

Tanks	82%	N= 1733
Armoured Combat Vehicles	32%	N= 1625
Large Calibre Artillery	49%	N= 1682
Combat Aircraft	68%	N= 270
Attack Helicopters	43%	N= 40
Ships	11%	N= 40
Missiles and Missile Launchers	13%	N=67878

States which submitted *arms exports data* did so with varying levels of transparency. For example, of the 24 states reporting exports, 17 opted to use the 'Remarks' column of the form to provide some description of the weapon system being exported. However, when assessing the use of this column by number of transfers reported, only 64 of the 159 exports reported (40%) contained this type of data in the 'Remarks' column. Some states used highly aggregated data, especially in the missile and missile launcher category. While this complies with the procedures outlined in the Report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts (Document A/47/342), in effect it produced little or no information on the actual transfers which occurred.

Discrepancies and Quality of Data: Patterns and Explanations

Lack of Confirmed and Transparent Data. One key to making recommendations for the further development of the Register is to attempt to understand the reasons for the less than expected quality of data in the first year of operation. There are at least six reasons that can be put forward for consideration. The *first* is basic, namely, the lack of participation by states, especially those with major levels of arms imports in the seven categories in 1992. Data on a transfer cannot be confirmed and thereby have optimum validity when one or the other partner to a deal does not participate in the Register. This suggests that efforts in the UN and other international/regional fora to increase participation, in addition to reinforcing the norms established in the resolution, could significantly increase the quality of the data. A *second* reason for the lack of confirmed data is conflicting interpretations of category definitions. For example, Malta reported receiving ships from Germany which did not meet the category definition, i.e., they were below 750 tons and were not armed with missiles. Germany conformed to the procedures and did not report the transfer. So despite the fact that both countries participated in the Register, this data could not be confirmed. Similar problems occurred with the specific categories of combat aircraft and attack helicopters. A grey area is being created by broad Register definitions for attack helicopters (particularly ship-based helicopters) and combat aircraft (armed trainer aircraft). As a result some governments did not report transfers of systems that were publicly reported in sources such as the SIPRI arms trade register as meeting UN Register definitions.