

recommendations based on the causes of the current impasse that were detailed in Part III and IV of this report.

Recommendations for action

- *Recognize sensitivity of military holdings.* The current group of governmental experts (GGE) reviewing the Register should make explicit mention of the fact that military holdings lie at the heart of the security concerns of states, and that data submitted in this category, if at all, will understandably be at a different level than either transfers or PNP. Military holdings data, in the context of transparency and confidence building, only make sense at the local or regional level. This recognition may contribute to more cooperation from states which have heretofore viewed the Register as unrealistic in this regard.

- *Standard form for reporting production.* At the same time, the report should make clear that the exports and national production of the northern states *does* matter. Most of the arms in the inventories of states in areas of tension arrived there via the northern states. Such transparency remains critical to efforts to create CBMs and prevent conflict at the local and regional level. Arms buildups, unlike MH, *can be stopped*. If the above suggestion concerning putting MH in a different category than PNP can be achieved, it would enhance the possibility that the Group might adopt language establishing, at a minimum, a standard form for reporting PNP. This form would be very useful for states and UNDDA in promoting participation in the Register.

- *Seminars on relationship between arms buildups and conflict.* Canada has been very active in promoting the Register in Asia and Latin America. It is recommended that this effort be continued but with more emphasis on the basic points made above. Canada should host workshops *during this review period*, for the Group of Experts and others, that enhances the knowledge of states regarding the role of arms buildups in the outbreak and exacerbation of armed conflict. Such workshops could focus on the following:

- i. Presentations by those scholars who have researched the role of arms buildups in conflict. This body of knowledge is significant. What do we know about this? These presentations should present case studies that demonstrate how arms buildups with negative (e.g., instrumental in the outbreak of conflict), positive (e.g., deterrence) and benign effects (weapons never intended for military use). The recent case of Russian plans to send a destabilizing weapons system to Cyprus (A-300 air defense missile system) is an instructive case in point. The transfer was transparent, it was destabilizing (Turkey threatened to bomb the missile system if it was deployed), and yet the issue was defused as a result of all of the involved states being members of consultative mechanisms (NATO and OSCE).⁴⁹ At the other end of the spectrum, an assessment of the recent war between Ethiopia

⁴⁹ . A thorough collection of raw data and analysis on this case has been assembled by the Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.