Tropical Built Environment Journal. Volume 9, No. 3, 320-330, 2023 www.tbejournal.com
ISSN: 1118-1790

EXAMINATION OF THE RIGHT HOLDERS' EXPECTATIONS IN REVOCATION PROCEDURE FOR REALIGNED WAYLEAVES IN SOUTH-EAST, NIGERIA

Chinaza Henry Obineme[1], Charles Chukwunwike Egolum[1*] and Joseph Ugochukwu Ogbuefi[2]

[1]Department of Estate Management, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria
[2]Department of Estate Management, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Enugu Campus, Nigeria
*Corresponding Author: cc.egolum@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract

For a project to be executed, land is required and such land must be acquired legitimately. Public projects such as transmission of electricity require wayleaves which should be aligned spanning a vast area. Communities and individuals, holding titles to land are therefore usually affected. Sometimes the route earlier specified by the transmission company may be adjusted and realigned. This paper is aimed at examining the right holders' expectations in revocation procedure for realignment of electricity wayleaves in South-East, Nigeria, with a view to ensuring that affected right holders are satisfied with the revocation and compensation procedure. The methodology involves the use of questionnaire, interview and documents analyses. The total population of this study is 3,882 comprising 465 Estate Surveyors and Valuers (ESVs) and 3,417 Affected Rights Holders. Data is collected from affected rights holders (ARHs) and Estate Surveyors and Valuers and analysed using Relative Importance Index (RII) and Correlation analysis. The study revealed that, the reason for the realignment being made known in detail to the affected right holders and prompt payment of compensation ranked first (RII = 4.64) as the major expectation of ARHs. It also revealed that right holders are not satisfied with the period of notice given to them for awareness and to relocate during such exercise, as well as with delayed payment in compensation which erodes the value of the money. It was recommended that detailed notice should be given and appropriate compensation promptly paid to mitigate hardship inflicted on the affected right holders. The expectations of ARHs require prompt and careful attention to avoid hiccups in the project execution.

Keywords: Expectations, Realigned Projects, Revocation Procedure, Rights Holders, Wayleaves

Introduction

Various projects are carried out by Government, and one of such could be the installation and operation of electricity equipment, such as the erection of generating stations, distribution stations, the carrying of overhead conductors across the land by means of supports erected on the land, and the carrying of overhead conductors across land without any supports being erected on the land itself, and these require the rights of land title holders to be revoked with compensation paid for respective heads of claims. Due to rapid urbanization, the demand for energy supply had increased in Nigeria, and in order to provide this energy, there is need for electricity (power transmission) wayleaves. Wayleaves are simply a Right of Way (ROW). It is an easement granted over land in form of a corridor and as such, electricity wayleaves are referred to as corridors beneath power lines. Wayleaves are important in protecting

the mains service line from being interfered with by activities like farming, waste dumping, building, or mining, which damage equipment and interfere with the provision of services. Wayleaves also protect people from incidental electrocution from a loosely hanging power line or fallen pylons.

A lot of processes is required to achieve such project development of which first is the process of revocation of rights in land. Government revokes rights in land without the willing consent of its owner or occupant in order to provide infrastructure for social and economic developments and as well for the protection of the natural environment. Revocation is an inherent power of the Governor to revoke interests in land and landed properties without the willing consent of the affected rights holders (ARHs).

Ordinarily individual land rights holders within urban areas and/or rural areas may not be willing to yield up rights in land and possession at a certain point in time, not even in return or in exchange for financial benefits (Kuma, Fabunmi and Kemiki, 2019). The rights in land are then fully revoked from affected rights holders whether they are for initial route or realignment, after payment of compensation based on assessment. However, there is usually delayed payment and most of the time, the damages to buildings, crops, and economic trees, injurious affections, among others are not adequately enumerated and assessed (Ige and Oladapo, 2018). And, when it took long for the compensation to be paid, the affected rights holders keep improving their properties with the belief that government is no longer interested since compensation is not yet paid to them, but if in the long run, the government pays, it does not cover the additional improvement on land or value update as at the time of payment neither is the interest added to the earlier value, for delayed payment (Obineme, Udobi and Ifediora, 2021). More so, a lot of items are not taken into account, during the survey on the assumption that they have no economic value since the government has no rates for such as regards compensation calculation.

The compensation principle is to repay the claimants for their losses, and should be based on the principles of equity and equivalence. Anuar and Mohd (2015) provided that the sum payable should represent a sum not only for the rights taken but also for other losses suffered in consequence of the revocation. The principle of equivalence is crucial to determining compensation. Realignment of electricity wayleaves is an area of concern that brings in mixed feelings on the part of the affected rights holders. There is a general feeling and expression that the revocation procedure with respect to the realignment of electricity wayleaves does not provide enough notice and publicity. More so, measurement errors which lead to leaving some of the affected properties out from assessment on the basis that they were not affected as such, contribute to the revisiting of the site to finish the task left (mop-up exercise). And as well contribute to the inadequacy of compensation sum. Egolum and Emoh (2017), stated that the leading role of the Estate Surveyor and Valuer involved in the valuation/assessment of the amount of compensation payable to each claimant is also highlighted in ensuring a successful project execution. However, in ensuring a successful project execution, the affected rights holders and occupants should neither be enriched nor impoverished as a result of the revocations.

However, with regards to the 330 KVA (kilovolt-ampere) transmission line project with its substations in Ubuluisiuzo town of Anambra State, 132 KVA transmission line project from Onitsha to Oji River, 132 KVA transmission line project from Ubuluisiuzo in Anambra State to Orlu in Imo State, 330 KVA transmission line project at Nenwe town, Enugu State, and 132 KVA transmission line from Alaoji in Abia State to Ebonyi State, are some of the projects that trigger revocations of rights for public interest from the affected rights holders.

Some of these projects at the time of this study are completed.

It is based on the foregoing identified and discussed issues such as; short notice, measurement errors, the inadequacy of compensation sum, and rights of holders not initially affected with respect to transmission lines in the identified areas stated earlier that, this study is aimed at examining the rights holders' expectations in revocation procedure for realignment of electricity wayleaves in South East, Nigeria, with a view to ensuring that affected rights holders are satisfied with the revocation and compensation assessment and payment procedures.

This would be achieved by identifying the right holders' expectations in the procedure of revocation for realigned projects in the study area and testing the following hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant difference between the expectations of right holders and those of Estate Surveyors and Valuers' in compensation assessment procedures in realignment of electricity wayleaves in South-East, Nigeria.

Literature Review

The review is aimed at identifying gaps in earlier works which this study attempts to fill. It covers the following areas: revocation procedure for realignment of electricity wayleaves in South East, Nigeria and the rights holders' expectations in revocation procedure for realignment of electricity wayleaves in the study area.

Revocation procedure for electricity wayleaves in Nigeria

Strategic planning skills are necessary for successful execution of electricity wayleaves projects since by nature, it interfere with land rights. This is reflected by (Muhammad and Muhammad, 2014) who matches resources and activities of an organization to the environment in which it operates. 132 KVA and 330 KVA are high voltage power transmission lines and such have no direct benefit to rights holders whose properties are traversed over and such it is better to execute with thoughtful plan. More often, unreactive strategies are used in electricity wayleaves project yet it is a contributor to urban planning and national development. To survive in a dynamic environment, policy makers need to focus on strategies that deal with emerging environment changes with regard to electricity wayleaves.

Electric Power Sector Reform No. 6, 2005, the Act established the Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC) as an independent regulatory agency. The NERC was inaugurated in October 2005, and is mandated to carry out the monitoring and regulation of the electricity industry as stated below:

i. Issuance of licences to market participants, and
ii. Ensure compliance with market rules and operating guidelines.

This Act also deals with acquisition of land and access rights.

Part V Section 77 subsection (1) of the Electric Power Sector Reform Act 2005 Cap E7, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004 (EPSRA) provides that where a generation licensee, transmission licensee or a distribution licensee, or a proposed licensee for generation, transmission or distribution service, requires any land in connection with its obligations under its licence or a proposed licence, such licensee may apply to the Commission, in such form as the Commission may prescribe, for a declaration that the land is required for purposes of generation, transmission or distribution of electricity. This provision states the first step to follow when land is required to apply to the Commission. The Commission duties with regard to the application submitted for purposes of generation, transmission or distribution of electricity were seen in subsection (2), (3) and (5) as follows: Subsection (2) provides that the Commission may call for such further information as the

Commission may deem necessary in connection with an application submitted under subsection (1) of this section and in considering the application made under subsection (1) of this section, the Commission may invite and consider submissions from the Commissioner of Lands of the State where the concerned land is situated.

