

foundation of virtually every international environmental agreement and legal instrument concluded since Stockholm.

- In 1972 agreement was reached on a follow-up program with a budget of US \$100 million for the initial five years - which would be equivalent to around US \$400 million in current dollars. In 1992, an effective outcome to UNCED will require funding several times this figure - in the billions rather than hundreds of millions of dollars.
- (iv) **From Rio to Stockholm: Lessons for 1992⁴**
- *Set specific goals and targets for Agenda 21.* Many recommendations in the Stockholm Action Plan failed to have a significant impact during the first decade because they were too general or vague, especially those directed to the UN specialized agencies. The same mistake should not be repeated at UNCED. The UNCED Secretary General's insistence on specific goals, targets and commitments for Agenda 21 should be vigorously supported.
 - *Curtail lobbying by UN agencies.* At the Stockholm Conference the UN agencies conducted an intense albeit clandestine campaign against the proposal to establish the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Their lobbying backfired. Before and at Rio, governments should make it clear they will not tolerate similar interference by international public servants. Attempts to do so should be exposed and stopped.
 - *Strengthen UN coordination and cooperation.* Since Stockholm the UN agencies have largely ignored or resisted UNEP coordination efforts. Throughout the UN system today, too much of the limited staff and financial resources are squandered on inter-agency rivalries and ineffective coordination machinery. UNCED should ensure that existing or new follow-up machinery has the political and financial clout to secure the coordination and full cooperation of other UN bodies. The Rio Conference should also start the process for making the specialized agencies subordinate and fully accountable to the UN General Assembly.
 - *Expand environmental monitoring and assessment capabilities.* Ten years after Stockholm, the assessment of environmental conditions and trends continue to be constrained by major gaps and a still modest capability for monitoring, collecting and

⁴ See Bruce, pp.39-41 and Munro, pp. 19-28.