ELECTRICITY PRIVATISATION IN NIGERIA: UNCOVERING LESSONS FOR A BRIGHTER FUTURE

***OMOFUMA OSAMONYI, THOMAS TEMITOPE G., AKINROGUNDE OLUWADARE O. AND EDWIN THEOPHILUS E.**
Department of Electrical/Electronics Engineering, Ogun State Institute of Technology, Igbesa,

Abstract
This paper discussed the lessons from the privatisation of the electricity sector in Nigeria. The origin and factors for privatisation programs in Nigeria to the stagnation of government-owned enterprises and the system's corruption services were examined. However, the paper explored the conceptual meaning of privatisation and commercialisation. Similarly, the unfruitful output of the privatisation program in the country for more than two decades was examined. The paper concluded that Nigerians have yet to fully realise the benefits of the country's privatisation efforts as corruption and inefficiency continue to be the norm. The program only allowed some corrupt leaders to acquire those properties at the expense of the average Nigerian. Hence, the program's purposes and laudable objectives still need to be met and fulfilled. Therefore, the study suggested some far-reaching recommendations to ameliorate problems associated with privatisation programs in Nigeria.

Keywords: privatization, commercialisation, electricity sector, stagnation, Nigeria

Introduction
Nigeria has pursued privatisation policy since 1988, but neither the Nigerian government nor the general public has benefited from the programs (Jerome, 2005). The primary reason for privatisation is to promote economic growth and development by reducing waste and encouraging economic sector development. Bakare & Gold (2011) stated that prior to privatisation, the nature of the public sectors in Nigeria was very bad, and he went on to explain the sorry state of public enterprises in Nigeria, painting a depressing picture of inefficiency, low productivity, losses, budgetary burden, and poor productivity in the services rendered.

Despite the policy's existence for more than two decades, Nigerians cannot say with certainty that the policy's objectives have been met. The policy was supposed to get

Nigeria out of its economic quagmire, but that has yet to happen (Jerome, 2005). The circumstances that led to the implementation of this policy have not changed; corruption is still the norm, and it is slowly becoming irreversible. The objectives of promoting economic growth, achieving macroeconomic stability, and reducing public sector borrowing due to corruption, subsidies, and subventions to unprofitable establishments have yet to be reduced or eliminated. Can the Nigerian government state unequivocally that these public enterprises' poor performance and inefficiency that prompted privatisation have been eliminated?

According to Etieybo (2011), privatisation was intended to transfer ownership and control of public enterprises to private individuals as a solution to public enterprises' perennial problems. However, the Olusegun Obasanjo administration has carried out this transfer program since 1999. Unfortunately, the program only allowed some influential Nigerians to acquire those properties at low prices, leaving the policy's purpose unknown. Public enterprises were created to provide nonprofitable services, serve as tools for achieving distributional goals, and create job opportunities.

The obvious question is, how has the policy fared? In Nigerian society, underdevelopment, poverty, and unemployment have become commonplace. Most developing countries, including Nigeria, are in disarray due to poor governance, development, planning, economic downturn, and political crises. The main reason for this continued decline is imperialist intervention, enacting many economic policies to bolster state corruption. As a result, developing countries could continue borrowing rather than producing. Meanwhile, 4,444 developing countries face various challenges that force them to rely on imperialism for survival before receiving funding. Multilateral financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank have become clear and straightforward to understand on behalf of 4,444 colonial rulers in developing African countries (Etieybo, 2011).

Reseach methodology

This research aims to examine the electricity privatisation process in Nigeria and draw lessons for a brighter future. The study will utilise a qualitative research approach, which involve analysing and interpreting data from the secondary source. The data analysis technique will involve a thematic analysis of the article to identify the main themes, patterns, and relationships within the data. Overall, this research aims to provide valuable insights into the lessons learned from the electricity privatisation process in

Nigeria, contributing to the development of a brighter future for the electricity sector in the country.

Cocnceptual underpining of privatization and commericalization

The term "privatisation" refers to the selling of state-owned businesses (SOEs) to private interests, whereas "commercialisation" refers to the rearrangement of SOEs to enable them to alter economic government subsidies (Olukoshi, 1985). Davis (1988) defines privatisation as a widespread or partial sale of public-owned assets to interested local or international investors. In terms of "commercialisation," Davies adopts the same view as Olukoshi, "commercialisation does not imply a transfer of ownership of public assets through sale to the private sector. In this situation, the government retains ownership of the firms, but they are now to be operated as commercial enterprises with solely market-based operations."

Market forces rather than welfare considerations would decide the profit and the price paid for a service. Hence, during a twin strategy of "privatisation" and "commercialisation" would have the effect of relieving the government, the outcome of one differs substantially from the other, according to Davies. To be sure, while "commercialisation" might be justified "if the quality of goods and services generated by these commercialised businesses can justify the expense on the public," Davis (1988) went on to say that privatisation is more comprehensive. He further stated that privatisation "goes beyond rising prices and widespread unemployment; it hits the basic core of constructing a just and equitable society," which all Nigerian governments have gullibly pretended to seek for since independence.

Likewise, the privatisation of public enterprises will entail the transfer of public wealth, which the government holds in trust for the people, to private interests. There is a significant distinction between "privatisation" and "commercialisation" policies. The Institute of Directors Nigeria Section defined "privatisation" as the "systematic and planned withdrawal of government from those operations that private entities and/or undertakings can do more efficiently than government agencies or companies" (Ubeku, 1986). According to Shawsudded Usman, then-Director General of Nigeria's Technical Committee on Privatisation and Commercialisation (TCPC), privatisation, in general, entails reducing public sector engagement in economic activity, and privatisation, in particular, entails;

i. State provision is reduced through the sale of government shares, the increase of privately financed education and health services, and so on.

ii. Decrease in state subsidies, notably introducing user charges where none previously existed (i.e. tolls on state and federal roadways). Furthermore, a reduction in current product prices (i.e. those on petroleum and fertilizers) Subsidies to PUEs such as Nation-Nigeria Railway Corporation and Nigeria Telecommunication Limited have been reduced.

iii. Minimal state regulation;

iv. Combination of 2 and 3, notably subsidy reduction, permitting more private operators, selling government shares, and deregulating the economy.

From the above, it is clear that "privatisation" is more all-encompassing than the "commercialisation" of PUEs and the "deregulation" of the economy. At the same time, economic regulation generally encompasses all types of government control exerted on economic and corporate operations. Economic "deregulation" is the purposeful and systematic elimination of regulatory supervision, structures, and operational norms in the economy's administration and pricing system. There appears to be no disagreement regarding what deregulation is and is not. It essentially means granting the forces of supply and demand free freedom. Nevertheless, whether this approach is, the best solution to Nigeria's economic problems is debatable.

The economic efficiency debate embraces all of the arguments favouring privatisation and commercialisation. Etieybo (2011) states that privatisation and commercialisation develop because the private sector is structured around a system of rights and incentives. It places a greater emphasis on profit maximisation than the public sector. The privatisation and commercialisation debate has three main points. The first believes that privatisation is a feasible policy; the second believes that privatisation and commercialisation are not viable policies; and the third believes that privatisation is neither viable nor unviable (Etieybo) (2011). Arguments for privatising and commercialising public enterprises focus on the argument that it is a tool for effective resource allocation and management. Thus, privatisation and commercialisation are anticipated to relieve poverty by increasing a country's economic indicators. In general, privatisation and commercialisation are expected to reduce corruption and red tape while strengthening the role of the private sector in the economy. Thereby ensuring employment, improved quality of life, and higher capacity utilisation (e.g., lower prices, more choices, and faster delivery of goods and services) (Shirley & Walsh, 2000).

Privatisation and commercialisation critics believe the processes will have a detrimental impact on wealth distribution. This suggests that privatisation and commercialisation have the potential to create socioeconomic inequities. The second criticism against privatisation and commercialisation is that they can reduce income levels and access to essential social goods and services. However, a third issue to consider is that privatisation and commercialisation would result in higher costs for products and services.

There is also the concern that privatisation and commercialisation would increase unemployment. The most fundamental reasons against privatisation and commercialisation concern power dynamics between industrialised (and their multinational partners) and developing nations. Most arguments see privatisation as a neocolonial agenda aimed at exploiting developing nations. In contrast, others regard it as a neoliberal concept of development pushed by major co-operations or transnational foreign capitalist countries and institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank. Martin (1994), on the other hand, claimed the opposite; his primary conclusion about privatisation and public-sector reforms is as follows;

a. The state house has a significant social and economic function and responsibilities.
b. The successful and efficient performance of such functions and obligations necessitates innovative approaches to public sector management.
c. Involving service consumers and personnel improves services and creates broad agreement on how resources for producing these services will be distributed.

However, some arguments for public sector services may be incompatible with cost reduction, which should not be attributed to ineffectiveness or inefficiency (Martin, 1994). Similarly, Pint (1991), cited by Wilmer (1997), argued that public monopoly is more efficient (controlled) than private monopoly when the objectives are suitably balanced. According to Wilmer's detailed study (1996), public ownership is not inferior to private ownership and is even superior in several industries. In energy, insurance, railway, and water services, public ownership works extremely well, or at least as well as private ownership. He further stated that external objectives, internal profit distribution, and true technological and organisational effectiveness distinctions might need to be clarified when comparing the public and private sectors. According to Rasinmaki (1997), the new market economy model prioritises social and ethnic duties over profit maximisation. In theory, sales of public assets or absolute (material) privatisation may be conceivably provided regulatory legislation and processes effectively preserve citizens' legal protection, equality, and fundamental human rights in the new environment. Rasinmaki stated that public legal obligations and essential capabilities and tasks that cannot be transferred to the private sector before implementing privatisation should be specified first. A government may delegate public service production to a private company not governed by legislative responsibilities (Rasinmaki, 1997). The private organisation does not provide the same level of democratic decision-making, control, transparency, and legal protection to citizens as the local government. The advantages of municipal service production include, for example, the manageability of municipal operations, municipal democracy, and citizen legal protection (Rasinmaki, 1997). According to Rees (1984), the only correct approach to evaluate the performance of a public institution is to ascertain how effectively it achieves defined goals and objectives.

This point is frequently overlooked when public sector organisations are chastised for needing to be more efficient and effective. According to Martin (1994), the privatisation argument has centred on whether the private or public ownership or management model is superior. This has resulted in many heated debates but has not yielded proven outcomes. Martin (1994) stressed that the difficulty is the question, not the response. There has been minimal debate over the distinction between public service values and profit-seeking. Nonetheless, Rees considers the distinction the central issue. However, this does not imply that only the public sector can implement the values of public services or that the public sector is exempt from applying private sector operating principles and practises or engaging in public-private partnerships.

Power sector pre-privatization

From 1972 until early 2006, the government-controlled National Electric Power Authority monopolised power generation and supply in Nigeria (NEPA). Due to a lack of proper finance and management initiatives, the utility's performance has continuously worsened. In 1993, for example, the total amount of electricity generated was 14,621 GWH, comparable to 1,669 MW of power. From 1981 and 1985, the fourth National Development Plan saw an oil boom and a 10% rise in electricity consumption (Ikeonu, 2006). Because of the quick development rate, installed capacity is finding it challenging to fulfil the load demands of residential, commercial, and industrial consumers.

Given this expansionary tendency, the country's policymakers saw no reason to invest in the electricity industry. This rapid expansion led to load shedding, impacting household life and the commercial and manufacturing operations of the economy's industrial sector. Electricity plants, transmission lines, and distribution networks must be sufficiently maintained for logistical and economic reasons (Jerome, 2005). When maintenance is undertaken, planned maintenance is utilised, which is generally quite costly and may not even increase the power system's lifespan. As a result, in most cases, the average MW power availability is less than half of the installed capacity. It was, therefore, not surprising that by 1999, when the immediate past civilian administration took office. One of the key thrusts of the government's economic reform strategy was to ensure the complete overhaul of the power sector. This overhaul led to a working group (Haggard & Webb, 1993), specifically focusing on adopting the National Electric Power Policy (NEPP), which defined Nigeria's power sector reform framework.

According to Jerome (2005) the previous government decided to handle the Nation's power supply challenges to provide continuous power supply within three years without first evaluating the problems in the NEPA setup to speed action in resolving the frequent power supply concerns. This necessitated a substantial financial investment in improving production capability. Nevertheless, more than equivalent investment was made in transmission and distribution networks. In 1999, this investment increased available electricity. Because the transmission and distribution facilities on the ground could not keep up with the increasing electricity output, these positive growths have no impact on consumers.

