

centre for circulation of notifications, monitoring, verification, observation of launches, and other necessary functions.

A Multinational Centre for Monitoring Arms Control at Sea

Arms control has not developed very far in its maritime dimension, other than the provisions in the SALT and START treaties for limitations and reductions on ballistic missile submarines, and in unilateral withdrawals of maritime tactical nuclear weapons. And yet some of the first attempts at arms control early in this century were focused on naval limitations. If developments in this area were to occur in the future they would almost certainly be multinational and global in scope, and would probably require some sort of multinational centre for effective implementation.

Multinational Centres for Development of Equipment, Methodologies and Training

As more experience is gained with multilateral operations, and as more states enter into the activities of monitoring compliance with treaty undertakings and contributing to confidence-building and transparency, a requirement will arise for multilateral centres for the development of equipment and methodologies, and for training of inspectors, operators, interpreters and analysts from many countries.

Such a development would be especially important for the efficient functioning of bodies involving personnel from many countries with different backgrounds and technical qualifications, and should aid in the establishment of confidence on the part of less-developed partners in conclusions reached by groups in which their representation is proportionately small. A prime objective of a centre should be to promote harmonization of the equipment and procedures to be employed by the various regimes.

Categories of Needs and Opportunities for Harmonization

As has been described earlier, and depicted in tables, the organizations, bodies and regimes can be grouped in several different ways. The needs and opportunities for harmonization can be *within* one regime (e.g. within the UN Arms Register, the MTCR or a Conflict Prevention Centre) or *among* the various regimes within a group.

One grouping is by functional areas. Existing groups include nuclear, chemical, biological and conventional weapons, and missiles, indicated in Table 6. When two or more regimes operate within the same functional area there are likely to be opportunities for harmonization among the regions. For example, as illustrated in Table 6, there is ample opportunity for harmonizing the reporting and analysis conducted by the IAEA, the London Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Zangger Committee, OPANAL, and the successor to CoCom, since all deal with nuclear proliferation. Similarly, bodies dealing with the proliferation of conventional weapons that would benefit from harmonization include the CSCE Forum for Security Co-operation, the UN Arms Register, the successor to CoCom, and any body using aerial surveillance such as the Open Skies Consultative Group, should it be authorized to undertake monitoring or verification. Regimes operating in different functional areas are likely to have fewer needs for harmonization.

Another grouping is by geographical areas. At the present time the obvious opportunities would seem to be among the regimes operating in Europe. Geographical groups such as Antarctica, the seabed and outer space are so different in their nature that there may be few opportunities for harmonization until new regimes are added.

