

**Report:**  
**THE UNITED NATIONS REGISTER  
OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS:  
ON COURSE IN ITS THIRD YEAR OF  
REPORTING**

by Edward J. Laurance and Tracy M. Keith

*Dr. Edward J. Laurance is Professor of International Policy Studies, Director of the Program for Arms Control, Disarmament, and Conversion (PACDC), and Associate Director of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS). He is the author of **The International Arms Trade** (1992), and **Arms Watch: SIPRI Report on the First Year of the UN Register of Conventional Arms** (1993), written with Herbert Wulf and Siemon Wezeman, and co-editor of **Developing the UN Register of Conventional Arms** (1994). Tracy M. Keith is a researcher at PACDC. Her previous work experiences include the Defense Center for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, the Provisional Technical Secretariat of the Preparatory Commission for the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.*

On October 31, 1995, the U.N. Secretary-General released the third annual report on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. Created in December 1991 in the wake of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the Gulf War, the U.N. Register is designed to promote transparency in armaments, which can lead to the prevention of excessive and destabilizing accumulations of conventional arms.<sup>1</sup> This year's report contains data and information provided by 84 governments on their exports and imports of armaments delivered during calendar year 1994. This voluntary confidence-building instrument continues to make transparent most of the world's trade in major conventional weapons and provides an example for further progress at the regional level.

Participation in the Register is slowly increasing. As in the first two years, all of the major suppliers participated in the Register. And since the release of the Secretary-General's report, eight additional states have submitted data and information. This brings the total number of participants to 92 as of January 29, 1996, compared to 84 in November 1993, and 82 in November 1992. Other states are expected to submit returns during 1996. Regional patterns remain the same. Few states in the Middle East reported due to the overall security environment. Sub-Saharan African participation is also low, as the small states in Africa rarely import arms of the quality and type covered by the Register. Notable for its absence this year is the government of Egypt, which announced in the fall 1994 General Assembly that it would no longer participate in the Register, since the Register had failed to expand to include inventories, procurement through national production, and weapons of mass destruction.

The United States is by far the major exporter of arms in the seven major categories covered by the Register, followed by Germany, the United Kingdom, France, and Russia. The Register also reveals that much of the trade in 1994 continues to reflect the "cascading" process whereby Western European states send excess equipment to fellow European

states under provisions of the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. Turkey and Greece, as in previous years, continue to significantly modernize their arsenal as part of this process.

Despite the fact that major Middle Eastern importer states again did not report, exporter submissions reveal that the trade is brisk in this region. Additionally, the modernization and buildup of Asian states is also documented by the Register report for 1994. Finally, the Register has yet to develop a consultative mechanism by which potential problems revealed by the data can be addressed.

## EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION BY U.N. MEMBER STATES

**Participation:** One of the central goals of the U.N. Register is universal participation. As of November 26, 1995, the U.N. had received replies from 89 countries for calendar year 1994 (84 on the same date for 1993 and 82 for 1992). This represents 48 percent of the U.N. membership, compared to 45 percent in each of the two previous years.

**Regional distribution:** The regional distribution of the replies for 1992, 1993, and 1994 is shown in Table 1. The first two years of these data are taken from the report of the 1994 Group of Experts, who evaluated the first two years of operation of the Register.<sup>2</sup> For political reasons, this Group was restricted to using U.N. regional groupings. Even with this somewhat artificial aggregation of states, it can be seen that the highest participation continues to be achieved in Western Europe, and the lowest in Africa. When the data are aggregated by more functional and strategic regional groupings, it becomes clear that very few states from the Middle East submitted data in any year (Egypt, Iran, and Israel in 1992, Iran and Israel in 1993, and Cyprus, Iran, and Israel in 1994).

**Table 1: Regional Distribution of Member States Reporting to the U.N. Register**

U.N. Region	Submissions by Governments			% of Participation in the U.N. Groupings		
	1992	1993	1994	1992	1993	1994
African States	10 of 51	9 of 52	8 of 63	20	17	13
Asian States	22 of 47	19 of 47	24 of 48	47	40	50
Eastern European States	14 of 19	11 of 20	14 of 20	74	55	70
Latin American and Caribbean States	15 of 33	11 of 33	18 of 33	45	33	55
Western European and Other States	24 of 24	24 of 27	24 of 27	100	89	89
Not Members of Any Regional Group	3 of 5	2 of 5	3 of 4	60	40	75
Non-Member States			1			

**Continuity in participation:** A significant number of states, listed in Table 2, have reported to the Register for all three years. Table 3 gives a listing of those states which have reported to the Register during some portion of the three years of its existence, by year reported.

**Table 2. States that Participated all Three Years (N=68)**

Argentina	Australia	Austria	Belarus
Belgium	Bhutan	Brazil	Bulgaria
Canada	Chile	China	Croatia
Cuba	Czech Republic	Denmark	Dominica
Fiji	Finland	France	Georgia
Germany	Greece	Grenada	Hungary
Iceland	India	Indonesia	Iran

Ireland	Israel	Italy	Jamaica
Japan	Liechtenstein	Luxembourg	Malaysia
Maldives	Malta	Mexico	Mongolia
Nepal	Netherlands	New Zealand	Niger
Norway	Pakistan	Papua New Guinea	Paraguay
Peru	Philippines	Poland	Portugal
Rep. of Korea	Romania	Russia	Santa Lucia
Singapore	Slovakia	Slovenia	Spain
Sweden	Switzerland	Tanzania	Turkey
U.K.	Ukraine	United States	Yugoslavia

