

**Table II: Forecasting Calendars, Notifications and Observations**

	NATO	WP	NNA	Total
<b>1987</b>				
exercises forecast	17 (3 Advance)	25	5	47
exercises notified	19	25	2	46
exercises observed	9	8	0	17
<b>1988</b>				
exercises forecast	13	22	3	38
exercises notified	13	21	3	37
exercises observed	8	7	3	18
<b>1989</b>				
exercises forecast	10 (6 Advance)	17	3	30
exercises notified	10	17	3	30
exercises observed	6	5	2	13
<b>Total forecast</b>	<b>40 (9 Advance)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Total notified</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Total observable</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>48</b>

**Table III: Challenge Inspections — as of October 1989**

	By NATO	By WP	By NNA	Total
1987	2	3	0	5
1988	7	6	0	13
1989	7	3	0	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>

Agreement thus far. Observations and inspections have been carried out routinely without any significant problems. Military and diplomatic officials have stated that implementation of the Agreement has increased transparency of military actions among the participants and thus reduced tensions.

While the letter of the Agreement has been upheld, comments have been made about the openness and flexibility exhibited by some of the participating nations. NATO officials, for example, have stated that in general they were given more cooperation and freedom of movement while observing Eastern European exercises than during Soviet exercises. In addition, Warsaw Pact nations varied in the degree to which they allowed observers the use of cameras, dictaphones, and the like. These nations also differed in the quality of briefings given before exercises, the observers' access to command posts, and to transportation. NATO officials were often unable to determine which Warsaw Pact military units were participating in certain activities because their shoulder patches were covered up. These problems reflect a lack of cooperation on the part of the Warsaw Pact, but are not considered failures to comply with the Agreement.

The Warsaw Pact, on the other hand, has issued a number of more substantive complaints against the West. For example, Czechoslovakia claimed that the US exercise, *Caravan Guard* 87, held in early 1987, was not properly notified. The United States argued that, according to the Stockholm Agreement, exercises held within the first forty-two days of 1987 were notifiable only under the terms of the Helsinki Accords. Hence, the United States was not obligated to notify the exercise.

In a case concerning advance forecasts, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia charged in 1987 that the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) failed to forecast, in December 1986, the NATO exercise, *Certain Challenge*. The United States and the FRG responded that the exercise had been notified by the US in its annual calendar. Furthermore, because its involvement in the exercise was below the 40,000 advance notification level, the FRG was not required to give advance notification. This exercise was, however, included in the 1988 FRG calendar.

In May 1987 the United States announced that two forecast exercises, *Iron Forge* and *Compass Point*,

have been listed — all by NATO nations. The Table shows that the number of exercises forecast in these calendars is not always the same as those that are later notified. This occurs for a variety of reasons: changes in military planning can lower the level of troops to a non-notifiable number; exercises are forecast even though they are planned to be held at non-notifiable levels; and non-forecast exercises are sometimes added later.

In the three years since the Stockholm Agreement entered into force, the annual number of exercises has decreased. Perhaps this trend will continue. The Warsaw Pact has held more exercises than NATO, but they tend to be smaller and involve fewer nations at a time. When combined operations do occur within the Warsaw Pact, they usually involve only the Soviet Union and one alliance partner. In precedent-setting procedures, some participating nations have issued calendars stating that they have no notifiable activities to report, or that they have forecast non-notifiable activities. Whether such initiatives will evolve into regular behaviour remains to be seen.

Table III shows the number of challenge inspections carried out by signatories.\* Significantly, the NNA has not to date inspected or been inspected. This lack of experience is regrettable. In some future time of heightened tensions, experienced neutral inspectors could act as crucial interlocutors between East and West.

CSCE participants have stated that they are generally satisfied with the degree of compliance with the

\*Canada inspected its first exercise through the Stockholm arrangements in June 1989. The exercise took place in Czechoslovakia.