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Introduction

The presence and stubborn persistence of economic and social disparities in any society at different stages of economic development has been identified as a peculiar facet of the process of economic and social change. As a consequence, therefore, "the questions of social and economic justice in the distribution of the fruits of economic progress are as important and as difficult in terms of regions as in terms of social classes".\(^1\)

To this extent, the purpose of this paper is to present an overview of the Cameroonian experience in development planning with emphasis on the regional dimension. In the course of analysing the planning process and implementation, an attempt will be made to shed light on some of the major problems which have been encountered in evaluating the development effort at the regional level.

Attention will be focused on the following salient features of the Cameroonian planning, particularly at the regional level: the machinery for planning, preparation of regional/provincial plans and projects, regional allocation of planned investments, the institutions responsible for the coordination and implementation of regional plans and finally a general evaluation of the Cameroonian experience in regional planning for development.

To this end, it should be pointed out that Cameroon with its diverse cultural, ethnic and linguistic background, has since 1966 adopted a regional approach to planning with a view to ensuring a balanced distribution of investment resources and the fruits of economic progress. Cameroonian experience in regional planning began with the Second Five Year Economic and Social Development Plan (July 1966 - June 1971), and has

---

continued with the Third Five Year Plan (July 1971 - June
1976). Since 1966, the primary aim of Cameroonian planning
has been to "assert, symbolise and strengthen national unity".

Economic Planning in Cameroon has been regionalised in the
sense that it has paid attention to problems unique to certain
regions. It should be noted that regionalization of develop-
ment planning has not meant regionalism but rather integrated
development with a view to achieving balanced growth of the
national economy. This is because prior to independence
Cameroonian economic and social development policy reflected
the influence of the colonial past which never took the local
economic and social structures into consideration.

The Planning Machinery

The Constitution of 1961 created at the national level two
decision-making institutions with extensive economic and
political powers and responsibilities. These institutions
are the Presidency and the National Assembly which have the
regulative capacity with respect to their ability to control
and influence the planning process. To this extent, the
authority relating to matters of development planning, econo-
mic policies, control and organization of credit, establish-
ment of national budget and the determination of taxes and
all levies required to meet national government expenditure,
have been exercised jointly by these two institutions.

Specifically, the President of the United Republic of
Cameroon, is responsible under the terms of the Constitution
for ensuring the management of the affairs of the United
Republic. In his capacity as Chief of State, he defines the
main lines of the planning policy (in a Presidential Circu-
lar), and takes the major decisions. The National Assembly
debates and votes on the law to approve the development
plans.

The National Party - the Cameroon National Union - plays a
dual role. Firstly, by remaining in permanent contact with
the population, it observes and makes known the aspirations, desires and reactions of the masses of the peoples with a view to guiding national decision-making process. Secondly, it mobilizes and organizes the masses with a view to ensuring that the objectives of the development plans are achieved.

The planning machinery at the national level - the Ministry of Planning and Territorial Development - is headed by a Minister who is responsible for the general co-ordination of studies and procedures concerning the preparation of the plans and the control of their execution, especially from the point of view of territorial development. The Department of Planning, in cooperation with the other Departments of the Ministry, is responsible for the preparation of medium and long-term development plans, controlling the execution of the plans, the planning of human resources and the development of the national territory.

During the preparation of the plans, the Minister of Planning and Territorial Development is assisted by National Planning Boards which consists of members of public and semi-public services and representatives of the principal economic and social sectors of the Cameroonian economy. For the Third Five Year Development Plan (1971-1976), for example, there were ten Boards - four horizontal: synthesis, Economy, Finance, Territorial Development and Structures and six sectoral: Education, Training and Employment; Rural Economy; Industry, Power, Mines and Handicraft; Trade and Tourism; Transport and Telecommunications; Town Planning and Housing; Health and Social Welfare.

In order to set up effective planning machinery at the provincial level, Cameroon was divided into six administrative regions, 39 divisions, and 129 sub-divisions (under the 2nd Five Year Plan), and later to 7 provinces, 39 divisions and 129 sub-divisions following the creation of the United Republic of Cameroon in June 1972. Each of the seven provinces is administered by a Governor who is the direct representative
of the Central Government.

At the provincial level, there is a Provincial Economic Service which is responsible for:

i) Collecting, centralizing and forwarding to the Provincial Governor and the Minister of Planning and Territorial Development economic data on the province, and particularly ensuring that the control forms concerning the execution of the plans are kept up to date, and

ii) organizing the regionalization of the economic and social development plans by undertaking the secretarial duties of the Provincial Planning Boards.

Apart from Provincial Economic Services, there are also Provincial Development Councils which deal with all problems relative to the specification of the development targets and implementation of the projects earmarked for each province. In particular, the Provincial Development Councils propose regional action programmes and determine the order of priority of the operation to be adopted. In addition, the analyse the local means available and encourages the co-ordination of technical services, public agencies and private enterprises.

At the divisional level, there is a Divisional Development Committee which is chaired by a Prefect. The Committee comprises local technical services, deputies, mayors and private citizens. It examines the methods and the means employed to ensure the satisfactory execution of the plans as well as the progress made by the programmes. Further it ascertains the results of programmes in the field of rural action and submits its views on requests for subsidies by Local Councils. The Divisional Prefect is assisted in his work by a Regional Development Officer who is a technical representative of the Ministry of Planning and Territorial Development.

A Rural Action Committee also operates under the chairmanship of a Sub-Prefect. This Committee is composed of local representatives of the participating technical services,
representatives of the local councils and communities and private persons. The Committee is responsible for assisting the Sub-Prefect in the execution of economic and social development operations.

In effect, then, Cameroon has so far attempted to combine at each level, both the policy and technical planning functions. Under the Cameroonian planning system, technicians, politicians and administrators are brought together with a view to ensuring continuous cooperation in the formulation and execution of development objectives at the national, provincial and divisional levels. As a result, it has been possible to initiate programmes that are necessary to help each province to attain its economic and social potential. It has also been possible to undertake an overall regional economic and social analysis so as to ensure that all levels of planning machinery may proceed from a common base of information.

The Preparation of Regional/Provincial Plans

The process of preparing regional development plans consists of two stages. Firstly, an exercise which consists of the identification of the potentials for economic and social development and problems impeding growth in each region, including specific public/private investment programmes which can help develop those potential, is carried out. Further, areas which in each region's judgement are most likely to have the potential for future growth and centres from which the population can be served in order to promote the overall development of the region, are also identified.

Following this exercise, a determination of investment priorities is undertaken with a view to ensuring maximum gains from public and private capital invested. These benefits are in the form of improved opportunities for permanent employment and increased levels of income on a continuing rather than on a temporary basis. A further exercise involving a scheduling and programming of feasible projects for
implementation is undertaken. On the basis of this work, the Head of State issues directives to all Ministries and Provincial authorities reiterating the basic guides and fixing the objectives of the plan and the strategic operations to be adopted.

The second stage consists of the meeting of the national and provincial planning boards. During these meetings the regional/provincial boards are responsible for:

i) defining the conditions under which strategic investments concerning their respective areas would have to be put into operation so as to have maximum effectiveness, coherence and induced effects, and

ii) taking into account the strategic operations and their effects, defining regional objectives and the methods they propose to achieve them.

Finally, the provincial and divisional programmes are established by the national planning boards in collaboration with the provincial and national administrative structures. It should be noted that the total cost of the projects approved for all the regions does not usually exceed the total projected investment for Cameroon as a whole for each five-year plan.