Factors that gave rise to privatization of the power sector in Nigeria

People have long complained about government-owned firms stagnating and the corruption that infects many of them, hurting them and contributing to their stagnation. The people who devised and perpetrated this dishonest act now want it privatised. As a result, Abutudo (2002) viewed privatisation as an economic waste since the little progress accomplished in post-colonial Nigeria's first two decades had almost entirely been lost. This is because most of the expatriates who handed over these firms are returning in some form to regain control of executive positions in most of the enterprises and big companies abandoned to Nigeria under the pretence of privatisation more than two decades ago. We are confronted in the country with a psychological crisis of uncertainty rather than a total reassertion of foreign economic power.

Another reason for privatization is that public enterprises in Nigeria consume approximately N200 billion in National Resources each year through grants, subsidies, import duties, and other means (El-Rufai, 2003). Since 1973, public enterprises had consumed more than one-third of all money made from oil sales, and the estimates of the Vision 2010 committee indicated that federal government investments in public enterprises totaled more than US $100 billion (one hundred billion dollars) in 1974.

Thus, resources that could have been used to combat poverty and other programs that would benefit millions of Nigerians are diverted to a few public enterprises. These public enterprises were established to spearhead Nigeria's development, but they now appear to serve as platforms for patronage and the promotion of political objectives, and as a result, they suffer from operational interferences by corrupt civil servants and political office holders.

There is a widespread belief that the government established corporations in areas where investors and private individuals were unwilling to invest. Because businessmen were unwilling to invest large sums of money in a business that was likely to fail, the government established corporations such as the electricity company and others. One of the reasons is to promote development and job creation in such areas.

The government also needs revenue, and it is envisaged that once created, these businesses would contribute money to the government and begin growth. Leaving such a large establishment in the hands of foreigners would be exceedingly harmful and inappropriate, although it is also for security concerns. In some respects, this will reinforce the reliance and imperialism that developing nations are battling by demonstrating their competence to cope with these enormous enterprises (Abutudo (2002). In addition, the administration anticipated that privatisation would improve economic efficiency. It will alleviate the strain on the government's limited resources while enhancing the reward system, organisation, and management through incentives, communication, collective bargaining, and inventiveness.

Private corporations have long been considered superior and more efficient than governmental ones. As a result, privatisation would boost private initiatives, help restructure the Nigerian economy, reallocate public funds to efficient users, develop a self-sustaining culture, and attract international investors, among other things. Others think privatisation will significantly reduce political favouritism in government appointments, where public expenditures are frequently squandered. Most individuals sit down to accept money for which they did not labour. It is also possible to conclude that privatisation emerged due to corrupt leaders' ambition rather than the bad performance of the public sector. Privatisation is one of the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) financing criteria for Nigeria. Privatisation would save the government money and allow successful discussions on external debt rescheduling. Meanwhile, none of the third-world countries stuck in this debt trap will be able to escape readily, allowing them to continue to bend to the whims of corrupt governments and western imperialists.

The privatization era

On November 1, 2013, the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) announced a milestone in its energy market reform when it turned over properties to the 6:11 series of new entrants (six generation and eleven distribution companies, while the transmission is retained with the government) (Abutudo, 2002). The historic event energised all areas and industries, heralding the country's peaceful future. Meeting the development model of a nation with over 170 million people and a GDP growth rate of 7% is directly linked to energy availability. According to the study, electricity has unidirectional causality, which indicates that a power shortage may affect any economy. All the euphoria ended two years later, on February 1, 2016, with the imposition of a 45 percent rise in power cost. More notable is the locals' contention that electricity availability has remained unchanged.

In the 2015 World Energy Architecture Performance Index, Nigeria was placed 116th. This suggests that Nigeria has one of the world's lowest per capita usage rates of power. The nation's highest-ever peak generation was 5,074.7MW on February 2, 2016. On the other hand, demand forecasting is impeded by the difficulty of finding reliable data or sources. The Ministry of Power, on the other hand, forecasts demand in 2015 at 12,800MW. This reflects the supply situation, which must have a limited industrial and social expansion to less than the economy's capacity (Jerome, 2005).

