

These considerations make it particularly effective for use in confidence building arrangements which themselves usually revolve around the cooperative development of information about military forces and activities. In fact, it is entirely feasible to imagine a confidence building agreement that contains *only* measures that rely on cooperative monitoring techniques. Although there is no intrinsic reason why cooperative monitoring cannot be used to support other types of security management arrangement, it would appear to be particularly effective as part of a confidence building agreement because it amplifies the cooperative nature of this type of agreement.

Confusion about the relationship between cooperative monitoring, verification, and confidence building is compounded by the possibility that so-called "cooperative monitoring arrangements," if they are stand-alone creations *not* intended to service broader security management agreements, may actually look like examples of modest confidence building arrangements *and* may involve a legitimate confidence building process in their development. To an important extent, this confusion results from the fact that cooperative monitoring describes a set of common techniques and generally makes sense when associated with measures that require the collection of information (CBMs). Unlike the case of verification which is a dependent process, it can make sense to speak about an independent "cooperative monitoring arrangement", although this usage typically confuses what is in fact a confidence building agreement relying upon cooperative monitoring techniques with the specific techniques themselves.

Thus, it is reasonable to argue that the development of a confidence building agreement that is supported by cooperative monitoring techniques is a particularly good example of confidence building and that the *process of developing these techniques* may be entirely consistent with our broader understanding of the confidence building process. While not every security management approach that might rely on cooperative monitoring techniques

will necessarily be an example of confidence building, the fact that virtually all CBMs can benefit from the use of cooperative monitoring techniques and that many of the measures discussed in cooperative monitoring treatments are CBMs suggests a very close relationship between the two.

Organizing Categories of Confidence Building Measures

Before concluding this discussion of the transformation view of confidence building, it might be instructive to return for a brief look at the current version of the typology of CBM categories first introduced twelve years ago in *Confidence (and Security) Building Measures in the Arms Control Process: A Canadian Perspective*. In the intervening years, the original typology has undergone a number of revisions. Most of these were occasioned by the need to clarify the initial category definitions.

As indicated in Chapter Two of *Confidence Building in the Arms Control Process: The Transformation View*, the typology approach remains useful despite some methodological problems because it organizes a wide range of CBMs in a very accessible form according to their functional character. At present, the typology does not reflect any substantial changes flowing from the development of the transformation view of confidence building. However, it is possible to foresee how new confidence building efforts may encourage future revisions. Although many of the existing categories appear to be perfectly useable in new, non-traditional contexts, we may wish to add fundamentally new types of measures to this collection as our experience in this new dimension of activity grows. For the present, a "place holder" category — "non-traditional measures" — could be added to the existing structure to underline the need to think more creatively about this possibility. The current version of the typology is reproduced in abbreviated form below: