

- Adding new categories;
- Transforming the Register into a *military capabilities* Register; and
- Developing the Register into a useful *instrument of cooperative security*.

*Improving the current version of the Register as an arms transfer Register.* As previously discussed, the first year of operation fell short in terms of quality, confirmed and transparent data. This was due to non participation, conflicting interpretations of weapons category definitions, of whether or not a transfer has occurred, of when a transfer has occurred, and one poorly defined category – Missiles and Missile Launchers. Some obvious steps can be taken to improve this situation.

Probably no option is more important than promoting the Register so that universal participation becomes a reality. The level of confirmed data would rise, as would the confidence of states and perhaps the data submitted would become more transparent (e.g., use of the Remarks columns). Steps can also be taken to improve the process of reporting. Options here include improving the agreed upon universal definition of transfers and categories which states use as a basis for reporting, especially if participation increases. This approach has its limits, however, given the variety and levels of development of military forces. A second approach to the definitions problem would be the generation of a master list of specific models and types of equipment in the seven categories. This is the approach taken in the CFE Treaty. However it should be noted that all the worlds countries are involved in the Register, meaning that some pretty ancient equipment must be reported, and the Register includes two additional categories than does the CFE Treaty. Perhaps an intermediate step is the listing of examples of models and types for each category, a distinct possibility if participation increases and raises the confidence of states. A third approach is to improve transparency of national procedures, especially in regard to how states reached decisions as to *whether* or *when* a transfer occurred. One suggestion here is that on the form itself a special note be made urging states to submit such information. This approach increases transparency without the necessity of reaching agreement on universal definitions. It also leaves the door open for states to consult on these national procedures if and when a consultative forum or mechanism is developed.

A significant number of the discrepancies in the first year could be eliminated by increased bilateral and multilateral consultation. As one example, the CSCE agreed to share their reports in 1993 but that was apparently after they had been completed. This sharing could be moved up, especially in a CSCE which already has a computer network which could be adapted for this purpose. And states are always free to consult with each other when preparing their data submissions. A UN Centre for Disarmament Affairs that was more active could be instrumental in this part of the process by conducting seminars for missions in New York and issuing timely reminders of the value of such consultation in producing valid and transparent data. Similarly, data collection at the national level