This previous shortcoming has resulted in the widespread deployment of poor self-generation versions. This scenario has made Nigeria renowned as the world's largest importer of fossil fuel-powered generators, resulting in not just environmental implications but also an increase in the price of products and services (Jerome, 2005). For example, the country's primary telecommunications operator is believed to operate around 6,000 diesel-powered generator sets nationwide, with monthly recurrent expenses of $5.5 million US dollars. Such large administrative expenditures are passed on to clients. More so, they have had a key influence in a decreasing industrial sector, which has resulted in young unemployment estimated to be about 60%. Moreover, one litre of diesel produces around 2.7 kg of CO_2. Because electricity is essential for the fundamental development of amenities like clean piped water, health care, telecommunications, and quality education, the rural population has also lagged in terms of social development. More than 70% of rural Nigerians rely on wood for fuel. Fuelwood, often known as firewood, is any unprocessed woody biomass used to fuel a small fire for cooking or heating. In Nigeria, obtaining fuel wood for home and commercial usage is a major source of deforestation and erosion. The annual rate of

deforestation is roughly 350,000 hectares, or 3.6 percent of the present area of forests and woods, whereas replanting is only about 10% of the annual rate of deforestation.
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) inhalation from cooking offers a substantial health risk that begins before birth. Women and children are regarded to be the most sensitive to indoor air pollution since they are in charge of cooking and housekeeping and spend a lot of time around fireplaces. Nigeria has the highest risk of newborn (2088) and child (5148) fatalities due to such occurrences, according to findings from 2008 demographic and health surveys. Soot from biomass burning and other sources, often known as black carbon, is a powerful global warming agent and impacts public health. According to one research, black carbon is the second most significant contribution to global warming behind carbon dioxide.

Challenges and opportunities

Challenges

In a developing nation such as Nigeria, power sector reforms offer substantial issues not only to the government that began the programme but also to the populace that consumes electricity and to the newly formed PHCN, which portrays itself as a superior option to the moribund NEPA. These issues may be divided into four categories: economic and social, technical, political, and environmental.
Economic and social: The main goal of the federal government in revamping the power industry is no longer debatable: to increase the efficiency of the nation's power business while also making energy more inexpensive and accessible to consumers. This necessitates boosting the national grid's capacity and reactivating most of the country's 'dead' power plant units. The federal government, the PHCN, and independent power providers must build more power plants (IPPs) to meet consumer demand for electricity. Building new power plants and rehabilitating malfunctioning older facilities are both capital-intensive. Steady electrical supply in our houses is always expensive. End users will pay more to utility suppliers because the latter's principal goal is profit. This is demonstrated by Hall's (2000) research on a privatisation initiative in Hungary and the United Kingdom.
Technical: It is not enough to create appropriate electricity by relying on current transmission line capabilities; examining how the power may benefit both the PHCN and the customers is also necessary. The former highlights the importance of transmission line and substation strengthening and new transmission line construction to facilitate energy evacuation, particularly in areas where IPPs cluster due to proximity to energy sources (Inugonum, 2005). The latter requires the PHCN to implement a demand-side management (DSM) programme. Demand-side management programmes often encompass electric utilities' planning, implementation, and monitoring activities to encourage customers to modify their quantity and power usage pattern. Instead of

building new power plants to meet rising consumer demand, energy providers might reduce consumption by offering customised programmes to homeowners, businesses, institutions, and industries. To assess the effectiveness of such methods, the costs and benefits of DSM options should be directly compared to the costs and benefits of constructing new power plants and transmission networks (Donald n.d).

Political issues: To achieve the intended results, equal playing grounds must be created and maintained for all players in the growing power sector reform. The reform programme is anticipated to make the electricity industry more accessible to major parties inside and outside the nation. This means that IPPs should anticipate a favourable political environment before investing their cash. Most IPPs prefer to build their plants in the Niger Delta area, where their required energy is assured. At the moment, the unfriendly atmosphere in the Niger Delta caused by armed ethnic militias and young rebellion would surely dissuade potential power investors. This underlines the need to keep the nation's democratic systems to preserve government policy stability. Consequently, once operational, the intended complete national energy strategy will be maintained, addressing conservation, storage, consumption, construction, and distribution.

Environmental factors: The environment determines the sort of power plants that will be developed in a specific region. Due to high levels of carbon monoxide (CO_2) emissions, a city that already has a cement and chemical sector, for example, may be hesitant about hosting thermal power plants. To avert this catastrophe, the government must create the Environmental Inspection Agency (EIA) to monitor and control how much pollution harms the environment and its population. Likewise, IPPs may face expensive compensation costs and right of way in developing a power plant in any city. Potential clients are always put off by these exorbitant compensation payments, which can go into the millions of dollars.