Subsection (3) provides that after holding such enquiry as the Commission may consider necessary, the Commission may, subject to such exceptions as it may have included in the relevant licence and subject to such further conditions as it may specify, declare that the land identified by the licensee, with such modifications to its boundaries as the Commission may specify, is required for the purpose of generation, transmission or distribution of electricity.

Subsection (5) provides that the Commission shall not act under subsection (3) of this Section unless it is satisfied, upon representations made by the licensee or proposed licensee concerned, that the electricity generation, transmission or distribution concerned is not otherwise practicable. Thus under this section, no such declaration shall be given without granting to the person having an interest in the land under consideration an adequate opportunity to make representations against such declaration.

Subsection (6) provides that the following a declaration by the Commission under subsection (3) of this section, the President, shall issue a notice in the Gazette to the effect that the land is required by the Government of the Federation for the public purposes of the Federation. Subsection (9) provides that where the President Issues a notice under subsection (6), the Governor shall, in accordance with the provisions of section 28 (4) of the Land Use Act, revoke the existing right of occupancy respecting the land and grant of certificate of occupancy in favour of the concerned licensee in respect of the land identified by the Commission in such notice and the grant of such certificate, the right of occupancy over the land shall vest in such licensee to the exclusion of the previous holder of the right of occupancy respecting the land, who shall be entitled to claim compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Land Use Act (2004). The execution feasibility process will entail consultative meetings between government staff, consultant, affected local communities and local administration. During these meetings, the necessary steps and date to start the exercise is reached however, the necessary steps to be followed are Notice of revocation, route marking and procurement of brief, enumeration and assessment, and then payment of compensation. Perhaps, in revocation of rights in land, any delay in either of the processes is likely to have an impact on the schedule for revoking an unencumbered right for wayleaves which extends into the scheduled start time for the execution of civil works and thus delay in the start time for execution of civil works as well as causes delay in the overall construction process. Moreso, in Akinlabi study (as cited in Deeyah and Akujuru, 2016) summate the procedure for revocation and compensation exercise in Nigeria as follows: i) Notice of Revocation, ii) Procurement of Brief, iii) Claim Survey, iv) Assessment for compensation, v) Valuation Report, vi) Payment of compensation, vii) Professional fees. The study failed to include the application to the authority for land required. Perhaps, there is no different law for initial or realignment of electricity wayleaves (route) and as such the application is expected to be the same whether is initial or realignment route.

The right holders' expectations in revocation procedure and compensation

Obineme, *et al*. (2021) in the research; an evaluation of compensation processes on compulsorily acquired land for infrastructural facilities in South East Nigeria opined that the following are the expectations from the affected rights holders as shown in the Table 1.

Table 1: Right holders' expectations

Expectations	Takes
Prompt compensation that is, at list not more than 90 days after enumeration.	Because when it took long for the compensation to be paid, the rights holders keep improving their properties with the belief that the government is no longer interested since compensation is not yet paid to them but if in the long-run, the government pays, it does not capture the additional improvement on land or value update as at the time of payment neither is interest added to the earlier value for delayed payment.
Adequate compensation	To ensure equity, that is the affected persons are neither worse off nor better off than before the property acquisition. And further stated that the issue of inadequacy of compensation are as the result of not including all the items of claim in the valuation, not paying on time as such allow the awarded mount to loss value, not considering the interest added to the earlier value for delayed, and not considering the additional improvement coursed be delayed payment.
All the Items should be compensated for**.**	A lot of items are not taken into account, during the survey on the assumption that they have no economic value since the government has no rates for purposes of compensation calculation.
Building plan as a criteria for compensation	The demand for approved building plan as criteria for compensation of any affected building is not found in compulsory acquisition and compensation statute. And this demand is causing the affected rights holders to pay to obtain such, as to avoid losing been compensated and as such impoverishing the affected rights holders and causing unrest in the communities.
Relocation time at list 120 days. Considering the fact that most tenancy agreement stipulate three months as period of time to be given for a yearly tenant. Not minding the half a year notice for a yearly tenant as required by law.	Relocation time is not specified by the law and as such is at the discretion of the acquiring authority, and that which they do give is 2months (60 days) at most which is not sufficient enough to allow the affected landowners prepare ahead of the acquisition (take possession) of their property to avoid any injurious affection likely to occur during demolition of the buildings.