Apart from the fact, that sectoral projects in each region/province are weighted and ranked according to their productivity, Cameroonian planning has strived to maintain:

i) "equilibrium between ethnic groups and regions, none of which must be treated with special favour or disfavour, but which must certainly improve their knowledge of each other to promote friendship;

ii) equilibrium between town and country, agriculture and industry, manual workers and civil servants; so that economic development can be realised in a climate of national solidarity; and

iii) equilibrium between cultures; which must give birth to an authentic Cameroonian civilization."
For the national plan, particularly for the 3rd Plan, it has been possible to use a growth model which considers only a single factor of production - 'capital'. The underlying assumptions are that: a) the growth of the Gross Domestic Product is solely a function of the investment made, and b) the capital-output ratio or capital coefficient will remain fairly stable during the period of each plan, which usually covers five years.

These assumptions have been based on the rationale that labour or 'manpower' has not, in general, constituted a bottleneck in Cameroon. This is partly because foreign technical assistance has provided a stop-gap to cover the shortage of local experts in the various economic sectors, and partly because statistical data on available and expected capital resources is more accessible than that for labour. Assuming the national capita-output ratio of 3, it has been possible to make projections for the various sectors and the gross national product.

However, it has not been possible to employ the same model to make regional projections, mainly because of the absence of statistical information on gross regional output, capita-output ratios, consumption, inter-regional trade, average rate of change of price-level, and regional population growth rates. In addition rapid structural changes have been taking place at the regional level and these changes have made it difficult to compile reliable data for regional projections.

The Regional Allocation of Investment

Considering the Cameroonian policy of maintaining equilibrium between regions, the planning process would be expected to give adequate attention to the spatial dimension of economic development of the nation. This important feature of planning in a unitary setting would be reflected by the nature of the decisions taken by the planning process with respect to the allocation of public and private resources between the various regions.
However, in the 1960-65 Plan, the planning process gave no consideration to the regional dimension of development. The absence of this dimension in the 1960-65 Plan can be explained by the fact that the Plan was originally formulated for former East Cameroon, before the two States joined to become a Federation. The lack of any comprehensive feasibility studies of possible development projects in former West Cameroon made it difficult to extend the Plan immediately to that State. Consequently, the total planned investment of 53,000 millions Francs CFA was earmarked for projects in East Cameroon.

With respect to the 1966-71 Plan, it should be pointed out that this was the first regionalized plan which was formulated for the six economic regions under the federal setting. For the first time, the planning process gave consideration to the spatial dimension of national development. The distribution of planned investment between the regions is shown in Table 1. It will be observed from Table 1 that the largest share (18%) of planned investment went to the Littoral region which in 1965 accounted for 10% of the total population. The South-Centre region, which had 20% of the total population, was allocated the second largest share - 12.4%. Projected investment in West Cameroon region, which contained 21% of the total population in 1965, was approximately 11.8% of the total planned investment.

For the 1971-76 Plan, investment allocations were not made on a regional basis as was the case in the 1966-71 Plan. Rather allocations were made on sectoral and project basis. The information contained in the Plan on the pattern of resource allocation, does not lend itself to regional analysis with a view to determining the volume of planned investment that was earmarked for each province. It has, therefore, been extremely difficult and frustrating to determine precisely whether or not investment allocation under the 1971-76 Plan was made with a view to fostering the government policy of maintaining equilibrium between the different economic and administrative regions of the country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Sector</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South-Centre</th>
<th>Littoral</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Production (Agriculture)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Tourism</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Planning and Housing</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: (contd.) Regional Allocation of Investment - 1966-71 Plan
(in billions of francs CFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Sector</th>
<th>West Cameroon</th>
<th>Undistributed</th>
<th>Total Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Production (Agriculture)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Tourism</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Planning and Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan Implementation

Generally, there exists two schools of thought regarding the appropriate institutions or governmental agencies that should be responsible for the implementation of national and regional development programmes. Thus, while some people who favour executive powers for a central planning agency believe that it should be responsible for implementing plans, others advocate that autonomous institutions be set up to perform this function. This latter school of thought maintains the view that plan formulation, as an advisory and goal specification function, is incompatible with the executive responsibilities inherent in the co-ordination and implementation of plans.

The policy of "concerted development" in Cameroon, required that separate institutions, apart from the Ministry of Planning and Development, be set up at the national and regional levels for the co-ordination and implementation of development plans. Thus, at the national level, the National Planning Council has been created and empowered to sit in specialized committees and departments charged with studying, for example, the problems of implementation of projects in the various sectors.

As concerns the role of the institutions for plan execution at the regional level, the Federal Inspector of Administration up to June 1972 (now the Provincial Governor), is assisted by a "Regional Development Council" which deals with all problems relating to the implementation of the development programme in his region/province. The Council which includes representatives of the private sector, meet twice a year.

At Divisional level, the Prefect, who is responsible for the implementation of development plans in his district, ensures the coordination of various projects. In his task, he is assisted by a "Regional Development Agent" and a "Divisional Committee for Development. The "Divisional Committee" which is composed of local representatives of the technical services
and specialized development agencies, meets at least four
times a year. It examines the methods and means of putting
the Plan into practice in order to ensure its successful execution, as well as the amount of progress made in the
programmes.

The "Regional Agent", a technical officer of the Ministry of Planning is placed at the disposal of the Prefect. Specifi-
cally he is responsible, under the Prefect's authority, for
following the execution of development programmes and for
arranging meetings of the Divisional Committee. In principle,
therefore, the Divisions are equipped to follow and co-ordi-
nate the implementation of the projects located at that
level.

At a sub-divisional level, there is a Rural Action Committee
which is presided over by the Sub-Prefect. It is composed of
local representatives of the technical services and various
organisations. This Committee, which meets each month, has
the essential task of ensuring permanent co-ordination and
continuity of action in the services during the implementa-
tion of development plan. At the same level, there is also
a "Commune mixte rurale" or a Local Council, which has
autonomy in the management of local projects. These Communes or Councils participate in development works, particularly
within the framework of the "Minor Rural Equipment System"
which allows for the mixed financing of certain operations.

Finally, the rural institutions are of vital importance,
particularly as administrative supervision at the divisional
level cannot go right down to the level of each village and
to the scattered rural inhabitants who must be made aware of
their own potential and contribution towards economic and
social progress and the means of achieving that progress.
For this reason, the policy in the various plans has been
a progressive replacement of mobile rural teams by Rural
Training Centres, where more lasting and concrete action
can result in the formation of well-informed farmers who,
by their example, can inspire others.
Notwithstanding, the network of various institutions at the various levels, there is no doubt that the centralized nature of the administrative machinery has led to the close supervision of the institutions for co-ordinating and implementation of the various plans, from the national level, especially by the Presidency and the Ministry of Planning and Territorial Development.

An Evaluation of the Cameroonian Experience

With regard to the general performance of regional planning in Cameroon, it should be noted that it is difficult to judge the separate effects of the various area development programmes in the different plans. In the first place, only rather limited data on regional economic development exist. Secondly, the total sums are normally provided under a large number of programmes both by the national and regional/provincial governments. Thirdly, capital expenditure has not been sufficiently broken down on a regional basis. For example, under the 2nd Five Year Plan (1966-71) more than 30% of total planned investment was earmarked as undistributed capital expenditure, and for the Third Plan (1971-76) the total projected investment is not broken down or divided between the various regions.

On the whole, however, the regional policy has been focused on specific problem areas and on those with specific resource potential for development. To this extent, it should be noted that "Today under the authority of Chief of State, of the Cameroon National Union and the moral forces of the nation; the structures most likely to promote development are in the process of being built". 2)

As a result, therefore, under the Second Five Year Plan (which was a regionalised one) the Gross Domestic Product increased from 194.8 milliard francs in 1966/67 to 296.8

milliard francs in 1970/71 – an annual growth rate of 9.6% in current francs CPA. If account is taken of the annual population growth of 2.1% and an annual average increase in the general price level of 3%, then the real growth rate of GDP per capita was 4.5% per year between 1966/67 and 1970/71. This rate was greater than that of 3.5% which is the rate required to double per capita income between 1960 and 1980 – a fundamental objective of Cameroonian perspective planning.