**Table 3. States with Partial Participation by Calendar Year**

	<b>1992</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>1994</b>
Afghanistan	no	yes	no
Albania	yes	no	no
Antigua and Barbuda	yes	yes	no
Armenia	no	yes	yes
Bahamas	no	no	yes
Barbados	no	no	yes
Belize	no	no	yes
Bolivia	yes	no	no
Burkina Faso	no	yes	yes
Cameroon	no	no	yes
Chad	no	yes	yes
Colombia	yes	no	no
Comoros	no	yes	no
Cyprus	no	yes	yes
Côte d'Ivoire	no	no	yes
Dominican Republic	no	yes	no
Ecuador	no	no	yes
El Salvador	no	no	yes
Egypt	yes	no	no
Estonia	no	no	yes
Guyana	no	no	yes
Jordan	no	yes	no
Kazakhstan	yes	no	yes
Kenya	no	yes	no
Lebanon	yes	no	no
Lesotho	yes	no	no
Libya	yes	no	yes
Lithuania	yes	no	no
Madagascar	no	yes	no
Malawi	no	yes	no
Marshall Islands	no	yes	yes
Mauritania	no	yes	yes
Mauritius	yes	yes	no
Namibia	yes	no	no

	1992	1993	1994
Nicaragua	yes	no	no
Nigeria	yes	no	no
Oman	yes	no	no
Panama	yes	no	yes
Qatar	yes	no	no
Rep. of Moldova	no	no	yes
Saint Lucia	no	no	yes
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	no	yes	no
Samoa	no	yes	yes
Senegal	yes	no	no
Seychelles	yes	no	no
Sierra Leone	no	yes	no
Solomon Islands	yes	no	yes
South Africa	yes	no	yes
Sri Lanka	yes	no	no
Tajikistan	no	no	yes
Thailand	no	yes	yes
Trinidad and Tobago	no	yes	no
Tunisia	yes	no	no
Vanuatu	yes	yes	no
Vietnam	no	no	yes

**Exporters:** Twenty-two (22) states reported exports of weapons in the seven U.N. categories. As in 1992 and 1993, most of the exporters of weapons in the seven U.N. categories, as identified in public sources, reported to the United Nations: 24 for 1992, 23 for 1993, and 22 for 1994. Exporters identified in public sources but which did not report their 1994 arms transfers to the United Nations include Egypt, Moldova, and North Korea.<sup>3</sup> As a result, most of the arms trade for the years the Register has been in operation has been made transparent. Table 4 lists states which did not participate in the Register process, but were identified as exporters by the corresponding importing countries.

**Table 4. Weapons Exporters Not Participating in Register for Calendar Year 1994**

(according to importer submissions)

Jordan  
United Arab Emirates  
Qatar

**Importers:** Forty-one (41) countries reported imports for 1994, as compared with 39 and 30 countries for 1992 and 1993, respectively. Table 5 reveals that, as in previous years, important importing countries have not participated in the Register process.

**Table 5. Weapons Importers Not Participating in Register for Calendar Year 1994**

(according to exporter submissions)

Algeria	Angola
Azerbaijan	Bahrain
Bangladesh	Cambodia
Egypt	Ghana
Kuwait	Lebanon
Morocco	Nigeria
Oman	Qatar
Saudi Arabia	Senegal
Sierra Leone	Sri Lanka
United Arab Emirates	
Yemen	

Even though not all of the major exporters reported, more information on the arms trade was once again revealed on export forms than on import forms. For 1994, exporters have reported 155 transfers (a single line entry on the form). This compares to 149 transfers in 1993 and 157 transfers in 1992. Importers have reported 116 transfers (86 in 1993 and 120 in 1992).

**Background information:** While forms are provided for states to submit data on arms transfers, states can provide “background information” on military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies in any form they wish. Submission of such information is therefore more “voluntary.” In both 1992 and 1993, 34 states submitted such information. In 1994, this number decreased to 31 (see Table 6). The number of states submitting information on military holdings was 22 for 1992, 24 for 1993, and 27 for 1994, while the number of states submitting information on procurement through national production was 14 in 1992, 17 for 1993, and 19 for 1994. Most of the states submitting information on both holdings and procurement were from Europe, where reporting such information is an integral part of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

**Table 6. States Submitting Holdings and Procurement through National Production for 1994**

	<b>Holdings</b>	<b>National Production</b>
Argentina	yes	no
Armenia	yes	no
Australia	no	yes
Austria	yes	yes
Belgium	yes	no
Brazil	yes	yes
Bulgaria	yes	no
Canada	yes	no
Czech Republic	yes	yes
Denmark	yes	yes
France	yes	yes
Germany	yes	yes
Greece	yes	no
Italy	yes	yes
Japan	yes	yes
Malta	yes	no
Marshall Islands	yes	no
Mexico	yes	yes
Netherlands	yes	yes
New Zealand	yes	yes
Niger	yes	no
Papua New Guinea	yes	yes
Paraguay	yes	no
Poland	yes	yes
Portugal	yes	yes
South Africa	no	yes
Spain	yes	yes
Sweden	yes	no
Switzerland	yes	yes
U.K.	yes	yes
U.S.	yes	yes

**EXTENT OF THE ARMS TRADE MADE TRANSPARENT BY THE U.N. REGISTER**

As with data from earlier years, the 1994 Register uncovered some previously unknown transfers, especially from states which either export large quantities of arms, such as France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States; or which are less open with security information, such as the Czech Republic, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, and Ukraine. Among the importer reports, Malaysia stood out as submitting a complete and detailed list of its arms imports, which included arms in categories other than those required by the Register. As in previous years, the 1994 Register produced more precise data on actual deliveries, both quantities and dates, than the currently existing public information.

*Number of items transferred by weapon type:* Since all major exporting states reported, the estimate of the amount of the trade by weapon type may be considered reasonably accurate. For 1994 data, measurement problems revealed in previous years remain. In 12 of the transfers reported to the U.N. Register in 1994, exporters and importers submitted

different numbers for what appeared to be the same transfer. Therefore, in the Table 7 below the number of items transferred were divided into “High” and “Low” categories. For example, the number of armored combat vehicles transferred is 4144, if one accepts the highest figures submitted, or 3507 if the lowest figures are accepted. As discussed later in this report, there is no way to verify which of these figures is “correct.” Despite this problem, the table reveals that the number of weapon systems (items) transferred has increased in several of the seven categories, when comparing the results of 1993 and 1994. As in 1993, many of the mismatches involved the United States (five of 12).