Source: Obineme, Udobi, and Ifediora (2021).

Table 1 shows the rights holders' expectations from acquiring (revoking) authority as regards to compensation and how to ensure a successful and satisfactory implementation, thus the rights holders' expectations as mentioned should not be taken lightly.

Ige, Akintomide and Adeola, (2016) carried out a study which highlights the rights holders expectations as allocation of sufficient time and resources for community consultation over land acquisition (revocation) and compensation issues, circumvention or reduced physical displacement, availability of expert advice during the revocation process, employment assistance for the land-loss communities labour force market, adequate consideration

to the land-loss communities' livelihood risk, unemployment risk, and impoverishment risk, good communication and involvement of communities, required entitlement to the displaced communities, prompt and adequate compensation, resettlement assistance to physically displaced communities, meaningful socialization and consultation with affected communities about the project and its impact but in all, the researchers failed to consider the expectation of those rights holders affected in realignment of electricity wayleaves.

Deeyah and Akujuru, (2016) stated that, the rights holders expected the revoking authority to adherence to land revocation best practice criteria as well as compensation payment best practice criteria as provided in international best practices. The criteria as highlighted are as follows:

1.Land revocation best practice criteria.

i. Develop and implement clear and transparent land revocation procedure.
ii. There should be timely notification and consultation with land and property owners.
iii. Affected persons should be given the opportunity to be heard and to have their concerns acknowledged and addressed by revocation authority.

2. Compensation payment best practice criteria

i. Compensation should be made to all affected persons including those without title to land.
ii. Pay in kind and/or in-cash in time before relocation and civil work start.
iii. Pay compensation at replacement cost for the cost of restoration in time.
iv. Encourage disclosure of information and the use of negotiation or arbitration procedure.
v. Ensure regulation are specific enough to provide clear valuation guidelines, but flexible enough to allow room to determine equivalent compensation in all situation.

It is necessary that best practices are adapted and effectively implemented to ensure that affected rights holders (ARHs) are placed in the position they were before the revocation.

Additionally, Opara (as cited in Odudu, 2017) also highlighted that affected rights holders preferred resettlements in other locations to cash compensation under the federal government's prescribed method of assessment. Reason is that, cash compensation under the prescribed rate/method has no bearing with the value of the affected rights holders' property. Moreso, rural dwellers who may not own substantial interests like buildings, may own interests in economic crops and trees and even swamps which may be overlooked as intangible interests by the revoking authority. For instance, the revoking authority rates were applied against the actual market value.

Research Methodology

The study employed the survey research approach, which involved collecting data from the sampled population of the study. The total population of this study is 3882 comprises of 465 Estate Surveyors and Valuers (ESV) and 3,417 Affected Rights Holders in the South-East area of Nigeria spanning Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo States. The study also employed google survey application to ease collection of responses to the questions in the questionnaire.

The study had a total population of 3,882, comprising 465 Estate Surveyors and Valuers (ESVs) and 3,417 affected rights holders. A total sample of 272 Estate Surveyors and Vluers and 511 affected rights holders (ARHs) were sampled, and data were successfully retrieved from 199 Estate Surveyors and Valuers comprising 22, 40, 9, 80 and 48 from each respective Eastern State, and 274 affected rights holders (ARHs) comprising 48, 58, 48, 86 and 36 from each respective State. The stratified random sampling technique is appropriate, since the approach involves a combination of approaches – stratified and random

samplings. Stratified random sampling involved the division of the Valuers listed in the official register of the Nigerian Institution of Estate Surveyors and Valuers, the affected rights holders as identified by the TCN assessment number into groups according to their locations. The study carried from 2012-2022. This research features a close ended question in addition to matrix which is also a form of close ended questionnaire. Here questions were arranged to form a table with identical response options placed on top. Options were given to respondents to choose from.

In this study, parametric and non-parametric statistical tests were employed. Descriptive statistics using mean is adopted in addition to frequency and percentage distribution. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient is used with the correlation coefficient (R) value indicating how well 2 continuous variables from the same subject correlate to each other. An R value of 1.0 means the data are completely positively correlated and 1 variable can be used to compute the other. An R of zero means that the 2 variables are completely uncorrelated. An R of -1.0 is completely negatively correlated. This technique is used to determine correlation between the pairs of variables. The statistical model is given as:

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2)(\sum y^2)}} \qquad \textit{Equation 1}$$

Where: x = X – X and y = Y – Y

The Non-parametric test used the relative importance index. This is for variables to be rated against a scale to assist in assessing the significance of each variable. The scale is transformed into an index otherwise known as Relative Importance Index (RII) for each component to determine the ranks of the different components. The Relative Importance Index (RII) is evaluated using the following expression:

$$\text{RII} = \sum \text{W}/(\text{AN}) \qquad \textit{Equation 2}$$

Where:

RII = Relative Importance Index
W= weight given to each component and method by the respondents, ranging from 1 – 5.
A = Highest weight (i.e. 5 in this study).
N = total number of respondents.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Tables 2 and 3 display the Opinions from affected rights holders (ARHs) on their expectations in the Right of Way (ROW) acquisition for the electricity wayleave, and compensation procedure in South Eastern Nigeria. This is done with the application of Relative Importance Index (RII).

Table 2: Presentation of opinion on expectations by the ARHs

Expectations/Response	S. Agreed W=5	Agreed W=4	Undecided W=3	Disagreed W=2	S. Disagreed W=1	RII	Rank
Reasonable notice for at least not less than 30 days	206 WF=1030	45 WF=180	0 WF=0	23 WF=46	0 WF=0	4.58	2nd
Reason for realignment made known in detail	174 WF=870	100 WF=400	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	4.64	1st
Prompt compensation	174 WF=870	100 WF=400	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	4.64	1st
Payment made together with the route (line) not affected by realignment	124 WF=620	100 WF=400	25 WF=75	25 WF=50	0 WF=0	4.18	4th
Relocation time for at least 120 days	100 WF=500	125 WF=500	49 WF=147	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	4.19	3rd
Total	778	470	74	48	0		

Key: WF = Weighted frequency.

Table 2 indicated that Reason for realignment made known in detail and Prompt compensation ranked first (RII = 4.64). These were followed by Reasonable notice for at least not less than 30 days (RII = 4.58). And followed by Relocation time of at least 120 days (RII = 4.19). Then, followed by Payment made together with the route (line) not affected by realignment (RII = 4.18). This goes to explain that the expectations that ranked first with (RII = 4.64) were the major expectations from ARHS with respect to the REWL, that is not to say that other expectations are not relevant because with the RII result it shows that they are also necessary for successful execution of REWL.

Additionally, Table 2 presents the results of responses as provided by the respondents on the listed expectations in column 1. The choice "S. Agreed" has a total score or total frequency of 698 as the highest. This tells us that these listed expectations are really the expectations of ARHs in the course of realignment of electricity wayleaves. The next is "Agreed with a total frequency of 470 which we also classified as a complement to the choice "S. Agreed". These results have proven the likelihood of the expectations from ARHs.

Table 3: mean ranking of response on expectations by ARHs

Response	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Rank
S. Agreed	100	206	$1.56x10^2$	1
Agreed	45	125	94.00	2
Undecided	0	49	14.80	3
Disagreed	0	25	6.81	4
S. Disagreed	0	0	2.88	5

Table 3 is the mean ranking in descending order from top to bottom as presented by the SPSS output. The table showed "S. Agreed as first on the ranking with a mean of $1.56x10^2$ in column 4 row 4 of the table. The second in ranking is "Agreed" with mean of 94.00 and "Undecided" taking third with a mean of 14.80 while "Disagreed" and "S. Disagreed" are the 4^{th} and 5^{th} respectively in the ranking. This has shown that the expectations really took effect as opined by ARHs.

