

universal definitions can be established for this type of data. Rather, the method mentioned earlier will be even more appropriate, namely states submit their rationale for the generation of data on weapons procured through national production.

The final pillar of an acquisitions Register will be the submission of the military holdings (inventory) of each state participating in the Register. The objective of preventing 'excessive and destabilizing accumulations of conventional arms' cannot be achieved without an assessment that in the end must rely on the baseline that military holdings provides. It should be noted that the United States has submitted such a proposal in the CD.

One way of addressing the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of armaments is to highlight and examine States' military holdings and procurement through national production. To that end, the United States proposes the following international data exchange of military holdings and procurement through national production.

The actual proposal calls for data to be exchanged on the seven categories defined in the Register, and encourages states to include type, names, general descriptions and photographs of the equipment listed.³⁴ Additionally a precedent was set in the 1992 submissions when 13 states submitted such data, for the same seven categories established for arms transfers.

It should be noted that with holdings the Register is getting at the heart of a nation's national security. One should expect even less transparency for this type of data. States will have to trade off this concern with that of being a participant in a universal, non-discriminatory international confidence building measure (CBM). For this category of data there will be even *more* definitional and data collection problems at national level. As with procurement data, the 1992 panel listed a host of questions in its report in this regard.³⁵

Adding New Categories of Conventional Weapons. An enhancement that would effect both of the above would be the addition of categories for transfers, procurement through national production and holdings. From the beginning of the exercise in the fall of 1991, disputes arose as to what type of weapons were to be made transparent. In essence it was the Western architects of the Register who settled on the five CFE categories plus ships and missiles and missile launchers. They are roughly those major systems that can be used in cross-border attacks (e.g., the Iraq invasion of Kuwait). As with procurement, a bargain was struck that the language of the resolution would include in the mandate of the experts group (1992 and 1994) that they could adjust these seven categories and add

³⁴ United States, *Working Paper by the United States on an international data exchange of military holdings and procurement through national production*, CD document CD/TIA/WP.4, 18 May 1993.

³⁵ *Ibid*, paragraph 41 (a-e), p. 18.