investors to the sector. Due to increase in the population of the country and the absence of additional power plants the

available facilities became overstretched and this led to the reform of the power sector.

Nigeria With the return of civil rule in 1999, the federal government embarked on power sector reform. This culminated in the Electric Power Sector Reform (EPSR) Act 2005. This is contained in a Federal Government of Nigeria Gazette and it stipulates the reforms in the electricity power sector and how they are to be implemented. The Power Sector Reform was embarked upon on March, 2005 due to the inadequate supply of electricity, high demands and issues with bills. The main goal of the reform is to accomplish full deregulation of the Electricity Supply Industry (ESI) in two years after its implementation. The objectives include making electricity generation and supply available to consumers, making the sector investor-friendly and dismantling NEPA‟s monopoly. This was achieved through the passage of the Electric Power Sector Reform (EPSR) Act which came into being on the 11th of March, 2005. The reasons given for the reform include: introduction of competition in the industry as a means of improving industry efficiency that will result in providing lower energy prices to end users, lack of price transparency in utility operations hence consumers and regulators demand price transparency and declaration of cross subsidies among different users, like many other public owned institutions, corruption, inefficiency and managerial incompetence prevailed and the electricity industry showed inconsistent policy direction and lack of strategy framework for its sustainable development, policy decisions by past government in the ESI were based on political or administrative interest instead of efficient resource allocation and cost recovery necessary for economic development and the strategic energy policy for the country was never implemented (Okobolo and Ismail, 2013). The Act repealed the earlier law establishing NEPA, consequently, the Power Holding Company of Nigeria, (PHCN) was setup and charged with the responsibility of providing power supply. It also restructured the power sector

from a vertically integrated structure into eighteen unbundled autonomous companies comprising one transmission company called TransCo, six generation companies known as GenCos and eleven distribution companies-DisCos respectively. The Act focused on the liberalization and privatization of the sole power provider-PHCN while introducing Independent Power Producers IPPs. The EPSR Act nurtures a wholesome market stating with a single buyer of electricity produced by PHCN and the IPPs for onward sale to the eleven DisCos that would also be offered for sale. Eventually the single model would be discarded for a bilateral contract model with suppliers and buyers free to contract between themselves (www.mbendi.com). The Act further provides for the establishment of the Nigeria Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC) which is charged with the following: (Inugonam, 2005).

- Regulate tariffs and quality service
- Oversee the activities of the industry for efficiency. Institutional and enforcement of the regulating regime.
- Licensing of Generation, Distribution, Transmission and Trading companies that result from the unbundling of NEPA.
- Legislative authority to include special conditions in licenses.
- Provision relating to public policy interest in relation to fuel supply, environmental laws, energy conservation, management of scarce resources, promotion of efficient energy, promotion of renewable energy and publication of reports and statistics.
- Providing a legal basis with necessary enabling provisions for establishing, changing, enforcing and regulating technical rules, market rules and standards.

In November 2005, Nigeria Electricity Regulatory Commission was inaugurated and took full responsibility. Other aspects of the reform provided for the management of the Rural Electrification Agency (REA), the

National Electric Liability Management Company (NELMCO) which is a special purpose entity created to manage the residential assets and liability of the defunct NEPA after privatization of the unbundled companies.

The Act also provided for the establishment of a Power Consumer Assistance Fund

(POLAF) to subsidize under privileged electricity consumers (Balogun, 2010).

However, in spite of these efforts, the problem of the power sector continues until November, 2013 when PHCN was formally handed to the new investors.

EEDC AND THE POST PRIVATIZATION PERFORMANCE OF THE POWER SECTOR

The Electricity Reform Act of 2005, unbundled PHCN into 11 Distribution companies, 1 Transmission Company and 6 Generation companies. This Reform Act gave birth to Enugu Electricity Distribution Company (EEDC). EEDC distributes electricity across the five South Eastern States of Nigeria, including Enugu , Imo, Abia Anambra and Ebonyi States, covering about 30,000km sq. The company has several millions of electricity subscribers administered through 18 Business Distric (BD) spread across the franchise area. (https://www.enugudisco.com).

