

- capacity building was also required in other areas such as education and training, strengthening of institutional infrastructure, and operation and maintenance of treatment plants and other installations for water use and disposal;
- water supply and sanitation services required further development;
- research and development had to be encouraged in key areas such as low cost sanitation, water conservation technologies, and improved irrigation technologies.

A few countries rejected the freshwater proposals for agenda 21 as being inadequate or on the wrong track. Mauritius stated that the proposals were too academic and should think of the people who would be affected. As an example, the proposal for water pricing was rejected: "if the cost of clean water is raised, then the poor will resort to traditional sources which have been polluted by industrial and other activities". As an alternative to water pricing, it was suggested that taxes be imposed on multinationals operating in countries.

The role of the Dublin Conference was mentioned in many interventions. While some interventions stressed the importance of the Dublin Conference in developing options and recommendations for consideration/endorsement at UNCED, it became clear that the Dublin/Rio process required clarification regarding what Dublin was to achieve. Several delegations, Canada in particular, stressed that the PrepCom should concentrate on ensuring that Dublin propose options for implementing, coordinating and funding the strategies and actions which it will present to UNCED.

Denmark, on behalf of the Nordic group, Sweden in a separate intervention, and the WMO, intervened to raise the issue of the financial status of the Dublin Conference, which is critical. There is an apparent shortfall of funds of some \$ 1 million, or about two-thirds of the projected costs. Individual countries and the UN agencies of the Inter-secretariat Group on Water were asked to make or increase their contributions to the trust fund. Sweden announced its intention to contribute an additional \$ 80 K to the fund.

During the second and third weeks, revisions to the Agenda 21 document were worked on, first in small, voluntary drafting groups and then in informal consultations of the full Working Group. There was initially a fair amount of confusion over what product the group was to draft and what documentation would be submitted to Dublin. Some delegations were concerned that a considerably revised Agenda 21 document prepared basically by the Secretariat should not go to experts at the Dublin Conference before being submitted to delegates at PrepCom IV. As a result, the Working Group took on the task of negotiating the Agenda 21 document during the course of PrepCom III itself, rather than simply giving guidance to the Secretariat to