Coding Manual for Identity Claims Data
Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project
Last updated 18 December 2018

Paul R. Hensel
Department of Political Science
University of North Texas
1155 Union Circle #305340
Denton, TX 76203-5017
phensel@unt.edu
http://www.icow.org

Table of Contents

Introductory Notes

The ICOW General Codebook

General data structure, coding rules, and coding procedures for the ICOW project (most of which are relevant both for this and for other ICOW data sets) are described in the ICOW general coding manual, which is also available on the ICOW web site (http://www.icow.org). This codebook focuses on the specific codesheets and variables for the ICOW territorial claims data set; coders and users of this data set must also read the general codebook to understand all coding rules relevant to this data set. General coding rules are only addressed here when there are important variants or additions beyond the material presented in the general codebook that are unique to territorial claims.

Identity Claims

An identity claim involves explicit contention between two or more states over the status or treatment of an ethnic group that is shared by the states. Official representatives of the government of at least one state must make explicit demands regarding the status of the group in at least one other state. "Official representatives" include such individuals as a country's head of state, foreign minister, and other legitimate political or military officials who are speaking on behalf of the state's government and are authorized to make or state the government's foreign policy. Claims by individuals or organizations without the authority to speak on behalf of a state government are excluded, unless official state representatives support their claim through explicit statements.

An "explicit claim" must be a public statement by such an official representative, and must be phrased in unambiguous terms. That is, the official state representative making the claim must make clear that his or her government is making demands over the treatment of the shared ethnic group in the target state; vague or ambiguous statements are excluded. Furthermore, the claim should be opposed by the targeted state, because this is a data set of *contentious* issues; situations where two states work together to repress a shared ethnic group or to advance the cause of the shared group do not qualify as claims.

As with all other ICOW data sets, it should be noted that this definition does not require any specific form of contention over the claim. In particular, it does not require that one or both sides resort to militarized force over the claim. Similarly, it does not require that the adversaries negotiate over the claim, submit it to third party arbitration or adjudication, or even take any action whatsoever over the claim. Such actions over a claim are more properly the subject of systematic analysis using complete data on all identity claims, rather than tools to be used for case selection.

Identity Claim Salience

The salience of contentious issues refers to the importance of the issue to each claimant country, and is measured through a number of specific indicators. Paul Hensel and Sara Mitchell's 2005 *GeoJournal* article described the ICOW measure of the salience of territorial claims, which uses six indicators of salience for both the challenger and target state in a claim; with each indicator for each state contributing one point, the resulting salience index ranges from 0-12. Three of these indicators measure the tangible salience of the territory (resource/economic value, strategic value, permanently settled land); when the indicator is present, the territory has greater potential value for whichever state possesses it. The other three indicators measure intangible salience (claims to what is considered homeland rather than dependent territory, an ethnic/identity connection to the territory and its residents, and a history of exercising sovereignty over it). These measure more psychological value of the territory and are more specific to the claimant state, because a challenger state may see the claimed territory as part of its homeland while the target rules it as a dependency (e.g. Argentina-UK over the Falklands/Malvinas or Spain-UK over Gibraltar).

The general process is similar for coding the salience of identity claims. A claim is considered to be salient for a state when the subject of the claim – the shared ethnic group – is more important to the state. Generally speaking, an identity claim will not have much tangible salience, because most such claims are over the treatment of a shared ethnic group within the target state and do not offer much potential economic or security benefit to the challenger if its demands are met (the exception is irredentist claims, which are essentially territorial claims with an ethnic component). Measuring the salience of identity claims, then, revolves around the strength of the ties between the group members living in the target state and the government and people of each claimant state.

As with territorial claims, an identity claim is considered more salient to a state when the ethnic group in question is considered part of that state's homeland rather than part of a colony or dependency (note that the challenger may see the group as part of its homeland but the target may be a colonial power holding the group's land in a dependency). Again like territorial claims, an identity claim is considered more salient to a state when the group has been part of the state in the past two centuries (typically when it was lost to a territorial transfer or forced migration) than when it has not. Salience is considered greater for the challenger state when the group is concentrated regionally, particularly along the border, because this means more contact and interconnections across the border; but salience is greater for the target state when the group is distributed statewide, as this means that the group is integrated more widely across the entire society. Finally, there are three indicators of the cultural connections – ethnic, linguistic, and religious -- between the shared ethnic group and each state, with the basic argument that a claim is more salient to a state when the members of the group involved in the claim share more in common with the overall population of the state.

Identity Claim Settlement Attempts

To be included in the data set, settlement attempts during ongoing identity claims must attempt to resolve part or all of the claim itself, or must at least attempt to manage the subject of the claim. As will be seen in the description of the attempted settlement data presented later in this codebook, this allows for four distinct types of settlement attempt: (1) functional, which involves attempts to manage the claim -- perhaps through the establishment of ceasefires or demilitarized zones -- but not to settle the challenger's demands regarding group status; (2) procedural, which involves discussion of future negotiations or procedures to settle the claim -- such as negotiations on submitting the claim to the World Court or to some other actor or body -- but not an attempt to settle the claim directly in the present talks; (3) attempts to settle part but not all of the challenger's demands over the group, which if successful would be able to reduce the demands and perhaps move toward a more final settlement; and (4) attempts to settle the challenger's entire set of demands, which if successful would presumably be able to end the entire claim.

Each settlement attempt that meets any of these four descriptions is subjected to additional data collection. Variables to be collected cover the dates on which the attempt began and ended, the type of settlement attempt, and the effectiveness of the attempt. It must be noted that any attempt meeting one of these descriptions should be included in the data set, regardless of whether or not it led to agreement on a final treaty or agreement, or whether or not any resulting agreement is actually ratified or executed by the signatories. Such questions are more properly the subject of systematic analysis using complete data on all attempts to manage or settle identity claims, rather than tools to be used for case selection.

Sources and Coding Procedures

The general coding procedures for the identity claims data set are the same as for any other ICOW data set, as described in the general codebook.

References

Paul R. Hensel (2001). "Contentious Issues and World Politics: Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 1 (March): 81-109.

Paul R. Hensel and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (2005). "Issue Indivisibility and Territorial Claims." *GeoJournal* 64, 4 (December): 275-285.