This region has a reported daily power demand of 7,577 (www.tcn.orgn.ng). Since the privatization of the power industry, it has been reported that there is only minor improvement in terms of power supply by EEDC.

A Power Optimization Software for Nigeria, owned by RACETT NIGERIA LTD., was used to study the operation of EEDC in the South-East geopolitical zone of Nigeria for July 2020. It allows users to input the daily power generated by each of the 28 functioning generating stations in the generation subsector. From this, the software calculates the power received by each

distribution region company. The software also computes the power distributed to constituent states of the 11 distribution companies. The number of hours of electricity that will be supplied to each Local Government Area (LGA) in a state is also made available. For each day in July 2020, the power generation data for each of the 28 generating stations in Nigeria was entered into the software tool. From this, the power received by EEDC was obtained. The number of hours of electricity EEDC supplied to Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo states for each day in July 2020 was obtained. This took into account the current transmission losses incurred by TCN, as well as the current distribution losses incurred by EEDC. It was noted that EEDC currently experiences technical distribution losses up to 57%. The effect of EEDC's technical losses on the effective distribution of electricity in the South-East geopolitical zone was analyzed. The number of hours of electricity EEDC could supply to its constituent states, assuming EEDC incurred no distribution losses in July 2020, was obtained, and compared with the company's current performance. The algorithm currently employed by EEDC in disbursement of the daily available electricity within each constituent state was also investigated.

The results were that EEDC received an average daily power of 7520.09 ± 403.9 MWH. Taking into account the distribution losses incurred by EEDC, only 3233.64 ± 173.7 MWH was available to distribute to the constituent states (Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo states). Based on state population, Abia State received 17% of EEDC's available electricity, Anambra State received 25%, Ebonyi 13%, Enugu 20%, and Imo 25%. The results also showed that EEDC was only able to supply 42.06%, 41.71%, 41.62%, 41.81%, and 42.6 % of the power demand required by Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo States respectively.

This resulted in EEDC being able to supply only 10 hours of electricity to its constituent states for every given day in July 2020

(http://racett.com.ng/page_id=111).

Of course, the increase of electricity tariffs by the privatized DISCOs without improving power supply is exploitation. Also, the DISCOs have failed to install prepaid meters for every electric power consumer in the country, and there are even cases where they failed to install prepaid meters for customers who have paid for them (Egbesola cited in Asu, 2016). There is no doubt that the prepaid meters would have mitigated the exploitation of electric power consumers using estimated electric bills which often contain charge for power not consumed. But the action of the DISCOs in the post-privatization era is a continuation of the old order of giving fictitious estimated bills to customers. Collecting money from customers for prepaid meters without supplying them is extortion. Collecting electricity tariffs from customers for power not supplied or consumed is even a bigger corruption.

FACTORS MILITATING AGAINST EEDC'S EFFECTIVE SERVICE DELIVERY

The Enugu Electricity Distribution Company (EEDC) faces several challenges in providing reliable electricity supply in Nigeria, with various effects on consumers. Idongesit and Abubakar (2022) have identified some of such challenges as:

1. Poor Infrastructure: Insufficient investment in infrastructure maintenance and expansion leads to frequent power outages, voltage fluctuations, and unreliable service. Consumers experience disruptions in their daily activities and businesses suffer from productivity losses.
2. Electricity Theft and Vandalism: Illegal connections, meter tampering, and vandalism of electricity infrastructure contribute to revenue losses for EEDC and can result in safety hazards for consumers. These practices also strain the distribution network, leading to more frequent outages and increased costs for legitimate consumers.
3. Billing Irregularities: Consumers

often face issues with billing accuracy, including estimated bills that do not reflect actual consumption and discrepancies in meter readings. This erodes consumer trust and satisfaction with the utility company.

4. Tariff Affordability: High electricity tariffs relative to income levels in Nigeria make it challenging for many consumers, especially low-income households, to afford reliable electricity supply. This can lead to energy poverty and limited access to essential services like lighting, refrigeration, and heating.
5. Inadequate Grid Capacity: The electricity grid's capacity often falls short of demand, particularly during peak hours, leading to load shedding and rationing of electricity supply. This affects both residential consumers and businesses, impacting productivity and economic growth.
6. Inadequate Regulatory Framework: Weak regulatory oversight and enforcement contribute to inefficiencies in the electricity sector, including issues like tariff setting, licensing, and quality of service standards. Consumers may lack recourse for addressing grievances and holding the utility accountable for its performance.
7. Fuel Supply and Generation Challenges: Inadequate fuel supply for thermal power plants and insufficient capacity in renewable energy sources hinder electricity generation, exacerbating supply shortages and reliability issues. Consumers bear the brunt of these challenges through prolonged outages and increased reliance on expensive alternatives like diesel generators.

Overall, these challenges facing EEDC's electricity supply in Nigeria have significant negative effects on consumers, ranging from inconvenience and economic losses to

constraints on socio-economic development and well-being. Addressing these challenges requires coordinated efforts from stakeholders, including government interventions, regulatory reforms, investment in infrastructure, and consumer education initiatives.

CONCLUSION

This paper which focused on privatization and service delivery in the Nigerian power sector using the Enugu Electricity Distribution company as a case study was designed to achieve practical purposes. The study examined the impact of privatization on the EEDC and their performance of service delivery functions and guided by empirical evidence, the researcher is led to conclude that the experience so far within the Awka south local government area of Anambra state with regards to the privatization of the power sector has not been palatable as privatization has not led to improve power supply and improved service delivery by the EEDC. The study found that the privatization of the power sector was based on patronage rather than merit, as well as inability of the privatized companies to improve power supply and distribution to homes despite the enormous hope put on them by the public.

Power still remains epileptic, service delivery still remains poor and extortion of consumer is still prevalent. That the power sector has failed to deliver to the expectation of locality is an understatement. The colossus amount of money expended on the sector is not in tandem with the current poor performance of the sector. The study also revealed that privatization

improved the responsiveness of EEDC to electrical problems which is commendable but a long way from applaudable. The federal government has failed to faithfully implement the competitive component of the privatization programme and this has resulted in a monopoly which has negatively affected service delivery.

RECOMMENDATION

The study has shown that privatization is not necessarily a guarantee that an ailing corporation will be economically revamped. This is because the question is not whether to privatize but how to privatize effectively and efficiently. Thus, if properly implemented, privatization can yield substantial benefits in terms of enhanced efficiency, growth and better service delivery. But then, privatization has to be reviewed as one of the processes of economic reform and should be implemented with complementary macroeconomic policies to achieve desired goals. Such policies relates to economic and financial liberation and competition, and appropriate regulatory framework to ensure proper conduct for privatized enterprises. To this end, the following recommendations will suffice thus:

1. There is need for more investors with technical expertise to come into the industry, this mean that the entire privatization process should be reviewed by the federal government, this will ensure that better services is rendered to consumers at affordable rates.
2. The Nigeria electricity regulatory commission (NERC) needs to enhance its capacity to regulate the activities of the power companies and enforce credible sanctions on defaulting companies to ensure that better services are rendered to power consumers. In this regards, competent and experienced electrical engineers should be appointed to head the NERC instead of non electrical engineers.
3. The EEDC must ensure that proper customer service desks are established to respond quickly and efficiently to customer's complaints these should be done in each ward in the local government.
4. EEDC should pay more attention to manpower development programmes and customer service training in attune with international best practices, that will positively impact

on the performance of their employees. The training programmes should also be designed to acquaint individual participants with specific knowledge and skills required to improve their efficiency in the organisation.

5. Electricity meters should be provided to all consumers at little or no cost to eliminate the complaint of arbitrary billing to customers in the local government and other areas
6. The federal government should encourage the power companies to exploit other sources of power generation such as coal, solar, and wind to complement hydro and gas power plants to address the incessant shortages of gas.