Opportunities

The Nigerian power sector offers immense opportunities for investors and stakeholders interested in economic growth and sustainable development. With a population of over 200 million people, Nigeria has one of Africa's largest markets for electricity, creating significant investment opportunities in the power sector. The Nigerian government has implemented several policies and programs to increase private sector participation in the power sector, providing attractive incentives for investors. Additionally, the country has vast untapped renewable energy resources, including solar, wind, and hydropower, providing an opportunity for clean energy investment. Despite the challenges facing the Nigerian power sector, such as inadequate infrastructure and inefficient distribution networks, the industry presents immense investment potential for stakeholders seeking to tap into the country's growing economy. Investing in the Nigerian power sector not only offers an opportunity for financial returns but also provides an avenue for contributing to the country's sustainable development and improving its citizens' living standards. Below are the areas of potential for the Nigerian power sector.

Efficiency and reliability of services: the efficiency and reliability of services in the Nigerian power sector have been a long-standing issue, affecting economic growth and development in the country. The power sector faces several challenges, including inadequate infrastructure, transmission and distribution losses, and poor revenue collection. These issues have resulted in low electricity supply, frequent power outages, and insufficient power supply to homes and businesses. However, the Nigerian government has implemented several reforms to address these challenges, such as privatising the power sector and implementing the National Integrated Power Project (NIPP). These reforms aim to improve the sector's efficiency, reliability, and performance, ensuring that electricity supply is available and accessible to all. Despite these efforts, challenges remain, and there is a need for further investments in the sector to enhance the efficiency and reliability of services and ultimately drive economic growth in Nigeria.

Investment opportunities: in Nigeria, power sector reform can potentially boost personal share ownership considerably. Around 800,000 new shareholders will likely be created due to NEPA's privatisation. This is beneficial since it promotes the capital generation and economic progress (Wikipedia, 2004). It can lessen public firms' dependency on government support. If essential investor confidence is built, the unbundling of NEPA will allow future enterprises to readily raise financing through the capital market, changing the development and expansion of their businesses. Additionally, private-sector-built power plants will infuse fresh money into the economy. The federal government's electricity industry reform will encourage investment and a healthy cooperative industrial setup. Nevertheless, what is presently occurring in the communication sector clearly demonstrates what privatisation may achieve.

Nigerians have previously been exploited due to Nigerian Telecommunication Limited's monopoly (NITEL). However, since the privatisation of the telecommunications sector, which resulted in the influx of privately owned telecommunication companies such as MTN, ECONET (V-Mobile), GlobalCom, RELTEL, RAINBONNET, and others, the cost of servicing a telecommunication line has dropped dramatically as a result of competition among these companies (Ige,2004). Similarly, a well-planned and wisely executed NEPA privatisation will provide investment possibilities, attracting local and foreign Independent Power Producers (IPPs).

Employment opportunities: the Nigerian power sector presents significant employment opportunities for the country's workforce, creating jobs in various areas of the industry. With a population of over 200 million people, the demand for electricity in Nigeria is high, creating job opportunities in generating, transmitting, and distributing electricity. The Nigerian government has implemented several policies to increase private sector participation in power, creating more job opportunities for Nigerians. Additionally, the industry requires skilled labour, providing training and capacity-building opportunities for the country's workforce. The implementation of renewable energy sources in the power sector, such as solar and wind power, has also created new employment opportunities in areas such as the installation and maintenance of equipment. Overall, the Nigerian power sector offers immense employment opportunities for the country's workforce, contributing to reducing unemployment rates and the country's economic growth and development.