Paul R. Hensel, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers II, and Clayton L. Thyne (2008). "Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52, 1 (February): 117-143.

Paul R. Hensel and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (2017). "From Territorial Claims to Identity Claims: The Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 34 2 (March): 126-140.

Revision History
• 8 December 2018: First release of identity claims manual.

Variables in the Dyadic Claim-Level Data File (ICCLAIM)

CLAIM: Number of Claim
Number: *An ICOW code number assigned to each claim to identify it (no substantive interpretation)*
<u>Notes</u>
• Leave this space on the codesheet blank until all candidate cases have been collected for the entire geographic region that you have been assigned.
• Where possible, ICOW claim numbers should correspond to the COW nation-state numbers in each geographic region or sub-region (e.g., all South American ICOW claims should fall between numbers 100-199, just like South American COW nation-states).
• Within each geographic region or sub-region, ICOW claim numbers should follow the general order of the COW interstate system codes for the primary dyad in each claim (see "DYAD," below). That is, a Colombia-Peru claim (100-135) should be listed before a Venezuela-Brazil claim (101-140). For claims involving a colonial power on at least one side, try to assign a claim number based on the COW code for the dependency rather than for the colonizer (so the Guyana-Suriname claim should be assigned a number based on states #110 Guyana and #115 Suriname rather than #200 UK and #210 Netherlands); see the project director for COW codes for entities that are not currently members of the COW interstate system.
• When assigning claim numbers, be sure to leave at least one unused number between each two claims, to allow for the addition of future claims if needed.

NAME: Name of Claim
Text: *Name of the claim (typically the group name and location, e.g. "French in Quebec")*
<u>Notes</u>
• This may not be as straightforward as coding the name of a territorial claim, where the claimed territory is often easy to distinguish, but it should be some indication of which group is being covered by the claim and in which geographic location(s).

DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim
Number: *An ICOW code number assigned to identify each dyad involved in each claim*
<u>Notes</u>
• Dyadic claims all have a Dyadnum value of "1".
• Multilateral claims are divided into dyads in approximate chronological order, as well as can be determined. For overlapping periods in which multiple dyadic claims are active, order dyads by approximate order of importance within the claim (which dyad involves the largest portion of territory, or is the most active?).

CHAL: Challenger state in this dyadic claim
Number: *COW country code of the actor in this dyad making the initial demand*
<u>Notes</u>
• This is the state making demands over the status or treatment of the group.

TGT: Target state in this dyadic claim
Number: *COW country code of state in this dyad targeted by the challenger*
<u>Notes</u>
• This is the state that is the subject of the challenger's demands over the status or treatment of the group (presumably the state where the group members in question reside).

BEGCLAIM: Start Date of Dyadic Claim
Number: *The month and year that the claim began*
<u>Notes</u>
• This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 194601 or 200012.

ENDCLAIM: End Date of Dyadic Claim
Number: *The month and year that the claim ended*
-9: *Claim coded as ongoing past the current end of the data set*

• This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 194601 or 200012.

RESOLVED: Type of Resolution of Claim
-9: Ongoing *The claim is not resolved (as of the current end of the data set)*
1: Dropped by Challenger T*he claim is simply dropped (the challenger simply stops pursuing it sometime during this year, and does not pursue it any further)*
2: Renounced by Challenger *The claim is renounced through an official statement by the leadership of the challenger (but not through any bilateral agreement with the adversary, or any third-party assistance)*
3: (*This value is no longer used; as of version 1.2 of the ICOW data, this value has been split into binding and non-binding third party activities, values 12 and 13 in the revised list*)
4: Bilateral *The disputants formally settle the claim in a bilateral treaty or agreement (including any bilateral agreement qualifying for inclusion in ICSETTLE)*
5: Independence *This dyadic claim is replaced by a new claim due to the independence of a former dependency (e.g., a claim involving Yugoslavia ends with the dissolution of Yugoslavia, when it is replaced by a new dyadic claim involving Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia, or some other former Yugoslav republic)*
6: Actor Leaves System *This particular dyadic claim ends when either the challenger or target state leaves the COW interstate system (e.g., the Haiti-U.S. claim over Navassa Island ends when Haiti leaves the COW system in 1915, and a new dyadic claim between the same states begins when Haiti rejoins the system in 1934; a number of claims involving Austria-Hungary also end this way when the empire leaves the system in 1918, some of which restart when the relevant successor -- Austria or Hungary -- joins the system in 1918 or 1919). Note that if the actor leaves the system due to military action over this claim (e.g. an invasion to conquer the territory) it should be coded as ending through conquest/occupation.*
7: Military Conquest/Occupation *This dyadic claim ends with the challenger state's military occupation of the territory where the group lives -- Note that this type of outcome may lead to a reversal of the challenger-target distinction, as the former target becomes the challenger in a new claim seeking to regain its lost territory*
8: Dropped by Target *The target state simply stops its objections to the challenger's claims, without any formal agreement between challenger and target. For identity claims this includes situations where the target state makes the requested changes in treatment of the group in question (e.g. by ending repression), but without any formal agreement between the challenger and target state.*
9: Renounced by Target *The target state explicitly renounces its objections to the challenger's claims, without any formal agreement between challenger and target. For identity claims this includes situations where the target state makes the requested changes in treatment of the group in question (e.g. by implementing an explicit law/policy guaranteeing religious or linguistic rights), but without any formal agreement between the challenger and target state.*
10: Plebiscite *The claim ended because of a plebiscite in the disputed area, the results of which were accepted by both sides. Note that this only refers to plebiscites where the outcome is actually in doubt by both sides; plebiscites that are called to ratify an accepted and implemented treaty do not count in this regard, and the claim should be coded as ending with the treaty.*
11: Claim No Longer Relevant *The claim is no longer relevant, as in cases where the target state no longer rules over the territory where the group lives (e.g., if the group achieved independence outside of this claim, or if its territory was transferred to a different state for reasons outside of this claim).*
12: Binding Third Party Decision *The claim ends through a legally binding third party decision (adjudication or arbitration).*
13: Non-binding Third Party Activity *The claim ends with the non-binding assistance of a third party (good offices, inquiry, conciliation, mediation, or multilateral negotiations).*
14: Peace Conference *The claim ends with the non-binding assistance of a multilateral peace conference that follows the end of a regional or global war, involving war participants and perhaps other interested parties attempts to adjust borders, as well as settling other postwar issues such as war guilt or reparations -- an example is the post-World War II Paris Peace Conference and its associated treaties.*
Notes
• This variable should be consistent with the "Claimend" variable from ICSETTLE. If the claim is considered settled through bilateral or third party means, then this coding should be reflected in one of the settlement attempts

included in ICSETTLE (and if a settlement attempt is coded as ending the claim in ICSETTLE, then this should be reflected in the "Resolved" variable in ICCLAIM).

