Confidence building appears to offer considerable promise as a security management approach. However, this potential cannot be fully realized unless a policy-relevant and conceptually sound understanding of the confidence building process and how it works animates application efforts. Relying on the traditional "minimalist" accounts of confidence building, with their tendency to reify the operational content of confidence building measures as the essence of "confidence building", is unlikely to provide much help. This approach, in particular, does not speak to the conditions that should be in place for effective confidence building to occur and lacks a convincing account of why and how adopting these measures will improve security relations. Coining new variants that rely implicitly on traditional reasoning or employ understandings that are excessively broad will not help either, because typically they lack a conceptual foundation. Confidence building should be seen as a process and not be equated with CBMs and what they do.

A number of policy implications flow from the transformation view of confidence building.

1) Understand the Opportunities and Limitations of Confidence Building:

Sponsors and participants will be more likely to enjoy success in employing the confidence building approach to change security relationships if they have a clearer, conceptually-based understanding of how it works and under what circumstances. Confidence building has specific requirements, objectives, and associated methods capable of achieving those objectives; all of which require clear articulation.

2) Distinguish Between Confidence Building Process and CBMs:

Policy makers should not mistake the adoption of CBM-like measures for confidence building. The latter clearly is a *process* and it is this process dimension of confidence building that helps policy makers to restructure

security relationships, rendering them more cooperative in character and less likely to lead to conflict and misperception. As a result, policy makers should concentrate increasingly on identifying when change is possible and on developing cooperative security arrangements when conditions are supportive. They should concentrate less on CBM package design, which will flow naturally from the effort to develop cooperative solutions. Analysts should concentrate more on understanding the role of supporting conditions and on explaining the nature of the confidence building process rather than focussing on CBMs and what they do.

3) Encourage Policy Relevant Research:

A better understanding by policy makers of the strengths and limitations of confidence building is essential to ensure that they make the most productive use of this security management approach and do not become disillusioned because of the approach's misapplication. Fostering this understanding requires more policy relevant research into confidence building. Such research should include both case studies of new applications -- both in new geographic regions and in new issue areas -- as well as generic studies of the confidence building process itself. Analysts and policy makers, particularly in various regional contexts, need to work closely to ensure that the explanations of confidence building make sense from a policy perspective and accurately capture what really occurs during successful confidence building. The transformation view suggests some of the issues that should concern analysts and policy makers as they pursue this goal.

4) Recognize the Importance of Supporting Conditions and Foster Them Where Possible:

An important policy implication flowing from the transformation view is the need to gauge when conditions are present that can support confidence building efforts. Imposing or encouraging confidence building before participants are ready for change is unlikely to