

concentrated focus, but in the end virtually all environmental issues found their way into the compendium of trends and problems. UNEP's limitations, as suggested elsewhere in the decision, do not result from the numbers of issues treated but rather with respect to its capacity to contribute to the solution of these problems through the exercise of its coordinating, catalytic and stimulating functions.

#### UNEP's Mandate

20. The most contentious aspect of the resolution concerned the basic orientation and overall objectives of UNEP for 1982-92. A debate emerged between those favouring an implementing or operational role for UNEP (developing countries) and those supporting the existing catalytic, coordinating and stimulating role (mainly the developed countries - Sweden excepted). Although this was not resolved with any clarity, a general agreement was achieved. A measure of recognition was given to the possibility that UNEP assist in the implementation of certain activities "where supplementary funds are available" in the area of supporting measures in such fields as information, education, training, national institution building, the further development of environmental law and guidelines, and methodologies of environmental management. The decision also stressed, however, "that the catalytic, coordinating and stimulating role of UNEP remains appropriate" and emphasized, with regard to the implementation of activities, that the responsibilities of other bodies of the UN system must be borne in mind.

21. Two major functional areas prescribed for UNEP's attention included assessment of environmental problems of world-wide concern and environmental management. Issues pertaining to development aid emerged in this context. References by developing countries to diminishing aid were refuted by major donors such as the USA, while attempts to include references to the need to apply environmental criteria to development aid projects were resisted by Brazil and Tunisia. The resulting exclusion from the resolution of statements linking environmental concerns to development assistance did not, however, accurately reflect the views of the majority of developing countries which supported the integration of environmental factors in the planning and execution of development aid projects.

22. The role of the Governing Council was also a focus of debate in view of a sense of its failure to assume the kind of global leadership envisaged at Stockholm. The Resolution accordingly included a recommendation that the Governing Council give overall policy guidance, set priorities, and enhance cooperation with the governing bodies of other UN organizations dealing with environmental issues.

#### IV THE NAIROBI DECLARATION

23. A draft declaration, which had been formulated by permanent representatives in Nairobi over the preceding three months, served as a point of departure at the special session for a working group established to finalize