ENDVIOL: Role of Organized Violence in End of Claim
1: Violence *This claim ended due to the threat or use of large-scale organized violence between the claimant states over this claim*
0: None *The claim did not end in this way*
-9: *Claim coded as ongoing past the current end of the data set*
Notes
• "Violence" refers to the threat or use of large-scale organized violence -- this does not necessarily have to meet the COW definition of interstate war (1000 dead in sustained combat between regular forces.) It may occur through military action or occupation that involved fewer casualties, or even no casualties if one state backs down because of military threats to carry out large-scale violence or occupation of the territory where the group lives.
• Note that a value of 1 (violent ending) must be coded for any claim that is coded for the RESOLVED variable as ending through military conquest or occupation.
• A claim will be coded as ending through violence if a peaceful (bilateral or third party) settlement over the claim largely codifies the results of organized violence (e.g., when a subsequent treaty or peace conference confirms possession of the territory by the victor of the earlier fighting).
• Ending through violence also includes cases of unsuccessful violence/war, which are followed by one side dropping its claim.
• This variable is NOT meant to identify cases where the violence was not organized (e.g., riots or other non-official forces) or did not directly involve these two claimants or this territorial claim (e.g., when the U.S. occupied Haiti or the Dominican Republic, leading to the end of their claims against some additional party because the claimant left the international system). The purpose of this variable is to identify cases where the claim was resolved through violence between the claimant states in the dyad.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET
Actors
• Be sure to list all nation-state actors involved in the claim, along with their COW code numbers and the dates when they were in the COW interstate system.

Dyads
• Be sure to list all dyads involved in the claim on the coversheet.
• The "Dyadnum" headings refer to the ICOW code number for each dyad, which will be determined once all claim-level and dyad-year-level information has been collected for the claim.

Brief Description of Issue
• This should be a one-paragraph summary of the issue in question. For the identity claims data set, this means a brief summary of the group and its relationship to both the challenger and target states. If possible, this description should also give some idea about events before (but leading up to) the claim, the circumstances under which the claim was first begun, and the original reasoning behind the claim.
• Where multiple dyads exist for a claim to a given piece of territory, each dyad should have a separate one-paragraph entry in this section of the codesheet (with an italicized subheading "Dyad #1" and so on). This will allow easy determination of what has changed across the claim's various dyads, whether this means a different set of countries claiming the territory (perhaps due to the independence of a colony) or the original claimants resolving much but not all of their claim.

Brief Chronology of Claim
• This should be a one- or two-paragraph summary of major actions taken during the claim. For example, significant negotiations, third party awards, or major crises or wars should be mentioned here. This section should also briefly mention how, when, and (to the extent this can be determined) why the claim ended.
• When multiple dyads exist for a claim to a given piece of territory, each dyad should have a separate one- or two-paragraph entry in this section of the codesheet (with an italicized subheading "Dyad #1" and so on. This

will allow easy determination of what happened during each dyadic claim, rather than forcing researchers to read through the entire claim chronology.

• Note that this brief chronology should be brief and should be in complete paragraph form, rather than event-by-event chronology form. The more detailed chronologies belong in the dyadic codesheets, rather than in these larger claim-level coversheets.

Coding Notes

• Details on the coding for the case, where relevant (explanations of why the case was coded as it was, particularly in controversial or unclear situations, with references where possible).

References

• List of sources consulted (provide full bibliographic citation for each source). Note that this is the only listing of references for the entire codesheet; in the original version of the codesheets, there was a space for references in the claim coversheet as well as each dyadic claim codesheet and each settlement attempt codesheet, but that led to confusion, duplication of sources in multiple places, and in some cases the failure to list a source anywhere.

Variables in the Dyad-Year-Level Data File (ICDYADYR)

CLAIM: Number of Claim *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*
DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*
CHAL: Challenger State *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*
TGT: Target State *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*

YEAR: Year of This Observation
• Because ICDYADYR is a dyad-year-level data set; this variable only appears in the computerized dyad-year version of the data set, not the hand-written dyad-level codesheet.

HOMEC: Homeland / Colony Claim Dummy for Challenger State
HOMET: Homeland / Colony Claim Dummy for Target State
1: Homeland *The territory where the group lives is administered or claimed as homeland territory of the state in question (i.e., it is not seen as a colony or dependency)*
0: Dependency *The territory where the group lives only involves territory that is considered a colony, possession, or other dependent territory (i.e., not part of the state's homeland)*
Notes
• The challenger and target may have different values for this variable. For example, Argentina claims the Falkland/Malvinas Islands as part of the Argentina homeland, while Great Britain administers the islands as a dependency.
• This variable may change in value across dyadic claims. For example, Guatemala claims Belize as Guatemalan homeland territory, which remains consistent. For the target in that claim, though, Great Britain administered Belize as a dependency -- but after Belizean independence, Belize became the target, at which point HOMETGT took on a different "homeland" value for the new Guatemala-Belize dyad than it had for the earlier Guatemala-Britain dyad.
• This should be easy to determine for most cases, where a territory is either seen as part of the national territory, or as part of a colony or dependency. For land empires (such as the Ottoman, Hapsburg, or Russian Empires), though, the distinction may not be obvious. In such cases the coder must determine whether the area is treated as an area that would be considered part of the core national territory (e.g. if large numbers of the empire's dominant ethnic group settle in the area and/or its inhabitants are given the same rights and privileges as citizens of the core national territory) or as a peripheral part of the empire that corresponds more closely to an overseas colony.

HISTC: Historical Sovereignty over Group by Challenger State?
HISTT: Historical Sovereignty over Group by Target State?
1: Yes *The challenger/target state has exercised sovereignty over the members of this group for at least one of the previous 200 years*
0: No *The state has never exercised sovereignty over this group in the previous 200 years*
Notes
• The purpose of these two variables is to determine whether the group in question has ever been ruled by each state in the dyad. This should almost always be coded as 1 for the target state, as the group is currently part of that state (which is why the challenger is demanding changes in the status or treatment of the group). For the challenger state, the key distinction is whether or not the group has been under its rule at some point in the past 200 years, before it was transferred to the target state (perhaps by a territorial change or forced migration). If so, the group is considered to have greater intangible salience to the current stat than it would if the group had not been part of the state in the relatively recent past.
• Sovereignty: For this variable to be coded as 1 for a state, there must have been an actual exercise of sovereignty over the members of the group, not just theoretical legal title to the land where the group lived -- if the state in question (and its citizens) never really occupied or administered the land, there is little intangible tie that can be measured. Also, this should not be coded where neither side has actual sovereignty over the territory, as in wilderness territory that both sides' citizens may be exploring but that neither government really controls.
• Duration: This sovereignty must have lasted for at least one full year, and can not include temporary military occupations (unless the territory was administered with the clear understanding that it was being annexed).

• 200 years: Intangible attachments to people or territory can endure for long periods of time, but we cannot allow an infinite time horizon. Some claims follow tenuous connections to long-defunct historical entities (such as the Biblical Israelites, Frankish or Slavic tribes, and so on). To keep it reasonable, this variable should only be coded with respect to sovereignty within the previous two hundred years before the observation in question.

• Former colonies: For colonial inheritance, the independent state should be considered to have possessed all lands that were possessed by its predecessor entity during the colonial era. For questions where multiple states emerge from a single colony or dependency, the coder must determine whether each state (challenger and/or target) represents the successor of an entity that exercised sovereignty over the territory for at least one full year during the time period covered by this variable; this should generally be based on internal administrative borders within the colony, at least to the extent that these correspond to the post-independence states.

• Relationship to homeland variables?: This historical sovereignty variable should be coded for all types of territory that were ruled by a given state or entity, whether homeland territory or colonial/dependent territory. Even for dependent territories, we believe that there is greater intangible value for a colony that has been ruled by the state previously than for one that has not.

• The codesheet includes a space to note the last year when each state is considered to have had sovereignty over the group, which might be useful for revisiting this 200-year threshold – be sure to indicate the last year (if any) when each state ruled over the group, regardless of whether this falls within 200 years of the claim.

SPATDIST: Spatial Distribution of Group in Target State

1: Regionally Based *The group is located in one or more particular regions that are easily distinguishable on a map*

2: Urban *The group is located primarily in urban areas, not in a particular region or subregion*

3: Regional and Urban *The group meets both the "regionally based" and "urban" definitions*

4: Migrant *The group is generally nomadic*

5: Dispersed *The group's members are scattered throughout the territory of the state*

6: Statewide *The group has a presence in virtually every part of the country*

7: Aggregate *The group is aggregated from several smaller groups during this time period*

-9: Missing *The group's spatial distribution is not coded in the current version of the Geo-EPR data*

Notes

• This variable is identified using the Geo-Referencing Ethnic Power Relations (Geo-EPR) data set, which used GIS to code the spatial distribution of each EPR group within each state. The needed information for each group is provided in the "Groups-Spatial.pdf" document in the Dropbox folder for project RAs; be sure to note if this information changes for the group at some point while the claim is ongoing.

SIMETHC: Ethnic Similarity between Group and Challenger State
SIMETHT: Ethnic Similarity between Group and Target State

2: Majority *The group makes up at least 50% of the state's population*

1: Substantial *The group makes up between 10-49.9% of the state's population*

0: Less *The group makes up less than 10% of the state's population*

Notes

• This variable is identified using the EPR data, which codes each ethnic group's size as a proportion of the total population of the state. The needed information for each group is provided in the group-level codesheets that were filled out at the beginning of the grant (e.g. "214. Germans.rtf" at the top level of the folder "214. Germans").

SIMLANGC: Linguistic Similarity between Group and Challenger State
SIMLANGT: Linguistic Similarity between Group and Target State

2: Majority *The primary language spoken by the group is spoken by at least 50% of the state's population*

1: Substantial *The primary language spoken by the group is spoken by between 10-49.9% of the state's population*

0: Less *The primary language spoken by the group is spoken by less than 10% of the state's population*

Notes

• The most common language in each group is identified using the EPR Ethnic Dimensions data set, which lists the three largest linguistic and religious groups for each EPR group in each state. This information is provided in the "Groups-LangRelig.pdf" document in the Dropbox folder for project RAs.

• The most common languages in each state are identified using *Ethnologue*, the UN Ethnocultural data set, and the CIA World Factbook. This information is provided in the "States-Lang.pdf" document in the Dropbox folder for project RAs.
• Be sure to note the largest language for the group, then the years (if any) when this language was 50+% or 10-49.9% of the state's population, in the appropriate places on the codesheet.

SIMRELC: Religious Similarity between Group and Challenger State
SIMRELT: Religious Similarity between Group and Target State
2: Majority *The primary religion of the group is followed by at least 50% of the state's population*
1: Substantial *The primary religion of the group is followed by between 10-49.9% of the state's population*
0: Less *The primary religion of the group is followed by less than 10% of the state's population*
<u>Notes</u>
• The most common religion in each group is identified using the EPR Ethnic Dimensions data set, which lists the three largest linguistic and religious groups for each EPR group in each state. This information is provided in the "Groups-LangRelig.pdf" document in the Dropbox folder for project RAs.
• The most common religions in each state are identified using the COW Religion data set, UN Ethnocultural data set, and the CIA World Factbook This information is provided in the "States-Relig.pdf" document in the Dropbox folder for project RAs, with separate columns for groups making up at least 50% and 10-49.9% of the population (with notes about groups that shifted categories at some point).
• Be sure to note the largest religion for the group, then the years (if any) when this religion was 50+% or 10-49.9% of the state's population, in the appropriate places on the codesheet.

CLAIM-RELATED DEMANDS BY GROUP MEMBERS
The following seven variables are used to indicate what type(s) of change members of the group are demanding from the target state:
DEMGPOL: Group Demands over Political Status
DEMGECON: Group Demands over Economic Status
DEMGLANG: Group Demands over Linguistic Status
DEMGPOL: Group Demands over Religious Status
DEMGPOL: Group Demands for Autonomy
DEMGPOL: Group Demands for Independence
DEMGPOL: Group Demands for Union with Challenger State
1: Yes *Members of the group demanded this type of change*
0: No *Group members did not demand this type of change*
<u>Notes</u>
• "Members of the group" can refer to factions within the group, not necessarily speaking for the majority. Different elements of the group may demand different types of change at the same time.
• These demands are not mutually exclusive. A single faction may demand multiple types of change at the same time (e.g. improvements in both linguistic and religious rights); multiple factions may demand different types of change at the same time (e.g. one demanding autonomy and another demanding union with the challenger state); and different demands may be made at different times.
• For any type of change, use the "Summary of demand" line on the codesheet to give a brief summary of what is being demanded (and, if possible, by which organizations or factions), and use the "Years when demand made" line to indicate when the demand was made by group members.

CLAIM-RELATED DEMANDS BY CHALLENGER STATE
The following nine variables – seven demand types and two for territorial claims -- are used to indicate what type(s) of change the government of the challenger state is demanding from the target state.
DEMCPOL: Challenger Demands over Political Status
DEMCECON: Challenger Demands over Economic Status
DEMCLANG: Challenger Demands over Linguistic Status
DEMCPOL: Challenger Demands over Religious Status
DEMCPOL: Challenger Demands for Autonomy
DEMCPOL: Challenger Demands for Independence

DEMCPOL: Challenger Demands for Union with Challenger State
1: Yes *The government of the challenger state demanded this type of change*
0: No *Challenger government did not demand this type of change*
Notes
• As with identifying claims, be sure that these demands are made by official government representatives, who are authorized to make or express foreign policy positions of the government.
• These demands are not mutually exclusive. The government may demand multiple types of change at the same time (e.g. improvements in both linguistic and religious rights), and different demands may be made at different times.
• Please note that the challenger's demands may be different from the demands made by the members of the group itself, as measured in the previous seven variables (for example, members of the group may seek union with the challenger state, but the government of the challenger state may disavow irredentism and may only seek to improve the political or economic conditions of the group within the target state).
• For any type of change, use the "Summary of demand" line on the codesheet to give a brief summary of what is being demanded (and, if possible, by whom), and use the "Years when demand made" line to indicate when the demand was made by group members.

TERRCLM: ICOW Territorial Claim over Area where Group Lives?
1: Yes *The challenger made an ICOW territorial claim to the area where this group lives during this claim*
0: No *No territorial claim during this claim*
Notes
The specific claim must be noted on the codesheet, including both the name of the claimed territory and the ICOW code number for that claim (in the next variable).

TERRNUM: ICOW Claim Number
XXX: ICOW Code Number for Territorial Claim *The challenger made an ICOW territorial claim to the area where this group lives during this claim*
-9: No Claim *No territorial claim during this claim*
Notes
• The territorial claim referred to in this variable must be included in the ICOW territorial claims data set.

CHALLENGER STATE SUPPORT FOR GROUP
The following three variables are used to indicate what type(s) of support the government of the challenger state is providing to members of the group in the target state.
SUPPOL: Challenger Government Political Support for Group *(such as advising, hosting, or assisting talks between the group and the target state government)*
SUPECON: Challenger Government Economic Support for Group *(such as supplying money or non-military goods such as food or medicine)*
SUPMIL: Challenger Government Military Support for Group *(such as supplying weapons, advising or training group military forces, or overt cross-border military action supporting the group)*
1: Yes *The government of the challenger state offered this type of support*
0: No *Challenger government did not offer this type of support*
Notes
• As with identifying claims, be sure that these demands are made by official government representatives, who are authorized to make or express foreign policy positions of the government.
• These are not mutually exclusive; the challenger may offer any of all of these types of support in the same year.
• For any type of support, use the "Summary of support" line on the codesheet to give a brief summary of what type of support is being offered (and, if possible, by whom), and use the "Years when support offered" line to indicate when the demand was made by group members.
• If it is suggested that the state provided one or more types of support, but you can not find clear enough evidence to allow coding it, be sure to make a note (with as much documentation as possible) in the Coding Notes section of the codesheet.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Coding Notes
• Details on the coding for the case, where relevant (explanations of why the case was coded as it was, particularly in controversial or unclear situations, with references where possible).
• Document and explain any time that claim characteristics change (e.g., group members or the challenger begin or stop making certain types of demands or offering certain types of support).

Brief Chronology
• When and how was the claim first made, and by which actor(s)?
• What significant events (if any) occurred during (or because of) the claim?
• Were there any dormant periods in the claim, and if so, how was the claim restarted?
• When do we consider the claim to have ended, and why?

Militarized Conflict between the Participants
• This section of the codesheet will allow us to check the current COW dispute data for missing militarized disputes, incorrect territorial-versus-other issue codings, and so on. Don't worry about filling this out while initially coding the case -- this is something that will be addressed later, as the project director codes MIDs for correspondence with specific identity claims.

References
• Be sure to list all referenced sources in the References list on the claim coversheet.

CLAIM: Number of Claim *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*
DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*
CHAL: Challenger State *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*
TGT: Target State *(See description under ICCLAIM data)*

SETTNUM: Number of Attempted Settlement
Number: *An ICOW code number for this settlement attempt*
<u>Notes</u>
• These code numbers are chronological, so the first settlement attempt for a given claim should have the number 01.

BEGSETT: Start Date of Attempted Settlement
Number: *The month and year that the settlement attempt began*
<u>Notes</u>
• This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 194601 or 200012.
• This is the date that the actual attempted settlement began, not the date on which it was first suggested; additional details such as the date it was suggested should go in the case's brief chronology (if it can be determined).

ENDSETT: End Date of Attempted Settlement
Number: *The month and year that the settlement ended*
-999: *attempted settlement remains ongoing*
<u>Notes</u>
• This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 194601 or 200012.
• For cases ending in successful agreements: use the date of the agreement.
• For other cases: use the date that the settlement attempt stopped (negotiations were broken off, an arbitration decision was handed down but rejected, etc.).

TYPESETT: Type of Attempted Settlement
1: Bilateral Negotiations *(between the claimants, without any third-party assistance)*
2: Good Offices *(third party attempts to facilitate communication between claimants)*
3: Inquiry or Conciliation *(essentially fact-finding mission by third party)*
4: Mediation *(third party is allowed to make suggestions toward settlement)*
5: Arbitration *(claimants submit claim to ad hoc third party for binding decision)*
6: Adjudication *(claimants submit claim to established legal institution for binding decision)*
7: Other Third-Party Settlement Attempt *(describe on codesheet)*
8: Multilateral Negotiations *(third parties included as equal, interested participants, rather than as neutral parties attempting to facilitate a bilateral settlement between the claimants)*
9: Peace Conference *(after the end of a regional or global war, a peace conference of war participants and perhaps other interested parties attempts to adjust borders, as well as settling other postwar issues such as war guilt or reparations -- an example is the post-World War I Paris Peace Conference and its associated Treaty of Versailles. This is somewhat similar to binding settlement attempts such as arbitration, in that the claimants themselves become subject to the decision reached by the peace conference, but the defeated party from the war may not be treated as possessing equal rights during the process, and may not even have the ability to present its own case. This is distinct from, say, mediation because the conference itself makes the decision regarding the disposition of the issue; if the parties are required to reach their own agreement with outside assistance/pressure, then the settlement attempt involves mediation rather than a peace conference.)*
<u>Notes</u>
• See the above discussion of types of settlement attempts for more detail on each type.
• When one actor offers good offices as a way to facilitate arbitration or mediation, code the more involved settlement attempt (in this case, the arbitration or mediation), but make a note of the good offices on the codesheet. Similarly, if a third party becomes involved in the middle of a period of bilateral negotiations by offering good

offices to keep the negotiations from ending, code the entire settlement attempt as involving good offices, and make a note on the codesheet.

TYPEACT: Type of Third Party Actor in Attempted Settlement
-9: *None (Bilateral settlement attempt)*
0: *Claim participants' citizens, or private citizens not acting on behalf of any state government (see note below under ACTOR1)*
1: *Minor power(s) only, at least one of which is located in the same region as the claim*
2: *Minor power(s) in other region only (i.e., no major power, and no minor power(s) in same region as claim)*
3: *COW Major power(s) only, at least one of which is located in the same region as the claim*
4: *COW Major power(s) in other region only*
5: *Regional IGO (intergovernmental organization) in same region as claim*
6: *Regional NGO (non-governmental organization) in same region as claim*
7: *Regional IGO in other region*
8: *Regional NGO in other region*
9: *Global IGO (including the ICJ and similar organizations)*
10: *Global NGO (including the Vatican)*
11: *Individual (not officially representing any other governments or organizations)*
12: *Minor powers, at least one of which is from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s), at least one of which is from same region as claim*
13: *Minor powers, at least one of which is from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s) from other region(s) only*
14: *Minor power(s) from other region(s) but not from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s) , at least one of which is from same region as claim*
15: *Minor power(s) from other region(s) but not from the same region as the claim; AND Major power(s) from other region(s) only*
<u>Notes</u>
• "Region" refers to the traditional COW conception of regions, as given in the COW interstate system list (actors 1-199 = Americas, 200-399 = Europe, 400-599 = Africa, 600-699 = Middle East, 700-899 = Asia, and 900-999 = Oceania). Note that this means that (for example) North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean are all considered to be part of the same region.
• "Major power" status is taken from the latest version of the COW interstate system list.
• Note that there is only one TYPEACT variable, although there could potentially be as many as six different third party actors involved in the claim. Code TYPEACT with respect to all third parties, taken as a whole -- note that this variable allows for multiple third party actors.
• Record any details about the specific individual or organization involved on the codesheet, if possible (was this a foreign king? foreign minister? military or religious leader?)

ACTOR1-ACTOR6: Third Party Actor(s) in Attempted Settlement
Number: *Code number for third party actor involved in settlement attempt*
0: *Claim participants (e.g., when the claimants appoint their own citizens to a tribunal to settle the claim. Citizens not acting on behalf of any government should be coded as 999, "private citizens.")*
-9: *None (bilateral attempt, no third party involved)*
<u>Notes</u>
• Due to the difficulty of rating as many as six or more actors for the prominence or effectiveness of their efforts as third parties, the actors should be recorded in ascending order of COW nation-state code numbers. If there are more than six actors, though, try to determine the six most active third parties in the settlement attempt to determine which six to include; if this is not possible, use the first six COW code numbers, but please leave a coding note indicating the other actors that were involved.
• Nation-state actors: use the COW project's nation-state code number.
• Non-state actors: see the ICOW list (available on the ICOW web site).
• If the specific actor is not listed in either the COW interstate system list or the ICOW non-state actor list, please type in the name or abbreviation of the actor(s) on the codesheet, and we can give them official code numbers later.

EXTENTSA: Extent of claim covered by settlement attempt
0: Functional *The settlement attempt doesn't attempt to settle the challenger's demands in the claim (e.g. the political status or independence of the group), but rather attempts to manage the claim (e.g. by arranging a ceasefire or demilitarized zone where group members live)*
1: Procedural *The settlement attempt doesn't attempt to settle the challenger's demands, but rather covers procedures to be used in settling these demands (e.g., negotiations over submitting the claim to arbitration or adjudication would be coded as procedural, although the actual arbitral or adjudication process would be a later settlement attempt covering part or all of the claim)*
2: Part of Claim *Part, but not all, of the claim is covered by the settlement attempt (i.e., attempts to settle one element of the demands – such as the group's linguistic rights – while saving other elements for future discussion)*
3: Entire Claim *Entire claim is covered (i.e., attempts to settle the entire set of demands being made by the challenger)*
Notes
• Note that the eventual agreement -- if any -- may be different from the original goal of the settlement attempt. For example, a settlement attempt that originally attempts to settle the entire claim may only lead to a procedural treaty, as the parties find themselves unable to settle the claim themselves and instead agree to meet again or to submit their claim to some third party.

AGREE: Did attempted settlement lead to an agreement by the claimants?
1: Yes *The settlement attempt results in a treaty, agreement, or award*
0: No *No treaty, agreement, or award results from the attempt*
Notes
• For settlement attempts involving third party decisions, "agreement" refers to the handing down of an arbitral or adjudicated award.

EXTENTAG: Extent of claim covered by agreement, if any
-9: No agreement
0: Functional
1: Procedural
2: Part of Claim
3: Entire Claim
Notes
• See the description of the values above (under EXTENTSA).
• Note that the eventual agreement -- if any -- may be different from the original goal of the settlement attempt. For example, a settlement attempt that originally attempts to settle the entire claim may only lead to a procedural treaty, as the parties find themselves unable to settle the claim themselves and instead agree to meet again or to submit their claim to some third party.

GRPCHAG: Did agreement call for change(s) in group status?
-9: No agreement
1: Yes *The agreement calls for changes in the status of the shared ethnic group (i.e., granting greater religious or linguistic rights, regional autonomy, or independence).*
0: No *The agreement does not call for any change in the status of the group.*
Notes
• Note that this only covers status changes that are addressed explicitly in agreements between the challenger and target states – changes that are made unilaterally are not included here.

CONCESAG: Which side made more concessions in the agreement?
-9: No agreement
1: Major Challenger Concessions *The agreement involves major concessions by the challenger state, without comparable concessions by the target state. (e.g., challenger gives up its entire claim without receiving concessions from the target)*

2: Minor Challenger Concessions *The agreement involves some concessions by the challenger, although these concessions are not major (or if they are substantial, the target state also makes partially offsetting concessions of its own).*

3: Roughly Even Concessions *The agreement involves roughly equal concessions by both sides in the claim.*

4: Minor Target Concessions *The agreement involves some concessions by the target state, although these concessions are not major (or if they are substantial, the challenger also makes partially offsetting concessions of its own).*

5: Major Target Concessions *The agreement involves major concessions by the target state, without comparable concessions by the challenger. (e.g., target acquiesces to challenger's entire claim, without receiving concessions from the challenger)*

Notes

• In the case of third party arbitral or adjudicated awards, treat the award as if it had been negotiated directly between the claimants. An award that gives all of the disputed territory to the challenger would thus be coded as involving major target concessions.

RATCHAL / RATTGT: Did challenger/target ratify the agreement (if any)?

-9: No agreement

0: No *This state did not ratify the agreement*

1: Yes *This state ratified the agreement*

Notes

• Ratification must be completed within a reasonable time. If the agreement specifies a specific time frame (e.g., within one year of the treaty's signature), then ratification must be completed within that time frame to be coded. When no time frame is specified, the time frame for ratification should be five year from signature.

• If an agreement does not require formal ratification in one or both states' political systems, and the state in question attempted to comply with or carry out the terms of the agreement, then it should be coded as ratifying the agreement. The main purpose of this variable is to identify cases where ratification was not completed (indicating the failure of the attempted settlement), rather than to identify specific details of each state's political process.

COMPCHAL / COMPTGT: Did challenger/target implement or carry out the terms of the agreement (if any)?

-9: No agreement

0: No *This state did not implement/carry out the agreement*

1: Yes *This state implemented/carried out the agreement*

Notes

• Note that "compliance," "implementation," or "carrying out" refer to the claimants taking the required actions. If an agreement fails for reasons beyond their control (e.g., both sides submit their cases to a third party but the third party refuses to hear them or dies before rendering an award), the claimants should still be coded as implementing the agreement.

• Compliance must be completed within a reasonable time. If the agreement specifies a specific time frame (e.g., within one year of the treaty's signature), then compliance must be completed within that time frame to be coded. When no time frame is specified, the time frame for compliance should be five years from signature.

• Compliance can always be withdrawn later, so any coding of compliance with a given agreement is necessarily an inexact decision that could be reversed. As a result, compliance should be coded based on a five-year period -- so a state that complies for less than five years should be coded as not complying with the agreement. An agreement that is meant to be carried out once (e.g., an agreement to submit cases to a third party arbitrator) should be coded based on whether or not the required action was carried out within the specified time frame (as described above).

CLAIMEND: Did attempted settlement lead to the end of the identity claim?

-9: No agreement

0: No *The claim continued past the end of this settlement attempt*

1: Most of Claim *The agreement produced a settlement of the challenger's demands that was followed by the end of explicit contention over most of the claim*

2: All of Claim *The agreement produced a settlement of the challenger's demands that was followed by the end of explicit contention over all of the claim*

<u>Notes</u>

• "All" of the claim means the end of contention over the entire set of demands made by the challenger. This may mean that the target agreed to make the demanded changes, the challenger agreed to drop its demands, or some other arrangement was reached that ended contention over this set of demands. When a settlement attempt is coded with this result, the claim should be coded as ending in the claim-level data (ICCLAIM).

• "Most" of the claim means the end of contention over most of the challenger's demands, although at least one demand remains unsettled and the claim remains ongoing. Examples include treaties or third party awards that resolve questions of a group's linguistic or religious rights but leave the question of possible group independence to be resolved later. When a settlement attempt is coded with this result, the full claim should not be coded as ending in the claim-level data (ICCLAIM), although some of the salience indicators in ICDYADYR may need to be recoded to reflect that some of the demands are now settled.

• This variable may be complicated by identity claims that appear to end following a treaty, only to be raised anew within several years (due to new leadership in one or both former claimant states, changes in the group's status, or other factors). If explicit contention over most/all of the claim does indeed end following a treaty or award, this variable should be coded accordingly, even if a new claim between the same states begins within a year or two.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET
Brief Chronology of Settlement Attempt
• Who was involved in the settlement attempt, what they did, when, etc.

• Brief summary of the result of the settlement attempt (how did it end? summarize the agreement that was reached and any details on its ratification or implementation if possible, or explain the impasse that prevented agreement / ratification / implementation).

Coding Notes
• Details on the coding for the case, where relevant (explanations of why the case was coded as it was, particularly in controversial or unclear situations, with references where possible).

References
• Be sure to list all referenced sources in the References list on the claim coversheet.