**Table 7. Total Number of Items Transferred by Weapon Type**

Category	1993		1994	
	High	Low	High	Low
Tanks	3066	2144	1339	1317
ACV	2421	2283	4144	3507
LCA	417	266	31080	31080 <sup>4</sup>
Combat Aircraft	446	441	428	420
Attack Helicopters	127	119	68	68
Ships	42	39	49	49
Missiles and Missile Launchers	5620	3043	14447	14289

**Regional distribution:** The above arms transfers were distributed regionally as indicated in Table 8. As in both 1992 and 1993, a significant percentage of the arms delivered in 1994 were within Western Europe as part of the cascading process stemming from the CFE Treaty provisions. The “H” (High) and “L” (Low) categories reflect the previously described problem of exporters and importers submitting different numbers for the same transfer.

**Table 8. Total Number of Weapons Imported in 1994 by Region of Importer State**

Region	Tanks		ACV		LCA		Cbt Acft		Attk Helo		Ships		M/ML	
	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
Africa	148	.	408	.	42	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Asia	172	.	245	180	30244	.	146	138	35	.	31	.	11201	11073
CIS and EE	50	.	180	.	13	.	2	.	.	.	2	.	345	.
Latin America	.	.	392	267	11	.	48	.	24	.	1	.	247	246
Middle East	703	.	1196	749	105	.	114	.	6	.	7	.	343	.
North America	.	.	.	.	20	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	95	94
Western Europe	265	243	1471	.	645	.	116	.	3	.	8	.	2216	2187
Other	1	.	252	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>World Total</b>	<b>1339</b>	<b>1317</b>	<b>4144</b>	<b>3507</b>	<b>31080</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>14447</b>	<b>14289</b>

**Leading exporters:** As in previous years, the United States continued to be the dominant arms supplier by most measures in 1994. For example, when considering number of transfers, the United States exported arms in 59 separate deals, followed by Germany with 26, the United Kingdom with 17, France with 16, Russia with 15, Ukraine with nine, and Italy and Slovakia with eight. Germany continued to actively export as part of the cascading process.

**Table 9. The Major Weapon Exporters in 1994**

(numbers of weapon systems transferred)

Country	Tanks		ACV		LCA		Cbt Acft		Attk Helo		Ships		M/ML	
	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
Belgium	.	.	377	252	2028	.	25	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Czech Republic	40	.	177	.	.	.	59	51	.	.	.	.	.	.
France	5	.	72	.	23490	.	2	.	14	.	.	.	60	.
Germany	203	181	1188	.	546	.	24	.	2	.	18	.	1020	.
Italy	.	.	97	.	3370	.	26	.	2	.	.	.	.	.
Russia	30	.	328	.	129	.	20	.	.	.	1	.	436	.
Slovakia	1	.	169	.	47	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ukraine	50	.	16	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	74	.
U.K.	18	.	36	18	88	.	43	.	2	.	9	.	196	.
U.S.	764	.	1082	635	302	.	210	.	48	.	12	.	12344	12186
<b>World Total</b>	<b>1339</b>	<b>1317</b>	<b>4144</b>	<b>3507</b>	<b>31080</b>	.	<b>428</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>68</b>	.	<b>49</b>	.	<b>14447</b>	<b>14289</b>

**Leading importers:** In 1994, Egypt, Greece, Israel, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Turkey were identified as major arms recipients from submissions made by member states to the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms. States that have been identified through public sources as major recipients of conventional arms which did not participate in the Register include Saudi Arabia.

**Table 10. The Major Weapon Importers in 1994**

(numbers of weapon systems transferred)

Country	Tanks		ACV		LCA		Cbt Acft		Attk Helo		Ships		M/ML	
	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
Egypt <sup>5</sup>	434	.	188	.	63	.	43	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Greece	43	21	996	.	224	.	33	.	.	.	2	.	.	.
Israel	.	.	451	4	6	.	53	.	4	.	2	.	.	.
Malaysia	.	.	47	22	29909	.	42	.	.	.	1	.	2	.
Philippines	.	.	51	33	183	.	48	.	33	.	.	.	10780	.
Saudi Arabia <sup>6</sup>	148	.	255	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sweden	160	.	137	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Turkey	62	.	226	.	131	.	44	.	1	.	5	.	.	.
<b>World Total</b>	<b>1339</b>	<b>1317</b>	<b>4144</b>	<b>3507</b>	<b>31080</b>	.	<b>428</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>68</b>	.	<b>49</b>	.	<b>14447</b>	<b>14289</b>

**Details on types of weapons transferred:** The Register procedures allow for states to increase the transparency of their returns by providing an optional weapons description column, in which states can enter data on the type or model of weapon being exported or imported. Seventeen (17) of the 22 countries that reported exports used this column. Of the major arms exporters, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States did not reveal the type or description of the weapons transferred (see Annex to this report). One exception among major suppliers was Germany, which submitted detailed information on all of its transfers. All but eight of the 42 countries reporting imports made use of the description column.



## EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN EXPORTER AND IMPORTER ON ARMS TRANSFERS

**Cross checking:** The Register allows for cross-checking, as it asks member states to report both exports and imports. It is possible to determine the extent to which the reports of exports and imports match, especially when reporting the same transfer. Discounting duplicate transfers (exporters and importers reporting the same transfer), the U.N. Register recorded 208 arms transfers or deals for calendar year 1994 (183 in 1993 and 197 in 1992).

Four types of cases occurred in the reports:

A. The transfer was reported by both exporter and importer, and the same number of items matched (designated by "M" in the table below and the Annex to this report).

1992: 54 (27 percent) of the 197 transfers reported.

1993: 42 (22 percent) of the 183 transfers reported.

1994: 56 (27 percent) of the 208 transfers reported.

B. The transfer was reported by both exporter and importer, but the number of items reported did not match (designated by "Diff#" in the table below and the Annex to this report).

1992: 16 (8 percent) of the 197 transfers reported.

1993: 17 (9 percent) of the 183 transfers reported.

1994: 12 (6 percent) of the 208 transfers reported.

C. The transfer was reported by only the exporter or the importer. The other party participated in the Register process but did not report this particular transfer (designated by "NR" in the table below and the Annex to this report).

1992: 70 (36 percent) of the 197 transfers reported.

1993: 61 (33 percent) of the 183 transfers reported.

1994: 81 (39 percent) of the 208 transfers reported.<sup>7</sup>

In 1994, 45 of the 81 transfers in this category were reported by importers and the remaining 36 by exporters. This means that, although exporters and importers have made the decision to participate in the Register, there is an apparent disagreement on what constitutes a transfer or when a transfer takes place.

D. The transfer was reported by only the exporter or importer. The other party did not participate in the Register process (designated by "NP" in the table below and the Annex to this report).

1992: 57 (29 percent) of the 197 transfers reported.

1993: 60 (33 percent) of the 183 transfers reported.

1994: 53 (25 percent) of the 208 transfers reported.

In 1994, 50 of the transfers in this category were reported by exporters and could not be cross-checked due to non-participation by importers. The remaining three transfers in this category were made by importers and could not be cross-checked due to non-participation by exporters.

**Differences in reporting number of items:** As indicated in the "Diff#" type above, exporters and importers reported different numbers on the same deal. The cross-checking mechanism does not explain which of these numbers is correct.

Exporters and importers more often agreed on the number of items reported in 1994, with only 12 cases of disagreement. Differences in reporting of armored combat vehicles showed the greatest discrepancies with six cases, followed by missiles and missile launchers with four cases, and one case each of combat aircraft and tanks. There was no case of disagreement as to the number of items transferred in the categories of large caliber artillery, attack helicopters, or warships. The total number of armored combat vehicles transferred in 1994, according to the submissions of member states, could have been as high as 4144, or as low as 3507, a difference of 637. Similarly, missile and missile launcher transfers could have been as high as 14,447, or as low as 14,289, a difference of 158. Since no weapon description was given in most of these cases, it is often difficult to determine whether it was the same transfer. The details of all 12 cases are compiled in the Annex to this report.

**Quality of reporting:** The need for improved quality of reporting is underlined by assessing individual country reports. As in previous years, some states submitted data which did not correspond to the Register's procedures. Procurement through national production was reported in the standardized form for imports. In addition, exporters and importers did not always use the same category of weapons; frequently they used either category III or VII for the same transfer.

## SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The report of the U.N. Register for arms delivered in calendar year 1994 reveals patterns similar to the previous two years. It continues to make transparent the bulk of the global arms trade in the seven categories of major conventional arms, revealing some aspects and specific deals not revealed by public sources. The continuity of participation is particularly significant, given what some viewed as the failure of the 1994 Group of Experts to agree on expanding the Register to include the more formal submission of data on military holdings and procurement through national production, and its expansion to include other categories of weapons such as light weapons and landmines.<sup>8</sup>

The continuity displayed in the third year of reporting confirms that this instrument continues to provide information that the member states of the United Nations can use in bilateral and more formal multilateral deliberations. With the third year of reporting, the norm of transparency continues to gain acceptance and is being used as an example for regional groupings that are beginning to address the utility of transparency and confidence building as approaches to cooperative security. This is particularly illustrated by recent developments in the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Organization of American States (OAS), both of which have called on their members to participate in and build upon the U.N. Register.<sup>9</sup>

The 1995 report also confirms the consensus reached in evaluations of the first two years: the Register can be improved as a reporting instrument. The Register is to be reviewed in 1997. Based on an assessment of the data and interviews with participants in the Register process, the following improvements are needed:

**Increase participation:** Since 25 percent of the arms deals for 1994 could not be cross-checked due to the non-participation of member states, increased participation could significantly increase the level of transparency of the arms trade. Interviews and observations reveal that a variety of reasons exist for this lack of participation. These include concern for national security, a lack of political will, difficulties in compiling national statistics, and, in some cases, legal obstacles.

**Review the category definitions:** Discrepancies in reporting remain, because exporters and importers differ as to whether a particular transfer fell within the category definition. This problem is exacerbated when one party to the transfer does not submit information regarding model type or weapon description. The missile/missile launcher category remains problematic and a source of significant confusion which detracts from the norm of transparency. Absent a multilateral consultative mechanism, these discrepancies can only be resolved at the national or bilateral diplomatic level.

**Develop consensus on definitions of a transfer:** As in previous years, a few states submitted data on events which were clearly not a transfer as defined by the U.N. Register. Examples include reporting procurement through national production, orders as opposed to deliveries, components as opposed to end-items, and co-produced or licensed equipment.

**Increase sharing of national arms trade laws and procedures:** The reality of the international arms trading system is that it continues to be regulated by national laws and procedures. As a result, one state may report that a transfer occurs in 1994 while the partner in this transaction reports its delivery in the following year. States were urged to submit such laws and procedures with their data. While some complied with this request, more need to do so. The United Nations needs to be more active in making applicable laws more widely known so that confidence in the submissions will increase.

**Develop consultative mechanisms:** While the above recommendations will improve the level of transparency of the global arms trade, the Register cannot perform its stated goal of contributing to the prevention of excessive and destabilizing accumulations without some type of multilateral consultative mechanism by which potential problems revealed by the data can be addressed. The U.N. Secretariat, specifically the U.N. Centre for Disarmament Affairs, regularly and efficiently receives, maintains, and distributes data and information submitted by states to the Register. However, it cannot perform the vital political functions necessary for the Register to advance as a more useful confidence-building instrument. At the global level, some type of mechanism or forum must be developed or utilized to address the data submitted by states, especially if buildups are occurring. But the most critical location for such a mechanism remains at the regional level, where the military buildups and security concerns actually occur.

---

<sup>1</sup> In December 1991, the U.N. General Assembly passed resolution 46/36L, which established the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms. Member states were requested to submit data by April 30 each year on conventional arms exported or imported in the previous year. In its present form, the Register records and makes public data on major weapons systems in seven major categories: battle tanks, armored combat vehicles, large caliber artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, and missiles and missile launchers.

In October 1993, the Secretary-General released a report that for the first time made public government-supplied data on arms transfers, based on reports submitted to the U.N. Register from over 80 countries for the calendar year 1992. On October 12, 1994, the Secretary-General made public and presented to the General Assembly the second annual report, which covers arms transfers for the calendar year 1993.

For an in-depth description and analysis of the first year of operation of the U.N. Register see: Edward J. Laurance and Herbert Wulf, *An Evaluation of the First Year of Reporting to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms* (Monterey: Monterey Institute of International Studies, October 1993); Edward J. Laurance, Siemon T. Wezeman, and Herbert Wulf, *Arms Watch: SIPRI Report on the First Year of the UN Register of Conventional Arms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Ian Anthony, "Assessing the UN Register of Conventional Arms," *Survival* 35 (Winter 1993), pp. 113-129; Malcolm Chalmers, Owen Greene, Edward J. Laurance, and Herbert Wulf, eds., *Developing the UN Register of Conventional Arms* (Bradford: University of Bradford, 1994).

<sup>2</sup> *United Nations Register of Conventional Arms: Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Continuing Operation of the Register and its Further Development* (New York: United Nations, 5 August 1994).

<sup>3</sup> For a report from public sources on 1994 deliveries, see John Sislis and Siemon Wezeman, *1994 Arms Transfers: A Register of Deliveries from Public Sources* (Monterey: Monterey Institute of International Studies, 1995).

<sup>4</sup> In this and subsequent tables, the very large numbers of "large combat artillery" reflect artillery imported by Malaysia that we assume to be ammunition as opposed to artillery systems.

<sup>5</sup> Based on submissions from exporter states only.

<sup>6</sup> Based on submissions from exporter states only.

<sup>7</sup> Forty-two (42) of the 81 transfers that were reported by the other party in the deal involved the United States.

<sup>8</sup> See Edward J. Laurance and Herbert Wulf, "The 1994 Review of the UN Register of Conventional Arms," in *SIPRI Yearbook 1995* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 556-563.

<sup>9</sup> See "The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and the Asia-Pacific," in Malcolm Chalmers and Owen Greene, eds., *The United Nations and the Asia-Pacific* (Bradford: Department of Peace Studies, Bradford University, 1994), pp. 129-154.

## ANNEX

### Reports Submitted to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms Calendar Year 1994

The following data on arms deliveries were submitted by member states of the United Nations to the Register of Conventional Arms, covering exports and imports.

#### NOTES:

1. Each line of data includes the type of form that was used for its submission, either an Exports form or an Imports form. If a transfer was submitted by both the exporter and the importer, only the exporter form is listed and any discrepancies in the number of items are identified in the "Cross Check Status" column.
2. For the purposes of this publication, data on the "State of Origin" and "Intermediate Location" are not included. They are listed on the actual report issued by the U.N. Secretary-General.
3. The entries in the "Cross Check Status" column are developed by the authors and are not part of the officially submitted data. They reflect the following situations:  
**M:** Match. The data entered match that reported by the other state in the transaction (# of items reported by exporter and importer do not vary by more than 10 percent).  
**Diff#:** Different Numbers. The data entered differ from that reported by the other state in the transaction (# of items reported by exporter and importer vary by more than 10 percent).  
**NR:** Not reported. The other state in the transaction (exporter or importer) has participated in the Register but has not reported this particular transfer.  
**NP:** Non-participation. The other state in the transaction (exporter or importer) did not participate in or submit any data to the Register.  
**NA:** Not applicable. The recipient is not a country. (e.g. U.N. Peacekeeping Forces).
4. The "Region" column reflects the region to which the transfer was made. Therefore, for Export forms, the region is the region of the importer, listed in the "Second Country" column. For Import forms, the region is that of the importer listed in the "Country" column.

#### REPORTS

Country	Form	Category	Second Country	Region	# of Items	Cross Check Status	# of Items	Description/Comments
Belarus	Exports	LCA	U.K.	Western Europe	2	NR	•	Multiple-launch rocket systems
Belgium	Exports	ACV	Mexico	Latin America	168	Diff#	268	AMX-13
Belgium	Exports	ACV	Mexico	Latin America	95	Diff#	70	BDX
Belgium	Exports	ACV	U.K.	Western Europe	14	M	•	CVR-T
Belgium	Exports	Cbt Acft	Chile	Latin America	25	NR	•	20 Mirage-Mirship, 5 Mirage V
Bulgaria	Exports	Tank	Yemen	Middle East	6	NP	•	Tank-55
Bulgaria	Exports	Tank	Yemen	Middle East	56	NP	•	Tank-62
Bulgaria	Exports	LCA	U.K.	Western Europe	1	NR	•	122 mm Howitzer M-30 (1935)
Bulgaria	Exports	LCA	Yemen	Middle East	10	NP	•	166 Mine-thrower (1933)
Canada	Exports	ACV	Australia	Asia and Oceania	5	Diff#	27	ASLAV light armored vehicle
Canada	Exports	ACV	Saudi Arabia	Middle East	255	NP	•	Wheeled armored personnel carrier

*Conventional Arms Report*

China	Exports	Tank	Pakistan	Asia and Oceania	82	M	•	T-85 II
China	Exports	Ship	Iran	Middle East	5	M	•	
China	Exports	Ship	Thailand	Asia and Oceania	1	NR	•	
Czech Republic	Exports	Tank	Cambodia	Asia and Oceania	40	NP	•	T-55
Czech Republic	Exports	ACV	Austria	Western Europe	1	NR	•	ICV type BVP-2
Czech Republic	Exports	ACV	Cambodia	Asia and Oceania	26	NP	•	APC type OT-64
Czech Republic	Exports	ACV	Slovakia	CIS/EE	150	M	•	APV OT-64 no tur- rets or weapons
Czech Republic	Exports	Cbt Acft	Egypt	Middle East	23	M	•	Advanced jet trainer L-59
Czech Republic	Exports	Cbt Acft	Thailand	Asia and Oceania	28	Diff#	36	Advanced jet trainer L-39 ZA
Finland	Exports	ACV	Norway	Western Europe	7	NR	•	SISU XA-180
France	Exports	Tank	UAE	Middle East	5	NP	•	
France	Exports	ACV	Ireland	Western Europe	1	M	•	Panhard VTT-M3
France	Exports	ACV	Nigeria	Africa	42	NP	•	
France	Exports	ACV	Senegal	Africa	9	NP	•	
France	Exports	ACV	Singapore	Asia and Oceania	20	M	•	
France	Exports	Cbt Acft	Spain	Western Europe	2	M	•	F1-BE Mirage
France	Exports	Atk Helo	Chile	Latin America	1	NR	•	
France	Exports	M/MI	Cyprus	Middle East	27	M	•	24 missiles, 3 launchers, Exocets
France	Exports	M/MI	Malaysia	Asia and Oceania	2	NR	•	
France	Exports	M/MI	Oman	Middle East	1	NP	•	
France	Exports	M/MI	Qatar	Middle East	1	NP	•	
France	Exports	M/MI	UAE	Middle East	25	NP	•	
Germany	Exports	Tank	Greece	Western Europe	21	Diff#	43	Leopard 1 A 5
Germany	Exports	Tank	Sweden	Western Europe	160	M	•	Leopard 2
Germany	Exports	ACV	Finland	Western Europe	30	M	•	BMP-1
Germany	Exports	ACV	Greece	Western Europe	501	M	•	BMP-1
Germany	Exports	ACV	Greece	Western Europe	200	M	•	MTW M 113
Germany	Exports	ACV	Portugal	Western Europe	50	M	•	MTW M 113 (CFE Cascading)
Germany	Exports	ACV	Sweden	Western Europe	130	M	•	MT-LB
Germany	Exports	ACV	Sweden	Western Europe	7	M	•	MT-PLB
Germany	Exports	ACV	UNPROFOR	Other	227	NA	•	BTR-70
Germany	Exports	ACV	UNPROFOR	Other	25	NA	•	MTW M 113
Germany	Exports	LCA	Finland	Western Europe	27	M	•	Armored howitzer M 2S1
Germany	Exports	LCA	Finland	Western Europe	166	M	•	Gun M 46, 130 mm
Germany	Exports	LCA	Greece	Western Europe	72	M	•	Armored howitzer M-110 A2
Germany	Exports	LCA	Greece	Western Europe	150	M	•	Rocket launchers RM-70
Germany	Exports	LCA	Turkey	Western Europe	131	M	•	203 mm Armored howitzer M-110 A2
Germany	Exports	Cbt Acft	Greece	Western Europe	5	M	•	RF-4E
Germany	Exports	Cbt Acft	Turkey	Western Europe	19	M	•	RF-4 Phantom (CFE harmonization)
Germany	Exports	Atk Helo	Bahrain	Middle East	2	NP	•	BO 105
Germany	Exports	Ship	Estonia	CIS/EE	2	M	•	Mine sweeper demilitarized
Germany	Exports	Ship	Greece	Western Europe	1	M	•	Auxiliary vessel AGP

*Conventional Arms Report*

Germany	Exports	Ship	Indonesia	Asia and Oceania	7	M	•	Landing craft Frosch (LST) demilled
Germany	Exports	Ship	Indonesia	Asia and Oceania	6	M	•	Coastal patrol boat
Germany	Exports	Ship	Rep. of Korea	Asia and Oceania	1	M	•	Submarine kit (Class 209)
Germany	Exports	Ship	Turkey	Western Europe	1	NR	•	Submarine kit
Germany	Exports	M/MI	Italy	Western Europe	1020	M	•	Missiles RP/C-M 26 for MLRS
Israel	Exports	LCA	Brazil	Latin America	8	NR	•	120 mm
Italy	Exports	LCA	Nigeria	Africa	2	NP	•	Self propelled guns 155/39 Palmaris
Italy	Exports	Cbt Acft	Ghana	Africa	2	NP	•	MB-326 K (attack)
Italy	Exports	Atk Helo	Belgium	Western Europe	2	NR	•	A 109 HKII Scout (armed)
Netherlands	Exports	ACV	Greece	Western Europe	175	M	•	M-113 A1
Netherlands	Exports	LCA	Bahrain	Middle East	13	NP	•	M-110
Netherlands	Exports	LCA	Brazil	Latin America	3	NR	•	M-101
Netherlands	Exports	Ship	Greece	Western Europe	1	M	•	Frigate FFGH
Netherlands	Exports	Ship	Pakistan	Asia and Oceania	1	M	•	Replenishment ship (Fleet tanker)
Poland	Exports	Tank	Cambodia	Asia and Oceania	50	NP	•	T-55 A
Poland	Exports	Tank	Iran	Middle East	34	M	•	T-72
Poland	Exports	ACV	Angola	Africa	50	NP	•	BWP-2
Rep. of Korea	Exports	ACV	Malaysia	Asia and Oceania	22	Diff#	47	IFV K200, K381
Rep. of Moldova	Exports	LCA	Yemen	Middle East	13	NP	•	MLRS "Uragan"
Rep. of Moldova	Exports	Cbt Acft	Yemen	Middle East	4	NP	•	MIG-29 fighter air craft
Romania	Exports	ACV	Israel	Middle East	1	NR	•	Reconnaissance ACV TABC-79
Romania	Exports	ACV	Moldova	CIS/EE	30	M	•	TAB-71M armored personnel carrier
Romania	Exports	ACV	Turkey	Western Europe	1	NR	•	Armored combat vehicles 6x6
Romania	Exports	LCA	Poland	CIS/EE	6	NR	•	T-125 barrels
Russia	Exports	Tank	Angola	Africa	10	NP	•	
Russia	Exports	Tank	Iran	Middle East	20	M	•	T-72
Russia	Exports	ACV	Angola	Africa	138	NP	•	
Russia	Exports	ACV	Bangladesh	Asia and Oceania	14	NP	•	
Russia	Exports	ACV	Kuwait	Middle East	4	NP	•	
Russia	Exports	ACV	Turkey	Western Europe	54	M	•	BTR-80
Russia	Exports	ACV	UAE	Middle East	118	NP	•	
Russia	Exports	LCA	Finland	Western Europe	9	M	•	2 S-5
Russia	Exports	LCA	India	Asia and Oceania	120	M	•	130 mm gun
Russia	Exports	Cbt Acft	Romania	CIS/EE	1	M	•	MIG-29
Russia	Exports	Cbt Acft	Slovakia	CIS/EE	1	M	•	MIG-29
Russia	Exports	Ship	China	Asia and Oceania	1	M	•	
Russia	Exports	M/MI	Hungary	CIS/EE	342	M	•	
Russia	Exports	M/MI	Iran	Middle East	94	M	•	
Slovakia	Exports	Tank	UNPROFOR	Other	1	NA	•	T-55
Slovakia	Exports	ACV	Algeria	Africa	75	NP	•	OT-64 A
Slovakia	Exports	ACV	Algeria	Africa	75	NP	•	OT-64
Slovakia	Exports	ACV	Angola	Africa	9	NP	•	OT-64 Z
Slovakia	Exports	ACV	Sierra Leone	Africa	10	NP	•	OT-64 A

*Conventional Arms Report*

Slovakia	Exports	LCA	Angola	Africa	40	NP	•	122 mm RM vz. 70
Slovakia	Exports	LCA	Bulgaria	CIS/EE	7	NR	•	122 mm HD-30
Slovakia	Exports	Cbt Acft	U.K.	Western Europe	1	NR	•	MIG-21 MF
South Africa	Exports	Tank	No destination or number declared		•	•	•	G6 self propelled howitzer
South Africa	Exports	ACV	No destination or number declared		•	•	•	Eland 90 mm and 60 mm AFV
U.K.	Exports	Tank	Nigeria	Africa	18	NP	•	
U.K.	Exports	ACV	Oman	Middle East	4	NP	•	
U.K.	Exports	ACV	Philippines	Asia and Oceania	31	Diff#	13	SINBA, Armored vehicle
U.K.	Exports	LCA	Australia	Asia and Oceania	2	NR	•	
U.K.	Exports	LCA	Austria	Western Europe	32	M	•	M109 A3
U.K.	Exports	LCA	Austria	Western Europe	51	M	•	M109 A2
U.K.	Exports	LCA	Malaysia	Asia and Oceania	3	NR	•	
U.K.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Finland	Western Europe	5	M	•	Hawk Jet Trainer
U.K.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Malaysia	Asia and Oceania	24	NR	•	
U.K.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Oman	Middle East	12	NP	•	
U.K.	Exports	Cbt Acft	UAE	Middle East	2	NP	•	
U.K.	Exports	Atk Helo	Pakistan	Asia and Oceania	2	M	•	Old helicopters for shipborne use
U.K.	Exports	Ship	Bangladesh	Asia and Oceania	5	NP	•	
U.K.	Exports	Ship	Pakistan	Asia and Oceania	4	M	•	Ex-RN Type-21 Frigates w/ 4.5" gun
U.K.	Exports	M/MI	Chile	Latin America	1	M	•	EXCALIBUR MM-38 via U.K.
U.K.	Exports	M/MI	UAE	Middle East	195	NP	•	
Ukraine	Exports	Tank	Azerbaijan	CIS/EE	50	NP	•	T-55
Ukraine	Exports	ACV	Sri Lanka	Asia and Oceania	7	NP	•	IFV BMP-1 w/ 3 machine gun PTK
Ukraine	Exports	ACV	Sri Lanka	Asia and Oceania	4	NP	•	IFV BMP-2
Ukraine	Exports	ACV	Sri Lanka	Asia and Oceania	1	NP	•	IFV BMP-1 without arms
Ukraine	Exports	ACV	Sri Lanka	Asia and Oceania	4	NP	•	IFV BMP-1
Ukraine	Exports	M/MI	China	Asia and Oceania	56	NR	•	AAMs R27R1
Ukraine	Exports	M/MI	U.S.	North America	8	NR	•	SAMs 5V55R
Ukraine	Exports	M/MI	U.S.	North America	8	NR	•	SAMs 5V55K
Ukraine	Exports	M/MI	U.S.	North America	2	NR	•	SAMs 5V55RUD
U.S.	Exports	Tank	Egypt	Middle East	434	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	Tank	Morocco	Africa	120	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	Tank	Saudi Arabia	Middle East	148	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	ACV	Egypt	Middle East	188	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	ACV	Greece	Western Europe	120	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	ACV	Israel	Middle East	450	Diff#	3	M 577
U.S.	Exports	ACV	Lebanon	Middle East	175	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	ACV	Mexico	Latin America	28	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	ACV	Oman	Middle East	1	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	ACV	Turkey	Western Europe	74	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	LCA	Australia	Asia and Oceania	1	M	•	5 in/54 Mk 45 naval gun
U.S.	Exports	LCA	Canada	North America	20	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	LCA	Egypt	Middle East	63	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	LCA	Greece	Western Europe	2	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	LCA	Israel	Middle East	6	M	•	MLRS

*Conventional Arms Report*

U.S.	Exports	LCA	Japan	Asia and Oceania	9	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	LCA	Thailand	Asia and Oceania	20	M	•	
U.S.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Australia	Asia and Oceania	9	M	•	F-111G
U.S.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Belgium	Western Europe	1	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Egypt	Middle East	20	NP	•	
U.S.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Italy	Western Europe	3	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Portugal	Western Europe	20	M	•	17 F-16 As, 3 F-16 Bs
U.S.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Rep. of Korea	Asia and Oceania	4	M	•	F-16
U.S.	Exports	Cbt Acft	Turkey	Western Europe	25	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	Atk Helo	Israel	Middle East	4	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	Atk Helo	Turkey	Western Europe	1	M	•	AH-1W
U.S.	Exports	M/MI	Australia	Asia and Oceania	2	Diff#	46	Standard and Harpoon missiles
U.S.	Exports	M/MI	Canada	North America	10	Diff#	11	
U.S.	Exports	M/MI	Germany	Western Europe	6	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	M/MI	Japan	Asia and Oceania	7	Diff#	91	
U.S.	Exports	M/MI	Netherlands	Western Europe	59	Diff#	30	Harpoon Missiles
U.S.	Exports	M/MI	Rep. of Korea	Asia and Oceania	214	NR	•	
U.S.	Exports	M/MI	U.K.	Western Europe	18	M	•	
Argentina	Imports	Cbt Acft	U.S.	Latin America	23	NR	•	OV-10 "Mohawk" for reconnaissance
Australia	Imports	Ship	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	2	NR	•	Newport class LSTs
Brazil	Imports	Atk Helo	France	Latin America	13	NR	•	AS 550 A2 FEN NEC
Brazil	Imports	Ship	U.S.	Latin America	1	NR	•	NDCC tank landing ship Newport
Chile	Imports	Atk Helo	U.S.	Latin America	10	NR	•	MD-530-F
Denmark	Imports	M/MI	U.S.	Western Europe	87	NR	•	Stinger RMP Air defense missiles
Denmark	Imports	M/MI	U.S.	Western Europe	940	NR	•	missiles
Estonia	Imports	M/MI	Israel	CIS/EE	3	NR	•	MAPATS
France	Imports	ACV	UAE	Western Europe	9	NP	•	
Germany	Imports	LCA	U.S.	Western Europe	2	NR	•	5 inch MK5 Mod 2
Greece	Imports	Cbt Acft	U.S.	Western Europe	28	NR	•	A/TA-7E/C
Israel	Imports	Cbt Acft	U.S.	Middle East	3	NR	•	A-4
Israel	Imports	Cbt Acft	U.S.	Middle East	50	NR	•	F-16
Israel	Imports	Ship	U.S.	Middle East	2	NR	•	SAAR 5
Malaysia	Imports	LCA	Belgium	Asia and Oceania	2028	NR	•	90 mm
Malaysia	Imports	LCA	France	Asia and Oceania	8260	NR	•	60 mm
Malaysia	Imports	LCA	France	Asia and Oceania	15230	NR	•	81 mm
Malaysia	Imports	LCA	Italy	Asia and Oceania	1577	NR	•	105 mm T1 Yellow
Malaysia	Imports	LCA	Italy	Asia and Oceania	1787	NR	•	105 mm T1 Red
Malaysia	Imports	LCA	Spain	Asia and Oceania	1024	NR	•	155 mm HE Low H
Malaysia	Imports	Cbt Acft	Russia	Asia and Oceania	18	NR	•	MIG-29
Malaysia	Imports	Ship	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	1	NR	•	Landing ship tank
Mexico	Imports	ACV	U.K.	Latin America	1	NR	•	FOX
Peru	Imports	M/MI	Bulgaria	Latin America	190	NR	•	MISIL IGLA 1.C 9m 313



*Conventional Arms Report*

---

Peru	Imports	M/MI	Bulgaria	Latin America	56	NR	•	MAC DISPARO P/ IGLA 9P519-2
Philippines	Imports	ACV	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	10	NR	•	Hummer M1025
Philippines	Imports	ACV	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	10	NR	•	V-150 Commande
Philippines	Imports	LCA	Italy	Asia and Oceania	4	NR	•	Belly Gun Pod Cal 50
Philippines	Imports	LCA	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	179	NR	•	M60C
Philippines	Imports	Cbt Acft	Italy	Asia and Oceania	24	NR	•	S-211 A/C
Philippines	Imports	Cbt Acft	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	24	NR	•	OV-10
Philippines	Imports	Atk Helo	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	33	NR	•	MG-520
Philippines	Imports	M/MI	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	100	NR	•	LAC-131
Philippines	Imports	M/MI	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	10680	NR	•	RX MTR HK 40/56
Singapore	Imports	Cbt Acft	Jordan	Asia and Oceania	7	NP	•	
Singapore	Imports	M/MI	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	12	NR	•	
Spain	Imports	Cbt Acft	Qatar	Western Europe	7	NP	•	F1-EDA and DDA Mirage
Spain	Imports	Ship	U.S.	Western Europe	1	NR	•	“Hernan Cortes” landing craft
Spain	Imports	M/MI	U.S.	Western Europe	80	NR	•	AGN-BBB air-to- surface missile
Thailand	Imports	ACV	Germany	Asia and Oceania	18	NR	•	
Thailand	Imports	ACV	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	26	NR	•	
Thailand	Imports	Ship	U.S.	Asia and Oceania	1	NR	•	USS Knox class
Turkey	Imports	Tank	U.S.	Western Europe	62	NR	•	M-60A1
Turkey	Imports	ACV	Italy	Western Europe	97	NR	•	M-113
Turkey	Imports	Ship	U.S.	Western Europe	4	NR	•	Knox class Frigate
U.K.	Imports	M/MI	Belarus	Western Europe	2	NR	•	
U.K.	Imports	M/MI	France	Western Europe	4	NR	•	
U.S.	Imports	M/MI	Norway	North America	66	NR	•	