Tables 4 display the Opinions from Estate Surveyors and Valuers (ESV) on specific questions with respect to challenges faced in realignment of electricity wayleave by ARHs in South Eastern Nigeria. This is analyzed with the application of Relative Importance Index (RII).

Table 4 showed that Short notice given to ARHs on realignment route and Delay payment of compensation ranked first (RII = 4.69). This was followed by Late compensation to ARHs on the (RII = 4.63), followed by Reason of realignment not explained to ARHs (RII = 4.52), followed by Time value of money (RII = 4.47), followed by Initially ARHs left without notice (RII = 4.42), followed by Initially ARHs left without compensation (RII = 4.35), and followed by Omitted ARHs (RII = 3.84) as shown in the Table 4. This goes to explain that the Short notice given to ARHs on realignment route and Delay payment of compensation that ranked first with (RII = 4.69) are the major challenges in realignment of electricity wayleaves from ESV response, that is not to say that other factors are not relevant.

Table 4: RII presentation of response on specific questions with respect to realignment of electricity wayleaves

Questions/Response	S. Agreed W=5	Agreed W=4	Undecided W=3	Disagreed W=2	S. Disagreed W=1	RII	Rank
Initially ARHs left without notice	136 WF=680	42 WF=168	0 WF=0	10 WF=20	11 WF=11	4.42	5th
Initially ARHs left without compensation	129 WF=645	30 WF=120	20 WF=60	20 WF=40	0 WF=0	4.35	6th
Short notice given to ARHs on realignment route	137 WF=680	62 WF=248	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	4.69	1st
Reason of realignment not explained to ARHs	136 WF=680	31 WF=124	32 WF=96	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	4.52	3rd
Delay payment of compensation	147 WF=735	42 WF=168	10 WF=30	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	4.69	1st
Late compensation to ARHs on the realignment route	136 WF=680	52 WF=208	11 WF=33	0 WF=0	0 WF=0	4.63	2nd
Omitted ARHs	42 WF=210	105 WF=420	31 WF=93	21 WF=42	0 WF=0	3.84	7th
Time value of money	136 WF=680	31 WF=124	21 WF=63	11 WF=22	0 WF=0	4.47	4th
Total	999	395	125	62	11		

Key: WF = Weighted frequency.

Table 5: Ranking of the response on the challenges posed by realignment of electricity wayleaves

Response	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Rank
S. Agreed	37.00	143.50	115.56	1
Agreed	16.50	92.50	38.75	2
Undecided	.00	27.50	11.88	3
Disagreed	.00	18.50	6.31	4
S. Disagreed	.00	14.50	3.00	5

The information presented in Table 5 is the ranking of the response on challenges resulting from realignment of electricity wayleaves. The response which was ranked first is the "S. Agreed" while "Agreed" was ranked second. The next on the ranking is "undecided" followed by "Disagreed" and lastly by "S. Disagreed. Those that strongly agreed and those who agreed constitute the respondents that accepted there was indeed the listed challenges really came from realignment of electricity wayleaves.

Hypothesis Testing

H_0: There is no significant difference between the expectations of right holders and those of Estate Surveyors and Valuers' in compensation assessment procedures in realignment of electricity wayleaves in South-East, Nigeria.

Table 6 shows the output of correlation analysis from SPSS. The correlation coefficient **r** is positive and significant. The value of **r** is 0.891 and significant at 0.001. The correlation coefficient of 0.891 being significant at 0.001 which is within the 5% level is a good result. The value of **r** according to the rule should be between +1 and -1. +1 show a positive and linear relationship between the two variables of study while -1 shows a negative and linear relationship between them. With the result

obtained in the table as shown by the Pearson correlation coefficient to be significant at 5% level, we accept the null hypothesis that says "there is no significant difference between the expectations of right holders and those of Estate Surveyors and Valuers' in compensation assessment procedures in realignment of electricity wayleaves in South-East, Nigeria.".

Table 6: Output of correlation

		Expect. of ARHs	Expect. of ESV
Expect. of ARHs	**Pearson Corr.**	1	0.891
	Sig. (1-tailed)		0.001
	N	6	6
Expect. of ESV	**Pearson Corr.**	0.891	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.001	
	N	6	6
Probability:		0.001***	

Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations

Findings

From the analysis, it was revealed that reason for realignment being made known in detail and prompt compensation ranked first (RII = 4.64) as the major expectation of ARHs. Next on the list by rank was that reasonable notice should be given to them, preferably for a period of at least a month. Time for right holders to relocate to a different location was considered next which they deemed should not be less than 4 months, and that Payment should be made together with the route (line) not affected by the realignment. Overall response showed they strongly agreed to all the suggested expectations. Then, with respect to opinion of ESV on challenges faced by ARHs, it was revealed that short notice given to ARHs on realignment route and delay payment of compensation ranked first (RII = 4.69) as the major challenges for ARHs.

Summarily, it was revealed that there is no significant difference between the expectations of right holders and those of Estate Surveyors and Valuers' in compensation assessment procedures in realignment of electricity wayleaves in South-East, Nigeria. This was proved by the results of correlation in Table 4.

Conclusion

The study discussed the processes and steps followed in the process of realignment of electricity wayleaves, expectations of right holders and challenges. The study revealed that expectations of rights holders are majorly on the fact that reason for realignment be made known in detail to them and prompt payment of compensation, which if not addressed will continue to cause hiccups in the project execution. The outcome of this study indicates that realignment of electricity wayleaves as a project carried out in the South-East, Nigeria comes with challenges. Looking at the way it is executed one can easily conclude that it is not without hitches and discomfort to the environment where it is being executed.

Recommendations

The expectations of ARHs require prompt and careful attention to avoid hiccups in the project execution. Proper and due notification and prompt compensation payment, and formation of a trusted community committee are necessary for seamless REWL and smooth project execution.

Proper information on the exercise should also be passed on. Such information as to the start time, the time it will elapse, negative impact of the exercise, compensations to those who were caused damage/loss on initial route and realigned route and so on. Opinions of the stakeholders (actors) should be taken into consideration with utmost importance and everybody that is involved should be carried along so that they will not feel cheated or left out.

Reference

Anuar, A. and Mohd, N. D. (2015). Payment of adequate compensation for land acquisition in Malaysia. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal,* 12(3), 326-349. doi: 10.1080/ 1444 5921.2006.11104213.

Deeyah, C. L. and Akujuru, V. A. (2016). Assessing the effectiveness of the Nigerian compulsory acquisition practice in road infrastructural provision in Rivers State. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 5(4), 77-88.

Egolum, C. C. and Emoh, F. I. (2017). The issues and challenges of urban renewal in a developing economy. *International Journal of Development and Economic Sustainability, 5*(1), 32-44.

Electric Power Sector Reform Act. (2005). *Electric power sector reform Act 2005 Cap E7, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004 (EPSRA).* Retrieved from https://nerc.gov.ng/index.php/library/ documents/Regulations/Electric-Power-Sector- Reform-Act-(EPSR)-2005.

Ige, V. O. and Oladapo, R. A. (2018). Variation in compensation for compulsory property acquisition: Ondo State, Nigeria experience. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal,* 24(11), 1-10. doi: 10.1080/14445921.2018.1461768.

Ige, V. O., Akintomide, A. J. and Adeola, T. O. (2016). Compulsory land acquisition and compensation in Nigeria: Coastal communal perception. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies & Management*, 9(5), 545 – 553

Kuma, S. S., Fabunmi, F. O. and Kemiki, O. A. (2019). Examining the effectiveness and challenges of compulsory land acquisition process in Abuja, Nigeria. *FUTY Journal of the Environment, 13*(2), 1-13.

Land Use Act. (2004). Federal Republic of Nigeria. Retrieved from https://lawcarenigeria.com/ land-use-act/.

Obineme, C. H., Udobi, A. N. and Ifediora, C. O. (2021). An evaluation of compensation processes on compulsorily acquired lands for infrastructural facilities in South East Nigeria. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals,* 4(8), 23-32.

Odudu, C. O. (2017). Compensation issues in the Niger-Delta –A case study of Boboroku, Jesse, Delta State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Civil Engineering, Construction and Estate Management,* 5(4), 21-43.