

New and additional institutions: Whether emphasizing reform, restructuring, strengthening, or streamlining, all speakers stressed the need to start with the existing system rather than adding major new institutions. Japan urged others to be patient with existing institutions as they evolved toward integration of environment and development.

Strengthening of UNEP: Kenya, speaking for African states, proposed that UNEP become the central agency of the UN for environment and development. Most others (US, EC, Sweden, New Zealand, China) stressed need to strengthen UNEP capacity to carry out current mandate with emphasis on environmental law, information, and policy advice. Brazil, Malaysia and others pointed out that UNEP was equipped and focused on the "environment" of "environment and development", and should not undertake a major program of operational activities for development.

Intergovernmental policy and monitoring of Agenda 21: The need for a central body with political profile and credibility was widely noted. A number of references were made to the General Assembly itself, and to ECOSOC, as well as to the establishment of a commission or committee to report to ECOSOC. The US proposed the merger of functions of the Committees on Natural Resources, New and Renewable Sources of Energy, and Science and Technology for Development into a Sustainable Development Committee. India, Malaysia and others stated clearly that such a body should be intergovernmental, democratically constituted (i.e. not the Security Council). Malaysia specifically stated that responsibility for monitoring, and assessment should not repose in a non-governmental body, and that discussion of a Sustainable Development Council was premature. China noted that either ECOSOC itself or a new Commission could serve the purpose.

Inter-agency coordination: All speakers noted the importance of integration of environmental concerns to all activities of the UN, and of inter-agency coordination to this end. Many called for coordination mechanisms to be given "teeth" (Mexico); however, only the Philippines and Bangladesh mentioned the possible role of the Director General/Development and International Economic Cooperation in this area. Various suggestions were made for dedicated sessions of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, reinstatement of the Environment (and Development) Coordinating Board, under joint UNDP/UNEP chairmanship (US, Japan) or back to UNEP (Kenya). Mexico suggested a joint governments/agency body.

Funding, Global Environmental Facility (GEF): While all G-77 statements made reference to the need for resources, the only classic call for new and additional funding, rejecting the use of traditional aid funds for environment, was from India. Along with WEOG, other G-77 delegations seemed to focus more on integration of environment in order to assure real (i.e. sustainable) development. No G-77 statement made positive reference to the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). India, Chile and others expressed strong reservations about its utility as an umbrella fund for other conventions, and criticized its governance. EC, Sweden, and Finland spoke favourably of GEF as a useful, though experimental, pilot project.