With respect to the three major sectors of the Cameroonian economy – Primary, Secondary and Tertiary, it will be observed from Table 2 that in general, the percentage share of the primary sector in gross domestic production decreased from 36.7% to 32.0% between 1966/67 and 1970/71, whilst that of secondary and tertiary sectors fluctuated between 19.9% and 20.9% and 44.2% and 47.10%, respectively, during the same period.

The fluctuations in the shares of the secondary and tertiary sectors can be explained by the uneven sectoral shifts which took place within the various regions and the major industries that comprise these sectors. The steady decrease in the share of primary sector in the gross domestic production is clear indication of the planning effort to reduce the dominance of this sector in the Cameroonian economy.

Regarding the actual distribution of the regional investments, it will be observed from Table 3 that the projected investments, for the six economic and administrative regions in the 1966-71 Plan, indicated that the Littoral region was to have the largest proportion of total planned investments followed by the Centre-South region. However, for the year 1966-67 actual investments in the latter region, were indeed higher than in the former region.

Furthermore, although the 1966-71 Plan indicated that the West Cameroon region was to receive the third largest share of planned investment among the six regions, this projection
Table 2: Growth of Gross Domestic Production by Sectors (1966/67-1969/70)
(Value in milliard francs CFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963/64 as Base Year</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966/67</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967/68</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/69</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Growth
(Current Francs)

- Primary: 6.8%
- Secondary: 16.4%
- Tertiary: 9.7%
- Total: 9.7%

Annual Growth
(Constant Francs)

- Primary: 3.8%
- Secondary: 13.4%
- Tertiary: 6.7%
- Total: 6.6%

Projection in 2nd Plan:
in constant francs

- Primary: 3.3%
- Secondary: 9.7%
- Tertiary: 6.5%
- Total: 5.8%

Table 3: Regional Distribution of Actual Investments: 1966/67 (1966/71 Plan) (billions CFA francs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C-S</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>W-R</th>
<th>Cameroon</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Five-Year estimates</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respective percentage of the regions</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Order of Priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1966/67 Actual Investment</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Respective percentage of the regions</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Order of Priorities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


N = North  W-R = Western Region
E = East    L = Littoral
C-S = Centre-South U = Undistributed
was not fulfilled in 1966-67. Rather, the Northern region became third in terms of the actual investments that were undertaken whilst West Cameroon was fourth. Concerning the Western and Eastern region, it will be observed from Table 3 that their respective positions were maintained. In regard to undistributed investments, planned and actual capital expenditures in 1966/67 were close to the estimates made in the 2nd Plan - that is 38.1% as compared to 38.2%. For the remaining four years of the 1966-71 the information on the execution of the Plan does indicate the actual volume of investments that were finally undertaken in each region. Consequently, it is difficult to say whether or not the various regions maintain their respective positions as they did in 1966-67 - the first year of the Plan. In the case of the 1971-76 Plan, the report on the execution of the Plan during the first year (1971-72) again does not indicate the volume of actual investments undertaken in each region/province. This is probably because the 1971-76 Plan was not regionalised like the 1966-71 Plan.

Conclusion
All in all, it cannot be determined from the available data whether or not economic development under the policy of 'planned liberalism' at the regional level in Cameroon has been successful. In this regard, it should be pointed out that the absence of adequate data has prevented a full evaluation of the policy at the regional level, particularly in view of the government policy of maintaining balance between the regions. Nevertheless, the results of the policy at the national level as indicated earlier have been very encouraging.

It is hoped, however, that in future when more data on actual investments, per capita income etc. become available on the effects of this policy at the regional level, it will be possible to state precisely the extent to which decision-makers and planners have strived to maintain equilibrium or balance between the various regions/provinces as a consequence of regionalization of development planning.