



review the progress achieved at the Stockholm Conference as required by the mandate. The existence of an adjournment date distinguishes the Stockholm Conference from other open-ended arms control forums and could facilitate the process of coming to terms on a final agreement.

The negotiations at Stockholm have now advanced to the point where the outline of a final agreement is relatively clear. It will contain improved notification measures of military activity with lowered thresholds and increased advance notice, mandatory observation, enhanced information and verification procedures and a reaffirmation of the NUF principle. The principal proposals tabled to date reveal significant areas of convergence, although some major differences on the scope of certain measures still remain. The table on page 3 attempts to set out in comparative form the main elements of the current proposals of the NATO, NNA and WPO groupings of States.

While this chart provides a basic representation of the negotiating matrix at the Conference, it is more difficult to convey the politico-military positions which lie behind these respective proposals and the degree of their intercompatibility. The major points of conflict between the three groupings have involved the scope of notification, information, verification, constraints and non-use of force. A brief discussion of each of these issues follows.

On notification, the WPO has sought to include independent air and naval as well as land activities which NATO has resisted, arguing that the mandate provides for the notification of air and naval activities only when they are part of activities taking place on land. In his January 15 statement on arms control, the Soviet leader Mr. Gorbachev suggested that the problem of the notification of naval activities should be postponed to a future stage of the Conference, with the notification of land and air activities to be decided upon during the current stage. Most of the NNA, while not rejecting the NATO view that only land activities (which represent the

most threatening form of military activity for European security) should be notified at this stage, has not pronounced on the matter. In light of the NNA disposition plus the fact that air activities pose serious verification problems, it would seem that a notification regime restricted to land activities is the most probable outcome for this stage of the Stockholm Conference.

On information, NATO has argued that the exchange of information about each State's combat force structure in the zone is necessary in order to establish an independent standard of information. The information exchanged would be a valuable contribution to confidence-building in its own right. It would also simplify and assist materially in the verification of the notification measures, particularly the proposal to notify divisions out-of-garrison. The WPO, while not rejecting the principle of information, does not accept an exchange of information on combat force structure in the zone and has focused its attention on information in the context of notification which would only provide information on

forces actually participating in military activities at the time.

On verification, the WPO has generally insisted on the adequacy of National Technical Means (e.g., reconnaissance satellites) coupled with consultation to verify any CSBM agreement. NATO has insisted on the need for mandatory on-site inspection to verify compliance with the agreed CSBMs. NATO has not proposed any consultative measures of its own, because of concerns that such consultations could be used by a State to prevaricate and impede verification.

The NNA has proposed a measure providing for observation upon request and at short notice in exceptional circumstances. It would not, however, be mandatory for a State to grant such a request. The NNA also favours consultations both *ad hoc* and at fixed intervals to discuss implementation. Verification will form part of any agreement reached at Stockholm, but it is as yet not clear what verification provisions will be finally agreed to.



*The Canadian Delegation to the Stockholm Conference. At lower right is Mr. Tom Delworth, Head of Delegation. Behind him is Col. C. Namiesniowski, Military Advisor. At lower left is Mr. Chris Anstis, Deputy Head of Delegation. Behind him is Mr. Robert Vanier, Delegation Secretary.*