1. By its decision 85/16, paragraph 5(e)(v), adopted at its thirty-second session in June 1985, the Governing Council decided that, in calculating country indicative planning figures (IPFs) for the fourth programming cycle, 1987-1991, one of the supplementary criteria to be applied would be the country's status as a front-line State.

2. The Council may recall that a similar supplementary criterion was applied in calculating country IPFs for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986, in accordance with its decision 80/30 adopted at its twenty-seventh session in June 1980. However, paragraph 1(c)(i) of decision 80/30 stipulated that this criterion would be applied only to countries that did not benefit from other supplementary criteria. Subsequently, only one of the countries which was considered a front-line State did qualify and the issue of a precise definition of the concept did not arise.

3. Decision 85/16, however, does not incorporate the limitation on the use of the supplementary criterion for front-line States contained in decision 80/30, paragraph 1(c)(i), and thus the issue of a precise designation of countries falling within this category arises.
4. In seeking to identify the legislative authority for the designation of front-line States, the relevant General Assembly resolutions on the subject have been reviewed. It has become apparent that General Assembly resolutions did not identify the specific countries intended to be covered by this designation. A formal designation of front-line States has been made in resolution CM/Res/786(XXXV) of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) adopted at its thirty-fifth ordinary session in Freetown, Sierra Leone, June 1980, which includes the following countries: Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

5. In view of the above, the Administrator is applying the supplementary criterion of front-line States only to those countries specifically identified in the OAU resolution, this being the only legislative basis specifically supported by resolutions of an intergovernmental body. Subsequently, the suggestion has been made to the Administrator that other countries may have an equal claim to being considered front-line States by virtue of their geographical proximity to South Africa.

6. In the absence of a formal designation of other States as front-line States, the Administrator proposes, for the Council's consideration, that Lesotho and Swaziland be considered as front-line States on an "as if" basis, for the purpose of calculating their fourth cycle IPFs.

7. Should the Council decide in favour of applying this supplementary criterion to the calculation of the fourth programming cycle IPFs for Lesotho and Swaziland, any additional allocation of total fourth programming cycle IPF resources to those countries resulting from the recalculation will be provided from resources available under the "unallocated account", which is specifically reserved for such purposes.
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