United Nations. He argued that a combination of political and technological changes made this approach an attractive one. Chief amongst them were the end of the Cold War and the emergence of great power cooperation; a growing interest in multilateral arms control and verification; the commercial availability of moderately high-resolution satellite imagery (with the prospect of even better quality images in the near future); and a greater willingness on the part of international actors (both states and organizations) to rely on this type of monitoring data.

Despite the promising possibilities, several basic concerns stood as potential barriers to acceptance. First, the tendency for the international community to think in terms of "one treaty, one verification regime" (treaty specificity) made it difficult for many to accept the use of a single image distribution centre for the support of several different treaties. As well, it was not self-evident to many that this type of body would make a constructive difference — that there was any real need for it. This view was at least in part a product of the fact that existing arms control efforts had not adopted this course. Fiscal viability was another concern. This type of approach could be seen to be very costly (although the scheme presented here was not). Finally, technical and operational issues needed to be addressed. For instance, processes of image data dissemination, the speed with which requests could be honoured, procedures for pre-distribution analysis; and the question of how to maintain appropriate confidentiality needed to be resolved.

Mr. Diebert's presentation sought to address these concerns. The treaty-specificity barrier, he argued, was no longer rational (if it ever was) because of the proliferation of similar monitoring requirements and the exorbitant costs of developing duplicative verification regimes for each new arms control agreement. The end of the Cold War only served to underline the need for many states lacking sophisticated NTM to have access to monitoring data. This also meant that there was indeed a need for some form of satellite image distribution organization. With overlapping requirements underlying more and more existing and potential security management agreements, it made good sense to support the creation of a single body capable of meeting a number of those shared requirements. Cost was not the problem that many imagined it to be. The image distribution function was not costly in itself as it simply served to collect and direct image data from existing satellites. The body in the proposal was **not** a monitoring agency per se tasked with the development and operation of monitoring satellites. Finally, the operational requirements for this type of body did not appear overly onerous. Procedural arrangements ensuring, amongst other things, timely and technically competent performance as well as confidentiality could be worked out.

The remainder of the presentation focused on a more detailed discussion of the proposed United Nations Centre for Image Acquisition and Distribution (UNCIAD). Part of that discussion compared the UNCIAD idea with the earlier French proposal for an International Satellite Monitoring