Conclusion and recommendations

From the foregoing, this article examined the impact of electricity sector privatisation in Nigeria. It argues that Nigeria's experience with privatisation has demonstrated that it has bad implications for Nigerians. Among the negative results are workforce reduction, price increases for products and services, elitist domination, and PE rip-off. As a result, despite increased profit and service performance benefits, privatisation of PHCN is neither in Nigeria's best interests nor a feasible option for the country's ailing power sector, as the government is a key contributor to the power industry's inefficiencies. Appointments have been made based on patronage rather than merit over the years, and the PHCN has been unable to function independently of political intervention. Owing to the above discussion, the study makes the following suggestions:

i. Electricity consumer awareness and enlightenment on electricity usage: Energy consumers should be adequately enlightened and educated on the most efficient energy use that will result in sustainability.
ii. Adequate regulation: Appropriate regulatory frameworks should be implemented to ensure private investors are responsible for their activities and protect consumers from price gouging.
iii. More transparency: The privatisation process should be made more transparent so that the public knows the decision-making process and its reasons.
iv. Improved infrastructure: Efforts should be made to strengthen the infrastructure in the electrical sector so that the industry can supply consumers with reliable and affordable energy.
v. Boosting investment: The government should stimulate investment in the power industry by offering tax exemptions or subsidies to private companies that enter the market.
vi. Increased public participation: The public should be involved in decision-making to ensure that their concerns and needs are addressed and that the privatisation process meets their expectations.

References

Abutudo, M. (2002). Globalization and local initiatives: Issues and challenges being a seminar paper. LAPO Annual Development Forum: Benin City.

Bakare, A.S. and Gold, K.L. (2011). Estimating the impact of global system of mobile telecommunication (GSM) on income, employment and transaction cost in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and International Finance* 3 (1): 37 – 45.

Benbow, A. (2003). West Australia electricity reform privatisation disguised, Green Left Weekly, October 2003, pp.1-16.

Donald, C. (1997). U.S. Electric utility demand-side management: Trends and analysis. Retrieved from. www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/ pubs_html/feat_dsm/contents.html. On 11/2/2023 1997, pp.1-26.

El-Rufair, N. (2003). Is liberal democracy encouraging corruption and corrupt practices? The privatization process in Nigeria. The Nigeria Social Scientist, volume 6 No. 2 September 2003 p. 34.

Etieybo, E. (2011). The ethics of government privatization in Nigeria: Theory and practice. *A Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya*, 3(1): 82-112.

Federal Government of Nigeria (1993). Public enterprises act. Lagos: Government Printer.

Haggard, S. and S.B. Webb, (1993). What do we know confidence of intending investors in the power sector about the political economy of economic policy reform. J. *Oxford Journals*, Oxford University Press, World Bank Res. Observer, 8 (2): 143-68.

Hall, D. (2000). Impact of electricity privatisation on industrial relation: Lessons from UK and Hungary, www.psiru.org, November 2000.

Ige, O. (2004). Deregulation of the Power and Telecommunications Industry and Market operations reform in Nigeria, Proc. 20th National Conference of the Nigerian Society of Engineers (Electrical Division), October 6-7, 2004, pp. 1-4.

Inugonum, T. (2005). Challenges Facing the Development of Independent Power Producers in a Deregulated Power Sector in Nigeria (NEPA as a case study), 6th International Conference on Power System Operation and Planning (ICPSOP), May 22-26, Cape Verde, 2005, pp. 33-37.

Ikeonu, I. (2006). The Nigerian Electric power sector country. Reform: Establishing an effective licensing framework as a tool for attracting investments. J Institute for public-private partnerships, Inc., Regulation Resources Inform. Series, pp: 39-49.

Jerome, A. (2005). Privatization and enterprise performance in Nigeria: Case study of some privatized enterprises. African Economic Research Consortium, Nairobi. AERC Research Paper 175. February 2008.

Martin, B. (1994). From the many to the few privatization and globalization. Ecologist, 26(4): 115-155.

Olukoshi, A. (1985). Economic crisis, structural adjustment and the coping strategies of manufacturers in Kano. Nigeria New York: *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development*.

Pint, E.M. (1991). Nationalization versus regulation of monopolies: The effects of ownership on efficiency. *Journal of Economic,* 44(2): 131-164. View at Google Scholar. View at Publisher

Rasinmaki, (1997). The privatization of the administration of local government. Judicial study of the background, provision, restriction, forms and effects of privatization. *Judicial Review*, 2(4): 7-9.

Rees, R. (1984). Public enterprises economics. London: Weidenfield and Nicholsom.

Shirley, M. and Walsh, P. (2000). Public versus private ownership. The current state of debate. Policy Research Working Paper No.2420. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Wikipedia the Free Encyclopedia (2023). Privatization: Retrieved on January, 2023 from http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/privitization.