REFERENCES

Abdullahi, M. & Usman, R.N. (2014). Management of public enterprises through public private partnerships in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social and Humanistic Sciences, 19*(15), 76-81.

Abubakar, M. K. (2011). Welcome Address at the Summit on Energy and Sustainable Economic Growth, Energy Commission of Nigeria Organized workshop at Ladi Kwali Hall, Sheraton Hotel and Towers, Abuja, 9th - 10th March 2011.

Agabi & Oropko (2020). Performance of public enterprises and the privatization option. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, vol. *2*, no.2.

Anyebe, S.C. (2011). The energy crisis in Nigeria, an overview and implications for the failure, University of Chicago.

Awosope, C. O. A. (2003). Power Demanded but not supplied: The agonizing roles of emergency power supply and transmission system inadequacy, University of Lagos Inaugural Lecture Series, 10th September.

Babatunde, M.A. & Sharbu, M.I. (2008). The Demand for Residential Electricity in Nigeria. Abound Testing approach.

Blery, E., Batistatos, N., Papastratou, E., Perifanos, I., Remoundaki, G., & Retsina, M. (2009). Service Quality and Customer Retention in Mobile Telephony. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for*

Marketing, 17(1), 27-37.

Devroye, D. (2013). Who wants to privatize social security? Understanding why the poor are wary of private accounts; public administration review, 63(3).

Dickson, V. (2001). Privatization in Developing Countries, Washington: World Bank.

Ezeani, E.O. (2014). The State and Crisis in the power sector in Nigeria. *University of Nigeria Journal of Political Economy, 2*(182).

Gabbie, O., & O'Neill, M. A. (1996). Servqual and the Northern Ireland hotel sector: A Comparative Analysis Part 1. *Managing Service Quality, 6*(6): 25-32.

Gbererbie, D.E., Ibielan, J., Abasilim, U.D. & Exelence-Oluye, W.O. (2015). Deregulation Policy and Development in Nigeria. The Petroleum Sector Experience, 1999-2014, vol.30 no.2, July 2015. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, 129-152.

Gberevbie, D.E. (2016). Privatization and the future of the public sector in Nigeria. *Nasarawa State University Journal of Administration, 3*(1).

http://racett.com.ng/page_id=111

https://www.enugudisco.com

Inugonam, T. (2009). Electricity Demand challenges in Nigeria. PHCN News. Jan-Aug, 2009 ed.

Jerome, A. (2008), Privatization and Enterprise Performance in Nigeria: case study of some privatized enterprises. African economic research consortium, Nairobi.

Kay, J.A. & Thompson J.J. (1986). "Privatization. A policy in search of a rationale". *The Economic Journal*, vol.*96*.

Okolobah, V. & Ismail, Z. (2013). On the issues, challenges and prospects of electric power sector in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economic, Management and Social Sciences*.

Okpata, F. O. & Ukeje, I. O. (2017). Justice and human dignity in the development of Nigerian federalism and public service system: the problem of good governance. *International Multidisciplinary Academic Research Journal, 1*(1), 44-69

Oluseyi, P. O. Akinbulire, T. O. & Awosope, C. O. A. (2007). Solving the technical problems facing electrical energy development in Nigeria, UNILAG fair and conference in Awosope, C. A. (2014) Nigeria Electricity Industry: issues, challenges and solutions. 38th public lecture series. Vol. 3, no. 2,pp.1-40.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multi-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64* (1), 13-40.

Solanke, A. (2012). Towards new public management in Nigeria: Implementing privatization policy, Voice of Nigeria, Ikoyi, Lagos.Korewansth@voiceofNigeria.com.

Ukeje, I. O. (2019). Human capital development and implementation of food security and poverty reduction policy: diagnosing obstacles and prescribing options for sustainable development goals in Nigeria. A Paper presented at the 1st FMSS International Conference, Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu-Alike, Ebonyi State, Nigeria, 25th-27th June.

www.tcn.orgn.ng