

- ensuring that allocation of work undertaken by UN agencies is based on a realistic assessment of their specific comparative advantage (e.g. the strengthening of UNEP in environmental monitoring, information exchange, technical cooperation and elaboration of legal instruments; and UNDP in environmentally sound development);
- establishing appropriate means for environmental capacity-building (institutions, human resources, and environmental infrastructure and technology) at the regional and national level, using existing mechanisms to the degree possible;
- promoting innovative approaches to institutional arrangements which combine the strengths of intergovernmental, NGO, and business approaches;
- supporting the involvement of various NGO sectors in UNCED itself with a view to having UNCED agree on mechanisms for ongoing and substantive cooperation between UN organizations and NGOs;
- promotion of a limited number of small-scale initiative which have a high likelihood of adoption, as UNCED "deliverables."

Working Group III lags behind Working Groups I and II because of general consensus that in institutional issues form must follow function, and that decisions on institutions must await the achievement of substantive consensus on Agenda 21 issues taken up in WG I and II. Nevertheless many delegations took the opportunity in the general discussion to disclose or repeat elements of national positions on broad UN reform issues as well as UNCED specific questions. This debate revealed both points of convergence and areas of very wide disparity. Virtually all speakers noted that their remarks were preliminary, and it is clear that UNCED WG III has been used as a sounding board for UNGA Second Committee.

While the sequencing difficulty posed by reform of the UN vis-a-vis major new initiatives arising from UNCED was universally acknowledged, a number of delegations (US, EC) urged that action on both fronts should be undertaken in parallel. Other delegations (Canada, Sweden, Guyana, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand) indicated that the role of this PrepCom was to clarify issues and narrow options, and referred to criteria, guidelines or agreed guiding principles for decisions to be taken later. Algeria and others noted that the key to these changes would be political will, and that UNCED should be regarded as the beginning, rather than the end, of the process.

The deliberations of WG III did not come to grips, even at the conceptual level, with the Working Group's functions in relation to the plethora of relatively small, totally uncoordinated institutional initiatives currently under discussion in the convention negotiations and in WGs I and II (Agenda 21).

Major issues: