

In February 1994 this group was constituted by the Secretary General and had its first of three sessions, at the end of which they must write a report to the Secretary General regarding the further development of the Register. Irrespective of how they were selected, the composition of the group has some interesting aspects regarding this work.

1992 Panel

United States	Argentina
China	Brazil
France	Mexico
United Kingdom	Malaysia
Russia	Ghana
Canada	Egypt
Italy	India
The Netherlands	
Japan	
Czechoslovakia	

1994 Group

United States	Argentina
China	Brazil
France	Mexico
United Kingdom	Singapore
Russia	Ghana
Germany	Zimbabwe
Canada	India
The Netherlands	Pakistan
Japan	Egypt
Australia	Israel
Finland	Jordan
Cuba	

First, the emphasis was on continuity, with 15 of the original 17 countries returning. Many of the same people have returned and the Chairman is the same, Ambassador Hendrik Wagenmakers of the Netherlands. This is a sign that the UN work on the Register is not business as (Cold War) usual, when so-called study groups were often rotated among countries as rewards and often seen mainly as exercises in negotiating texts that had little operational impact. Second, with Germany as a member, the six largest arms exporters are in the Group. Third, the addition of Pakistan and Israel insures that the context of two of the regions of the world in which an operational Register could have an impact will be integrated into the work. Also, Pakistan has been a vocal critic of the Register because of its discriminatory nature (e.g., transfers only) and Israel has rarely been included in UN security exercises such as this. The addition of Cuba adds a member who abstained on the original vote to create the Register. It is early in the work of this Group but its composition insures that it will be harder to reach a consensus, and that such a consensus may have a lower common denominator on the dimension of transparency. On the other hand, the inclusion of additional key players in the nexus of arms and stability may mean that any consensus reached may carry more weight with the international community and further the advance of transparency.

The 1992 report spelled out what in essence is the work of the 1994 Group, and at the end of their first session in January 1994 they had reviewed the first year of operation and developed a draft outline which roughly corresponds to the second part of the 1992 report, the modalities for the further expansion of the Register. The resolution also required that this Group be given additional information for use in developing a report on the further development of the Register. The