APPENDIX: SAMPLE CODESHEETS

ICOW Identity Claim Coversheet

CLAIM *(Number of claim):*   **NAME** *(Name of claim):*
GROUPNUM *(TEK group number):*   **GROUP** (*group name*):

ACTORS *(States involved in claim):*
<u>COW Code</u>   <u>Name of Actor</u>   <u>Years in COW System</u>

DYADS: *(Dyads involved in claim):*
<u>Dyadnum</u>   <u>Challenger - Target</u>   <u>Begdate</u>   <u>Enddate</u>   <u>Resolved</u>   <u>Endviol</u>

Brief Description of Issue *(give a separate paragraph for each dyadic claim)***:**

Brief Summary of Claim Management *(give a separate paragraph for each dyadic claim)***:**

Coding Notes:

References:

ICOW Dyadic Identity Claim Codesheet

CLAIM *(Number of claim):*   **NAME** *(Name of claim):*
GROUPNUM *(TEK group number):*   **GROUP** (*group name*):
DYADNUM *(Number of dyadic claim):*
CHAL - TGT *(Claim challenger and target)***:**

BEGCLAIM *(Beginning of dyadic claim):*
ENDCLAIM *(End of dyadic claim)***:**
RESOLVED *(Type of resolution of dyadic claim; see codebook for list):*
ENDVIOL *(Did claim end through large-scale violence? 0=no, 1=yes, -9=ongoing):*

HOMEC *(Is location considered chal. homeland? 1=yes, 0=dependency):*
HOMET *(Is location considered target homeland? 1=yes, 0= dependency):*
HISTC *(Historical sovereignty by chal. over group? 1=yes):*   **Years:**
HISTT *(Historical sovereignty by target over group? 1=yes):*   **Years:**
SPATDIST *(spatial distribution, from GeoEPR):*

SIMETHC *(ethnic similarity to challenger; 2=50%+, 1=10-49%, 0=<10%):*
     EPR group size in challenger (from preliminary codesheet):
SIMETHT *(ethnic similarity to target; 2=50%+, 1=10-49%, 0=<10%):*
     EPR group size in target (from preliminary codesheet):
SIMLANGC *(linguistic similarity to challenger; 2=50%+, 1=10-49%, 0=<10%):*
     Largest group language (from Groups-LangRelig.pdf):
     Years as 50+% in challenger (from States-Lang.pdf):
     Years as 10-49% in challenger:
SIMLANGT *(linguistic similarity to target; 2=50%+, 1=10-49%, 0=<10%):*
     Years as 50+% in target (from States-Lang.pdf):
     Years as 10-49% in target:
SIMRELC *(religious similarity to challenger; 2=50%+, 1=10-49%, 0=<10%):*
     Largest group religion (from Groups-LangRelig.pdf):
     Years as 50+% in challenger (from States-Relig.pdf):
     Years as 10-49% in challenger:
SIMRELT *(religious similarity to target; 2=50%+, 1=10-49%, 0=<10%):*
     Years as 50+% in target (from States-Relig.pdf):
     Years as 10-49% in target:

DEMGPOL *(group demands over political status? 1=yes*):   Years::
     Summary of demand:
     Years when demand made:
DEMGECON *(group demands over economic status? 1=yes*):   Years::
     Summary of demand:
     Years when demand made:
DEMGLANG *(group demands over linguistic status? 1=yes*):   Years::
     Summary of demand:
     Years when demand made:
DEMGREL *(group demands over religious status? 1=yes*):   Years::
     Summary of demand:
     Years when demand made:
DEMGAUT *(group demands for autonomy? 1=yes*):   Years::
     Summary of demand:

Years when demand made:

DEMGIND *(group demands for independence? 1=yes)*:   Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMGIRR *(group demands for union with challenger? 1=yes)*: Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMCPOL *(chal demands over political status? 1=yes)*:   Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMCECON *(chal demands over economic status? 1=yes)*: Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMCLANG *(chal demands over linguistic status? 1=yes)*: Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMCREL *(chal demands over religious status? 1=yes)*:   Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMCAUT *(chal demands for autonomy? 1=yes)*:   Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMCIND *(chal demands for independence? 1=yes)*:   Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

DEMCIRR *(chal demands for irredentism/union? 1=yes)*: Years::
    Summary of demand:
    Years when demand made:

TERRCLM *(ICOW terr. claim over area where group lives? 1=yes)*:
    TERRNUM (*ICOW claim number(s), XXX.XX)*:

SUPPOL *(chal govt political support for group? 1=yes)*:   Years::
    Summary of support:
    Years when support offered:

SUPECON *(chal govt economic support for group? 1=yes)*: Years::
    Summary of support:
    Years when support offered:

SUPMIL *(chal govt military support for group? 1=yes)*:   Years::
    Summary of support:
    Years when support offered:

Coding Notes:
• Challenger/target:
• Historical sovereignty:

Militarized Conflict over Claim:
MID# *Year(s)*   *Brief Descriptions*

Chronology of Claim:

CLAIM *(Number of claim):*   **NAME** *(Name of claim):*
GROUPNUM *(TEK group number):*   **GROUP** *(group name)*:
DYADNUM *(Number of dyadic claim):*
CHAL - TGT *(Claim challenger and target)***:**

SETTNUM *(Number of attempted settlement):*
BEGSETT *(Beginning date of attempted settlement):*
ENDSETT *(End date of attempted settlement):*
TYPESETT *(Type of attempted settlement; see codebook for list):*

ACTOR1-ACTOR6 *(Third party actors, if any):*
TYPEACT *(Type of third party actor, if any; see codebook for list):*
EXTENTSA *(Extent of attempt; 0=functional, 1=procedural, 2=partial, 3=entire claim):*

AGREE *(Did attempt produce a treaty/agreement/decision? 1=yes, 0=no):*
EXTENTAG *(Extent of agreement; see ExtentSA, -9=no agreement):*
GRPCHAG *(Did agreement call for change in group status? 1=yes, 0=no, -9=N/A):*
CONCESAG *(Which side made more concessions in agreement? see codebook):*
RATCHAL, RATTGT *(Did chal/target ratify agreement? 1=yes, 0=no, -9=N/A):*
COMPCHAL, COMPTGT *(Did chal/target comply? 1=yes, 0=no, -9=N/A):*
CLAIMEND *(Did agreement end claim? 2=all, 1=most, 0=no, -9=N/A):*

Coding Notes:

Chronology of Settlement Attempt: