

**Issue Correlates of War Project
User Manual for ICOW Data, Version 1.1**

Last updated 4 June 2007

Territorial Claims: Western Hemisphere, Western Europe (1816-2001)
River Claims: Western Hemisphere, Western Europe, Middle East (1900-2001)
Maritime Claims: Western Hemisphere, Europe (1900-2001)

Paul R. Hensel

Department of Political Science
Florida State University
phensel@icow.org

Sara McLaughlin Mitchell

Department of Political Science
University of Iowa
sara-mitchell@uiowa.edu

The latest version of this codebook, associated documentation, and officially released data may be downloaded from the ICOW web site at <<http://www.icow.org>>.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	1
Introduction	
What is Included	2
More Information	2
Citing ICOW Data Sets	2
Contact Information	3
Claim-Level Summary Data ("ICOWclaimag")	
Description of File	4
Variable List	4
Dyadic Claim-Level Summary Data ("ICOWclaimdy")	
Description of File	8
Variable List	8
Dyad-Year Data ("ICOWdyadyr")	
Description of File	13
Variable List	13
Attempted Settlement Data File ("ICOWsettle")	
Description of File	28
Variable List	28

INTRODUCTION

These files include data collected by the Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) project. This project is described on the World Wide Web at <<http://www.icow.org>>, where the complete codebooks governing these data files may be obtained. That site also offers access to supporting files (such as lists of non-state actor codes used by the ICOW project), working papers involving ICOW data, and the latest version of all downloadable ICOW data sets.

What is Included

Three distinct data files are included, each focusing on a different unit of analysis. Two versions of each data file are included: a comma-delimited (.csv) file that can be read by any spreadsheet or statistical package, and a Stata (.dta) data file. The variables included in each file are described later in this document.

- (1) **ICOWclaimag.csv** and **ICOWclaimag.dta**: A data set with one observation per claimed territory, river, or maritime area.
- (2) **ICOWclaimdy.csv** and **ICOWclaimdy.dta**: A data set with one observation per *dyadic* territorial, river, or maritime claim.
- (3) **ICOWdyadyr.csv** and **ICOWdyadyr.dta**: A data set with one observation per territorial, river, or maritime claim dyad-year.
- (4) **ICOWsettle.csv** and **ICOWsettle.dta**: A data set with one observation for each attempt to settle a territorial, river, or maritime claim through either peaceful or militarized techniques.

More Information

This codebook only lists the variables in each data set and the allowable values for each one. It does not explain the coding procedures that were used to generate these data sets, or define or explain each allowable value. For that information, please consult the ICOW project codebooks that are available on the ICOW web site (<http://www.icow.org>):

- A general ICOW codebook is available that describes the general concepts and procedures used by the project.
- Separate codebooks are also available for each of the three current ICOW issue types (territorial claims, river claims, and maritime claims) to explain the details of each claim type.

Citing ICOW Data Sets

Users of the Western Hemisphere ICOW data should cite the following papers where relevant:

- Hensel, Paul R. (2001). "Contentious Issues and World Politics: Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 1 (March): 81-109. [*The first publication to use the ICOW territorial claims data set, and it introduces and summarizes the basic purpose and structure of the ICOW data set.*]
- Paul R. Hensel, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Thomas E. Sowers II, "Conflict Management of Riparian Disputes: A Regional Comparison of Dispute Resolution." *Political Geography* 25, 4 (May 2006): 383-411. [*The first publication to use the ICOW river claims data set.*]
- Stephen C. Nemeth, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Elizabeth A. Nyman, and Paul R. Hensel (2006). "UNCLOS and the Management of Maritime Claims." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago, IL. [*The first paper to use the ICOW*

maritime claims data set. The latest version is available at <<http://www.icow.org>>.]

• Hensel, Paul R., Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers II, and Clayton L. Thyne (2006). “Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. *[The first paper to discuss all three issue types together, and it goes into more detail on the topic of salience and comparability of the three issue types. The latest version is available at <<http://www.icow.org>>.]*

Contact Information

Any questions should be directed to Paul Hensel (phensel@icow.org) with respect to the territorial or river claims data, and Sara Mitchell (sara@icow.org) with respect to the maritime claims data.

Feel free to contact us with any questions about the format of the data set or the coding of individual variables or cases. We also welcome any questions about cases that we may have missed in our coding, or questions about why certain cases were coded as they were. We will try to respond as quickly as possible, and if necessary, to make the appropriate additions or changes to our data sets.

Claim-Level Summary Data ("ICOWclaimag")

Description of File

This data file primarily includes descriptive information on each claim. This includes the number of dyads involved in the claim, the beginning and ending of active contention in each claim, the highest salience level reached by the claim, and a summary of attempts to settle the claim over its entire history.

This file has one observation for each distinct claim. A separate claim is coded for each distinct piece of territory, river, or maritime zone that is claimed by at least one state. Each claim may have multiple dyadic claims if there are more than two actors contending over the territory, river, or maritime zone, or if the original claim ends but a new claim over the same general issue later restarts. Where this is the case, ICOWclaimdy includes separate information on each dyadic claim, while ICOWclaimag aggregates all of the different dyadic claims together.

Note that certain variables like claim names or form of termination are not included in the claim-level file because some claims' names change, either because most of the claim was settled and only a small portion remains (e.g., the Peru/Colombia claim covers the larger Loreto area until its resolution in 1922, but a smaller claim to the Leticia area within Loreto restarts in 1932) or because different dyads within the claim contend over different portions of the larger territory (e.g., the claims between Bolivia, Chile, and Peru variously involve Tacna, Arica, and Antofagasta).

Variable List

- Issue: A categorical variable to help distinguish between the different ICOW issue types.
 - 1: Territorial claim
 - 2: River claim
 - 3: Maritime claim

- Terriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are territorial issues
 - 1: Territorial issue
 - 0: No

- Riveriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are river issues
 - 1: River issue
 - 0: No

- Mariss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are maritime issues
 - 1: Maritime issue
 - 0: No

- Region: Geographic region in which this claim occurred. Note that this refers to the region in which the territory, river, or maritime zone is located; one or both claimant states may be located in a different region.
 - 1: Western Hemisphere
 - 2: Europe

- 3: Africa
- 4: Middle East
- 5: Asia and Oceania

- **Claim:** An ICOW code number assigned to each claim to identify it (0-999 represent territorial claims, 1000-1999 represent river claims, 2000 and higher represent maritime claims).

- **Dyads:** Total number of dyadic claims within this overall claim. (A given claim may experience multiple dyadic claims if multiple actors claim the same territory, river, or maritime zone, a former colony becomes independent and thus succeeds the colonial power as a claimant, the challenger state achieves its goals and the former target then begins a new claim as a challenger seeking to recover its losses, or the claim is settled and then reopened years later.) Each of these dyadic claims has a separate entry in the dyad-level claim data (ICOWclaimdy).

- **Begclaim:** The year and month in which the claim began. (Note that for claims that involved multiple dyads, this is the beginning of the earliest dyadic claim over this territory, river, or maritime zone.)

- **Endclaim:** The year and month in which the claim ended. (Note that for claims that involved multiple dyads, this is the ending of the latest-running dyadic claim over this territory, river, or maritime zone.)

200199: Ongoing at current end of data set (12/31/2001)

- **Duration:** The total duration of the claim, measured in years (calculated as the sum of the duration of all dyadic claims in this case).

- **ICOWsal:** ICOW index of the salience or importance of the claimed territory, river, or maritime zone to the two participants. For this claim-level data set, this is measured as the highest salience value for any dyadic claim at any time while the case was ongoing. The index ranges from 0-12, with higher values indicating greater salience; see the ICOW territorial, river, and maritime codebooks and the description of variables in the dyad-year-level data set (ICOWdyadyr) for a more complete explanation of the specific indicators that are involved:

Territorial claims:

- **Resources:** +2 points if present (TCresource=1)
- **Strategic location:** +2 points if present (TCstratloc=1)
- **Populated:** +2 points if present (TCpop=2 or 3)
- **Homeland:** +1 point for each state where relevant (TChomechal/TChometgt)
- **Identity basis:** +1 point for each state where relevant (TCidenchal/TCidentgt)
- **Historical sovereignty:** +1 point for each state where relevant (TChistechal/TChisttgt)

River claims:

- **Homeland:** +1 point for each state where relevant (RChomechal/RChometgt)
- **Navigation:** +1/2 point for each state with local use, +1 for national/international (RCnavc/RCnavt)
- **Populated area served by river:** +1/2 point for each state with towns/villages, +1 for major cities (RCpopc/RCpopt)
- **Resources:** +1/2 point for each state with local use, +1 for national/international

(RCresource/RCresourct)

- Hydroelectric power generation: +1/2 point for each state with local use, +1 for national/international(RCpowerc/RCpowert)
- Irrigation: +1/2 point for each state with local use, +1 for national/international (RCirrigc/RCirrigt)

Maritime claims:

- Homeland: +1 point for each state where relevant (MChomechal/MChometgt)
 - Strategic location: +2 points if present (MCstratloc=1)
 - Fishing: +2 points if present (MCfishing=1 or 3)
 - Migratory fish stocks: +2 points if present (MCmigrate=1)
 - Resources (besides fish and oil): +2 points if present (MCresource=1)
 - Oil: +2 points if present (MCoil=1, 2, or 3)
- ICOWsalc: A categorical version of the ICOW salience index described above.
 - 1: Low salience (ICOWsal values from 0-4)
 - 2: Moderate salience (ICOWsal values from 4.5-7.5)
 - 3: High salience (ICOWsal values from 8-12)
 - Salold: Previous versions of the salience index. For this claim-level data set, this is measured as the highest salience value for any dyadic claim at any time while the case was ongoing. For territorial claims, this is the version used in Hensel's 2001 ISQ article (this version of the index considers whether or not the territory is mainland or offshore territory, while ICOWsal considers whether or not each claimant state has exercised sovereignty over the territory within the past 200 years). For river claims this is the version used in Hensel, Mitchell, and Sowers' 2006 PG article (this version of the index adds 1/2 point if the river serves a population of villages/towns and 1 point if it serves cities of 100,000 or more, while ICOWsal does not add any points if the river serves only villages or towns -- which is more consistent with the way the territorial claim salience is measured). For maritime claims there is no difference between this measure and ICOWsal.
 - Attemptst: Total number of peaceful and militarized settlement attempts that occurred during any dyadic claim in this case (bilateral negotiations, non-binding third party attempts, binding third-party attempts, and militarized interstate disputes).
 - Attemptsp: Number of peaceful settlement attempts that occurred during any dyadic claim in this case (bilateral negotiations, non-binding third party attempts, and binding third-party attempts).
 - Attbilat: Total number of bilateral settlement attempts that occurred during any dyadic claim in this case.
 - Att3non: Total number of non-binding third party settlement attempts that occurred during any dyadic claim in this case (good offices, inquiry or conciliation, mediation, multilateral negotiations, peace conference, or "other").
 - Att3bind: Total number of binding third party settlement attempts that occurred during any

dyadic claim in this case (arbitration or adjudication).

- **Midsiss:** Total number of militarized disputes over the issue that occurred during any dyadic claim in this case. (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)¹
- **Midsfat:** Total number of fatal militarized disputes over the issue that occurred during any dyadic claim in this case. (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)
- **Warsiss:** Total number of full-scale COW interstate wars over the issue that occurred during any dyadic claim in this case. (Note that this only includes wars that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; wars between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)
- **Maxhost:** Highest COW level of hostility for MIDs over this issue (based on level of hostility in MID data set).
 - 0: No MIDs occurred
 - 2: Threat to use force
 - 3: Display of force
 - 4: Use of force
 - 5: Full-scale war
- **Maxfatal:** Highest COW fatality code for MIDs over this issue (based on fatality codes in MID data set).
 - 0: No fatalities occurred
 - 1: 1-25 fatalities
 - 2: 26-100 fatalities
 - 3: 101-250 fatalities
 - 4: 251-500 fatalities
 - 5: 501-999 fatalities
 - 6: 1000+ fatalities
- **Version:** Current version number of this data set.

¹ Militarized disputes are identified using the Correlates of War (COW) project's Militarized Interstate Dispute (MID) data set, which is available at <<http://www.correlatesofwar.org>>. For more information on this data set see Ghosn, Faten, Glenn Palmer, and Stuart Bremer (2004), "The MID3 Data Set, 1993–2001: Procedures, Coding Rules, and Description." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 21: 133-154. All decisions about which of these disputes involved ICOW claims are made by the ICOW project, based on our own investigation.

Claim-Level Summary Data - Dyadic ("ICOWclaimdy")

Description of File

This data file primarily includes descriptive information on each dyadic claim. This includes the name of the claim, the challenger and target states involved in the claim, the beginning and ending of active contention in each claim, the way the claim ended, the highest salience level reached by the claim, and a summary of attempts to settle the claim over its entire history.

This file has one observation for each dyadic claim. A given claim (i.e., a claim to a distinct territory, river, or maritime zone, as covered in ICOWclaimag) may include multiple dyadic claims; ICOWclaimag provides aggregated information that combines all dyadic claims over a single issue.

Variable List

- Issue: A categorical variable to help distinguish between the different ICOW issue types.
 - 1: Territorial claim
 - 2: River claim
 - 3: Maritime claim

- Terriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are territorial issues
 - 1: Territorial issue
 - 0: No

- Riveriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are river issues
 - 1: River issue
 - 0: No

- Mariss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are maritime issues
 - 1: Maritime issue
 - 0: No

- Region: Geographic region in which this claim occurred. Note that this refers to the region in which the territory, river, or maritime zone is located; one or both claimant states may be located in a different region.
 - 1: Western Hemisphere
 - 2: Europe
 - 3: Africa
 - 4: Middle East
 - 5: Asia and Oceania

- Claimdy: A claim-dyad identifier (CCCCDD), where CCCC is the ICOW 4-digit "Claim" variable and DD is the ICOW 2-digit "Dyadnum" variable. Users may find this useful for sorting cases or for merging various ICOW data sets (such as merging salience or recent interactions variables from the dyad-year data into the attempted settlement data, or aggregating and merging data from the dyad-year or attempted settlement data to the dyadic claim data).

- Claim: An ICOW code number assigned to each claim (0-999 represent territorial claims, 1000-1999 represent river claims, 2000 and higher represent maritime claims).
- Name: Name of claimed territory, maritime zone/issue, or river question/issue (note that different dyadic claims within a single case may have different names).
- Rivname: Name of river(s) involved in claim (river claims only)
Missing values: territorial or maritime claims (only coded for river claims)
- Rivnum: ICOW code number of river(s) involved in claim (river claims only)
Missing values: territorial or maritime claims (only coded for river claims)
- Dyadnum: An ICOW code number assigned to identify each dyad involved in each claim.
- Chal: COW country code of the actor in this dyad making the initial claim (the challenger).²
- Tgt: COW country code of state in this dyad that was targeted by the challenger.
- Dyad: A combination of the two claimants' COW country codes, intended to facilitate merging this with other dyadic data sets. This combination takes the form AAABBB, where AAA is the smaller of the two country codes and BBB is the larger (e.g., a U.S.-Russia dyad would be 2365, where AAA is 002 and BBB is 365).
Note that the "Dyad" variable is coded as missing for dyadic claims involving the EU. This was necessary because the EU is coded with 4 digits rather than 3, rendering an AAABBB format unusable. This is unlikely to pose a problem for most uses, though, as none of the dyadic data sets that would be merged with this one will have data for the EU anyway.
- Begclaim: The year and month in which the claim began. (Note that for claims that involved multiple dyads, this is the beginning of the earliest dyadic claim over this territory, river, or maritime zone.)
- Endclaim: The year and month in which the claim ended. (Note that for claims that involved multiple dyads, this is the ending of the latest-running dyadic claim over this territory, river, or maritime zone.)
200199: Ongoing at current end of data set (12/31/2001)
- Resolved: Type of claim resolution
Missing values: Ongoing (the claim is not resolved at the current end of the data set);
Note that ongoing claims are originally coded as a value of zero during data collection, but recoded as missing when the STATA data sets are created to

² Challenger and target country codes use the standard numbering system introduced with the Correlates of War (COW) project's State System Membership List, which is available online at <<http://www.correlatesofwar.org>>. Note that the European Union is coded as an actor in several maritime claims, with actor code 2220 (the code for the EU on our Non-State Actors list, which is available on the ICOW web site). This is not a typo or a coding error; the EU actually negotiated as an interested participant during the "Turbot War" case that is more typically associated as a claim between Spain and Canada. Please contact Sara Mitchell with any questions about the coding of these cases.

avoid misleading users by giving a "Resolved" value for ongoing cases.

- 1: Dropped by Challenger
- 2: Renounced by Challenger
- 3: Third Party
- 4: Bilateral
- 5: Independence
- 6: Actor Leaves System
- 7: Military Occupation
- 8: Dropped by Target
- 9: Renounced by Target
- 10: Plebiscite
- 11: Claim No Longer Relevant

- Endviol: Did claim end through organized violence?
Missing values: Ongoing (the claim is not resolved at the current end of the data set)
1: Yes (claim ended through organized violence)
0: No (claim ending did not involve organized violence)
- Duration: The duration of the claim, measured in years.
- ICOWsal: ICOW index of the salience or importance of the claimed territory, river, or maritime zone to the two participants. For this dyadic claim-level data set, this is measured as the highest salience value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. The index ranges from 0-12, with higher values indicating greater salience; see the description of this variable under ICOWclaimag, above, for a list of the specific indicators used for each issue type.
- ICOWsalc: A categorical version of the ICOW salience index described above.
1: Low salience (ICOWsal values from 0-4)
2: Moderate salience (ICOWsal values from 4.5-7.5)
3: High salience (ICOWsal values from 8-12)
- Salchal: Claim salience for the challenger state in this claim - measured as the highest value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. This value ranges from 0-6.
- Saltgt: Claim salience for the target state in this claim - measured as the highest value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. This value ranges from 0-6.
Note that for maritime claims, there is little differentiation in salience levels between the challenger and target states; only one of the six current salience indicators (homeland vs. dependent territory) may differ between the two claimants. There is more room for differentiation for territorial and river claims, as three of the six indicators of territorial claim salience and all six indicators of river claim salience may differ between the claimants.
- Salold: Previous versions of the salience index. For this dyadic claim-level data set, this is measured as the highest salience value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. For territorial claims this is the version used in Hensel's 2001 ISQ article (this version of the index considers whether or not the territory is mainland or offshore territory, while ICOWsal considers

whether or not each claimant state has exercised sovereignty over the territory within the past 200 years). For river claims this is the version used in Hensel, Mitchell, and Sowers' 2006 PG article (this version of the index adds 1/2 point if the river serves a population of villages/towns and 1 point if it serves cities of 100,000 or more, while ICOWsal does not add any points if the river serves only villages or towns -- which is more consistent with the way the territorial claim salience is measured). For maritime claims there is no difference between this measure and ICOWsal.

- Saltan: ICOW index of tangible salience - measured as the highest value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. This is most useful for territorial claims, and is discussed in the 2005 Hensel & Mitchell *GeoJournal* article. It ranges from 0-6 and is based on three of the six overall territorial salience indicators: economic resources, strategic location, and permanent population in the claimed territory (each of which contributes two points when present because either claimant could benefit from control of the territory in question). To keep the same 0-6 range for river and maritime claims as for territorial claims, only three indicators of tangible salience are used for the latter two issue types: use of the river for navigation, irrigation, or hydroelectric power generation in each state (river claims), and the presence of a strategic location, fishing resources, and oil resources in the maritime zone for (maritime claims).

- Salint: ICOW index of intangible salience - measured as the highest value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. This is most useful for territorial claims, and is discussed in the 2005 Hensel & Mitchell *GeoJournal* article. It ranges from 0-6 and is based on three of the six overall territorial salience indicators: homeland rather than dependent territory, an identity basis for the claim, and historical sovereignty over the claimed territory (each of which contributes one point per each claimant for which it is relevant). For river and maritime claims, this is only based on the homeland/dependent territory distinction (because the other salience indicators all involve tangible salience), so it ranges from 0-2.

- Salintc: ICOW index of intangible salience for the challenger state in the claim, as described above - measured as the highest value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. This is only calculated for territorial claims.

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- Salinttt: ICOW index of intangible salience for the target state in the claim, as described above - measured as the highest value at any time while the dyadic claim was ongoing. This is only calculated for territorial claims.

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- Attemptsp: Total peaceful settlement attempts that occurred over this dyadic claim (including bilateral negotiations, non-binding third party attempts, and binding third-party attempts).

- Attemptst: Total peaceful and militarized settlement attempts that occurred over this dyadic claim ((including bilateral negotiations, non-binding third party attempts, binding third-party attempts, and militarized interstate disputes over the issue).

- Attbilat: Total number of bilateral negotiations that occurred over this dyadic claim.

- Att3non: Total number of non-binding third party settlement attempts (good offices, inquiry or conciliation, mediation, multilateral negotiations, peace conference, or "other") that occurred over this dyadic claim.
- Att3bind: Total number of binding third party settlement attempts (arbitration or adjudication) that occurred over this dyadic claim.
- Midsiss: Total number of militarized disputes over the issue that occurred over this dyadic claim. (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)
- Midsfat: Total number of militarized disputes over this dyadic claim that produced at least one fatality. (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)
- Warsiss: Total number of full-scale COW interstate wars over the issue that occurred over this dyadic claim. (Note that this only includes wars that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; wars between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)
- Maxhost: Highest COW level of hostility for MIDs over this issue (based on level of hostility in MID data set).
 - 0: No MIDs occurred
 - 2: Threat to use force
 - 3: Display of force
 - 4: Use of force
 - 5: Full-scale war
- Maxfatal: Highest COW fatality code for MIDs over this issue (based on fatality codes in MID data set).
 - 0: No fatalities occurred
 - 1: 1-25 fatalities
 - 2: 26-100 fatalities
 - 3: 101-250 fatalities
 - 4: 251-500 fatalities
 - 5: 501-999 fatalities
 - 6: 1000+ fatalities
- Version: Current version number of this data set.

Dyad-Year Data ("ICOWdyadyr")

Description of File

This data file includes annual information on each dyadic claim. This includes measures of claim salience, information on peaceful and militarized settlement attempts to resolve the claim, and summaries of recent interactions over the claim. A separate data point is available for each year during which a given dyadic claim is ongoing.

Variable List

- Issue: A categorical variable to help distinguish between the different ICOW issue types.
 - 1: Territorial claim
 - 2: River claim
 - 3: Maritime claim
- Terriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are territorial issues
 - 1: Territorial issue
 - 0: No
- Riveriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are river issues
 - 1: River issue
 - 0: No
- Mariss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are maritime issues
 - 1: Maritime issue
 - 0: No
- Region: Geographic region in which this claim occurred. Note that this refers to the region in which the territory, river, or maritime zone is located; one or both claimant states may be located in a different region.
 - 1: Western Hemisphere
 - 2: Europe
 - 3: Africa
 - 4: Middle East
 - 5: Asia and Oceania
- Claimdy: A claim-dyad identifier (CCCCDD), where CCCC is the ICOW 4-digit "Claim" variable and DD is the ICOW 2-digit "Dyadnum" variable. Users may find this useful for sorting cases or for merging various ICOW data sets (such as merging salience or recent interactions variables from the dyad-year data into the attempted settlement data, or aggregating and merging data from the dyad-year or attempted settlement data to the dyadic claim data).
- Claim: An ICOW code number assigned to each claim to identify it (0-999 represent territorial claims, 1000-1999 represent river claims, 2000 and higher represent maritime claims).
- Dyadnum: An ICOW code number assigned to identify each dyad involved in each claim.

- Chal: COW country code of the actor in this dyad making the initial claim (the challenger).
- Tgt: COW country code of state in this dyad that was targeted by the challenger.

Note that one of the maritime claims codes the European Union as an actor, with actor code 2220 (the code for the EU on our Non-State Actors list, which is available on the ICOW web site). This is not a typo or a coding error; the EU actually negotiated as an interested participant during the "Turbot War" case that is more typically associated as a claim between Spain and Canada. Please contact Sara Mitchell with any questions about the coding of this maritime case.

- Dyad: A combination of the two claimants' COW country codes, intended to facilitate merging this with other dyadic data sets. This combination takes the form AAABBB, where AAA is the smaller of the two country codes and BBB is the larger (e.g., a U.S.-Russia dyad would be 2365, where AAA is 002 and BBB is 365).

Note that the "Dyad" variable is coded as missing for dyadic claims involving the EU. This was necessary because the EU is coded with 4 digits rather than 3, rendering an AAABBB format unusable. This is unlikely to pose a problem for most uses, though, as none of the dyadic data sets that would be merged with this one will have data for the EU anyway.

- Year: Year of this observation.

- ICOWsal: ICOW index of the salience or importance of the claimed territory, river, or maritime zone to the two participants. This index ranges from 0-12, with higher values indicating greater salience; see the description of this variable under ICOWclaimag, above, for a list of the specific indicators used for each issue type.

Note that salience is measured annually, and the value may change from one year to the next as portions of the claim are resolved (perhaps reducing the overall salience value), new areas are added to the previous claim (perhaps increasing salience), or new resources are believed to exist or discovered not to exist in the claimed territory (perhaps increasing or reducing salience).

- ICOWsalc: A categorical version of the ICOW salience index described above.

- 1: Low salience (ICOWsal values from 0-4)
- 2: Moderate salience (ICOWsal values from 4.5-7.5)
- 3: High salience (ICOWsal values from 8-12)

- Salchal: Claim salience for the challenger state in this claim. This value ranges from 0-6.

- Saltgt: Claim salience for the target state in this claim. This value ranges from 0-6.

Note that for maritime claims, there is little differentiation in salience levels between the challenger and target states; only one of the six current salience indicators (homeland vs. dependent territory) may differ between the two claimants. There is more room for differentiation for territorial and river claims, as three of the six indicators of territorial claim salience and all six indicators of river claim salience may differ between the claimants.

- Salold: Previous versions of the salience index. For this claim-level data set, this is measured as the highest salience value for any dyadic claim at any time while the case was ongoing. For

territorial claims this is the version used in Hensel's 2001 ISQ article (this version of the index considers whether or not the territory is mainland or offshore territory, while ICOWsal considers whether or not each claimant state has exercised sovereignty over the territory within the past 200 years). For river claims this is the version used in Hensel, Mitchell, and Sowers' 2006 PG article (this version of the index adds 1/2 point if the river serves a population of villages/towns and 1 point if it serves cities of 100,000 or more, while ICOWsal does not add any points if the river serves only villages or towns -- which is more consistent with the way the territorial claim salience is measured). For maritime claims there is no difference between this and ICOWsal.

- **Saltan**: ICOW index of tangible salience. This is most useful for territorial claims, and is discussed in the 2005 Hensel & Mitchell *GeoJournal* article. It ranges from 0-6 and is based on three of the six overall territorial salience indicators: economic resources, strategic location, and permanent population in the claimed territory (each of which contributes two points when present because either claimant could benefit from control of the territory in question). To keep the same 0-6 range for river and maritime claims as for territorial claims, only three indicators of tangible salience are used for the latter two issue types: use of the river for navigation, irrigation, or hydroelectric power generation in each state (river claims), and the presence of a strategic location, fishing resources, and oil resources in the maritime zone for (maritime claims).

- **Salint**: ICOW index of intangible salience. This is most useful for territorial claims, and is discussed in the 2005 Hensel & Mitchell *GeoJournal* article. It ranges from 0-6 and is based on three of the six overall territorial salience indicators: homeland rather than dependent territory, an identity basis for the claim, and historical sovereignty over the claimed territory (each of which contributes one point per each claimant for which it is relevant). For river and maritime claims, this is only based on the homeland/dependent territory distinction (because the other salience indicators all involve tangible salience), so it ranges from 0-2.

- **Salintc**: ICOW index of intangible salience for the challenger state in the claim, as described above. This is only calculated for territorial claims.

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- **Salintt**: ICOW index of intangible salience for the target state in the claim, as described above. This is only calculated for territorial claims.

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- **TChomechal**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): is the territory claimed as homeland rather than dependent territory by the challenger?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

1: Territory claimed as homeland

0: Territory claimed as dependency (colony, protectorate, etc.)

- **TChometgt**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): is the territory claimed as homeland rather than dependent territory by the challenger?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- 1: Territory claimed as homeland
- 0: Territory claimed as dependency (colony, protectorate, etc.)

- **TCpop**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- when there is a city of 100,000+ residents): Population of claimed territory

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- 1: No permanent population
- 2: Towns or villages
- 3: At least one city of 100,000 or more residents

- **TCresource**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- when present): Resource basis for claim?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- 1: The territory is known or believed to contain economically valuable resources
- 0: No resources are known/believed to be located in the territory

- **TCstratloc**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- when present): Strategic location for claimed territory?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- 1: The territory's location is (militarily or economically) strategic
- 0: The location is not considered strategic

- **TCidenchal**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Does the claim have an identity basis for the challenger state?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- 1: The claimed territory includes significant portions of ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other identity groups linked to the challenger state
- 0: No identity-based connection to this territory for this state

- **TCidentgt**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Does the claim have an identity basis for the target state?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- 1: The claimed territory includes significant portions of ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other identity groups linked to the target state
- 0: No identity-based connection to this territory for this state

- **TChistchal**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Has the challenger state exercised sovereignty over the claimed territory in the past 200 years?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- 1: Challenger has exercised sovereignty over territory within 200 years
- 0: No

- **TChistgt**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Has the target state exercised sovereignty over the claimed territory in the past 200 years?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

1: Target has exercised sovereignty over territory within 200 years

0: No

- **TCoffshore**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index since the 2005 Hensel/Mitchell *GeoJournal* article tweaked that index, although it was initially used in this index for Hensel's 2001 ISQ article, contributing two points -- one for each claimant state -- for mainland territories): is the territory located on the mainland or offshore?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

1: Claimed territory is offshore (not located on either state/entity's mainland)

0: Claimed territory is located on mainland

- **TCcontchal**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index): Contiguity of challenger state to the claimed territory (using the standard contiguity codes employed by the COW Contiguity data set, although **TCcontchal** and **TCconttgt** are coded by ICOW coders based on world atlases and are not taken from the COW contiguity data).

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

0: Not contiguous by any of the following criteria

1: State is contiguous to claimed territory by land/river

2: Contiguous by 1-12 miles of sea

3: Contiguous by 13-24 miles of sea

4: Contiguous by 25-150 miles of sea

5: Contiguous by 151-400 miles of sea

- **TCconttgt**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index): Contiguity of target state to the claimed territory.

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

0: Not contiguous by any of the following criteria

1: State is contiguous to claimed territory by land/river

2: Contiguous by 1-12 miles of sea

3: Contiguous by 13-24 miles of sea

4: Contiguous by 25-150 miles of sea

5: Contiguous by 151-400 miles of sea

- **TCncontig**: An indicator of territorial claim salience, based on **TCcontchal** and **TCconttgt** (not currently used in the ICOW salience index): Number of claimant states sharing a direct land/river border with the claimed territory

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

2: Both challenger and target are contiguous to the claimed territory by land/river

1: Either challenger or target is contiguous to the territory by land/river, but not both

0: Neither is contiguous to the claimed territory by land/river

- **TCentirecl**: An indicator of territorial claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience

index): Is challenger claiming entire territory of target state/entity?

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

1: Entire area of target state/entity is claimed

0: No

- TCarea: An indicator of territorial claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index): Area of claimed terr (sq mi); note that all area values below 1 square mile are rounded up to 1 square mile.

Note: We've made our best effort to measure the area of claimed territories as accurately as possible, but there is a surprising amount of variation across sources. Far too often we have found multiple sources that claim to be talking about the same territory, which show very similar maps of the territory in question, yet one's estimate of the area of the territory is more than twice the area estimated by the other. Use this variable with caution.

- TClnarea: Natural log of area (see above note about our confidence in this measure).

Missing values: River or maritime claim (this is only calculated for territorial claims)

- RCquantcl: An indicator of the content of the river claim (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a useful way to distinguish between different types of claims): Does the river claim involve a water quantity issue?

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

0: No water quantity issue involved

1: Future water quantity issue (the relevant use of the river has not yet begun)

2: Current water quantity issue (the claim involves an effort to stop a current use of the river)

- RCqualcl: An indicator of the content of the river claim (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a useful way to distinguish between different types of claims): Does the river claim involve a water quality issue?

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

0: No water quality issue involved

1: Future water quality issue (the relevant use of the river has not yet begun)

2: Current water quality issue (the claim involves an effort to stop a current use of the river)

- RCnavcl: An indicator of the content of the river claim (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a useful way to distinguish between different types of claims): Does the river claim involve a navigational issue?

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

0: No navigational issue involved

1: Future navigational issue (the relevant use of the river has not yet begun)

2: Current navigational issue (the claim involves an effort to stop a current use of the river)

- RCrivtype: An indicator of river claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a useful way to distinguish between different river shapes): River type/shape

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

0: Other

1: Cross-border river (through upstream state, then into downstream state)

2: Along-border river (river forms the border for its entire course between these states)

3: Mixed (cross- and along-border) river

3.1: Through upstream state's territory, then along border

3.2: Along border, then through downstream state's territory

3.3: Other (e.g., through upstream, along border, then through downstream)

4: Into border river (through upstream state, into a river that forms the border)

5: U-shaped (through upstream state, into downstream state, returns to upstream state)

- **RChomechal**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Does the river run through the challenger state's homeland territory?

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

1: River runs through state's homeland

0: River runs through state's dependency (colony, protectorate, etc.)

- **RCometgt**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Does the river run through the target state's homeland territory?

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

1: River runs through state's homeland

0: River runs through state's dependency (colony, protectorate, etc.)

- **RCnavc**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for navigation in the challenger state's territory?

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

2: Used for navigation internationally in this state (for interstate transport commerce)

1: Used for navigation locally (only for local transport or commerce)

0: Not used for navigation

- **RCnavt**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for navigation in the target state's territory?

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

2: Used for navigation internationally in this state (for interstate transport commerce)

1: Used for navigation locally (only for local transport or commerce)

0: Not used for navigation

- **RCpopc**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index for values of 2, indicating the presence of a city in areas served by the river, and zero points otherwise): Population along the river in the challenger state's territory

Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

2: At least one city of 100,000 or more residents along river

- 1: Towns or villages along river
- 0: No permanent population along river

- **RCpopt**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index for values of 2, indicating the presence of a city in areas served by the river, and zero points otherwise): Population along the river in the target state's territory

- Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

- 2: At least one city of 100,000 or more residents along river
 - 1: Towns or villages along river
 - 0: No permanent population along river

- **RCresourcc**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for resource extraction in the challenger state's territory?

- Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

- 2: Used for resource extraction for national consumption or international exports
 - 1: Used for resource extraction locally (only for local consumption)
 - 0: Not used for resource extraction

- **RCresourct**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for resource extraction in the target state's territory?

- Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

- 2: Used for resource extraction for national consumption or international exports
 - 1: Used for resource extraction locally (only for local consumption)
 - 0: Not used for resource extraction

- **RCpowerc**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for hydroelectric power generation in the challenger state's territory?

- Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

- 2: Used for hydropower generation for national needs or international exports
 - 1: Used for hydropower generation for local needs only
 - 0: Not used for hydropower generation

- **RCpowert**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for hydroelectric power generation in the target state's territory?

- Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

- 2: Used for hydropower generation for national needs or international exports
 - 1: Used for hydropower generation for local needs only
 - 0: Not used for hydropower generation

- **RCirrigc**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for irrigation in the challenger state's territory?
 Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)
 2: Used for irrigation for national needs or international exports
 1: Used for irrigation for local needs only
 0: Not used for irrigation

- **RCirrigt**: An indicator of river claim salience (this variable, divided by two, contributes up to one point to the ICOW salience index when present -- i.e., 1/2 point for local usage and 1 point for national/international): Is the river used for irrigation in the target state's territory?
 Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)
 2: Used for irrigation for national needs or international exports
 1: Used for irrigation for local needs only
 0: Not used for irrigation

- **RCdamsc**: An indicator of river claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index): Number of large dams on the river in challenger state's territory
 Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

- **RCdamst**: An indicator of river claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index): Number of large dams on the river in target state's territory
 Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)

- **RCterrclm**: An indicator of the connection between territorial and river claims (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a potentially useful supplement): Is this river claim related to an ICOW territorial claim?
 Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims)
 2: All of river flows through territory covered by an ICOW territorial claim
 1: Part of river flows through territory covered by an ICOW territorial claim
 0: River does not flow through claimed territory

- **RCterrnum**: An indicator of the connection between territorial and river claims (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a potentially useful supplement): ICOW code number for the related territorial claim (if any)
 Missing values: Territorial or maritime claim (this is only calculated for river claims),
 OR no territorial claim associated with this river claim

- **MChomechal**: An indicator of maritime claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Is the maritime zone associated with the challenger state's homeland?
 Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 1: Maritime zone is related to state's homeland
 0: Maritime zone is related to state's dependency (colony, protectorate, etc.)

- **MChometgt**: An indicator of maritime claim salience (this variable contributes one point to the ICOW salience index when present): Is the maritime zone associated with the challenger state's homeland?
 - Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 - 1: Maritime zone is related to state's homeland
 - 0: Maritime zone is related to state's dependency (colony, protectorate, etc.)

- **MCresource**: An indicator of maritime claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- when present): Is there a resource basis for the claim?
 - Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 - 1: Valuable resources are known/believed to be in the maritime zone
 - 0: No resources known/believed to be present

- **MCstratloc**: An indicator of maritime claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- when present): Does the maritime zone have a strategic location?
 - Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 - 1: The maritime zone is considered to have a strategic location
 - 0: No strategic location

- **MCfishing**: An indicator of maritime claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- for a value of either 1 or 2): Are there fishing resources in the maritime zone?
 - Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 - 2: Used for fishing for national consumption or international exports
 - 1: Used for fishing locally (only for local consumption)
 - 0: Not used for fishing

- **MCmigrate**: An indicator of maritime claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- when present): Are there migratory fish stocks in the maritime zone?
 - Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 - 1: Maritime zone contains migratory fish stocks that swim beyond the zone
 - 0: No migratory fish stocks

- **MCoil**: An indicator of maritime claim salience (this variable contributes two points to the ICOW salience index -- one for each claimant -- for any value of 1, 2, or 3): Is there oil in the maritime zone?
 - Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 - 3: Oil extracted from this maritime zone for national consumption or export
 - 2: Oil extracted from this maritime zone for local consumption only
 - 1: Oil is believed to be located in/under the maritime zone, but is not currently being extracted
 - 0: Oil not known/believed to be located in/under the maritime zone

- **MCoffshore:** An indicator of maritime claim salience (not currently used in the ICOW salience index): Is the maritime zone located adjacent to the mainland, or only to islands?
 Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 1: The maritime zone is located adjacent to islands, but not either state's mainland
 0: The maritime zone is located adjacent to one or both states' mainland territory

- **MCTerrclm:** An indicator of the connection between territorial and maritime claims (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a potentially useful supplement): Is this maritime claim related to an ICOW territorial claim?
 Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims)
 1: This maritime claim is related to an ongoing ICOW territorial claim
 0: No relation to territorial claims

- **MCTernnum:** An indicator of the connection between territorial and maritime claims (not currently used in the ICOW salience index, but this offers a potentially useful supplement): ICOW code number for the related territorial claim (if any).
 Missing values: Territorial or river claim (this is only calculated for maritime claims),
 OR no territorial claim associated with this maritime claim

- **Nbilat:** Number of rounds of bilateral negotiations between these two actors over this claim that began this year.

- **Attbilat:** Did at least one round of bilateral negotiations between these two actors over this claim begin this year?
 1: Yes
 0: No

- **N3non:** Number of non-binding third party settlement attempts (good offices, inquiry or conciliation, mediation, multilateral negotiations, or peace conferences) that began this year.

- **Att3non:** Did at least one non-binding third party settlement attempt involving this claim begin this year?
 1: Yes
 0: No

- **N3bind:** Number of binding third party settlement attempts (arbitration or adjudication) that began this year.

- **Att3bind:** Did at least one binding third party settlement attempt involving this claim begin this year?
 1: Yes
 0: No

- **Att3rd:** Did at least one third party settlement attempt (binding or non-binding) involving this claim begin this year?
 1: Yes

0: No

- Nmidiss: Number of militarized disputes over this specific issue that began this year. (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)

- Midissy: Did at least one militarized dispute over this specific issue begin this year? (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)

1: Yes

0: No

- Maxhost: Highest COW level of hostility in militarized disputes over this specific issue that began this year (if any).

0: No MIDs occurred

2: Threat to use force

3: Display of force

4: Use of force

5: Full-scale war

- Maxfatal: Highest fatality level in militarized disputes over this specific issue that began this year (if any).

0: No fatalities occurred

1: 1-25 fatalities

2: 26-100 fatalities

3: 101-250 fatalities

4: 251-500 fatalities

5: 501-999 fatalities

6: 1000+ fatalities

- Nfatal: Number of fatal militarized disputes over this specific issue that began this year. (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)

- Midfatyr: Did at least one fatal militarized dispute over this specific issue begin this year? (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)

1: Yes

0: No

- Nwar: Number of full-scale COW interstate wars over claim that began this year. (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)

- Waryr: Did at least one full-scale COW interstate war over this specific issue begin this year? (Note that this only includes wars that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; wars between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)

1: Yes
0: No

- **Attemptsp**: Total number of peaceful (bilateral and/or third party) settlement attempts that began this year.
- **Attemptst**: Total number of peaceful and militarized settlement attempts that began this year.
- **Attanyp**: At least one peaceful (bilateral and/or third party) attempt this year?
1: Yes (at least one attempt)
0: No (no attempts)
- **Attanyt**: At least one peaceful and/or militarized attempt this year?
1: Yes (at least one attempt)
0: No (no attempts)
- **Attmult**: More than one peaceful and/or militarized attempt this year?
1: Yes (multiple attempts)
0: No (no attempts)
- **Attnone**: No peaceful and/or militarized attempts this year?
1: Yes (no attempts)
0: No (at least one attempt)
- **Recmid5**: Total number of militarized disputes between these two actors over this claim in the past five years before this observation.
- **Recmid10**: Total number of militarized disputes between these two actors over this claim in the past ten years before this observation.
- **Recmid15**: Total number of militarized disputes between these two actors over this claim in the past fifteen years before this observation.
- **Recmidwt** Number of recent militarized disputes between these two actors over this claim, weighted by recency.
This weighting assigns an event in the year before the current observation a value of 1.0, with the weight of earlier events decreasing by 10% per year (thus an event ten years before the current observation has a value of 0.1 and earlier events do not contribute to this score).
- **Recfat5**: Total number of fatal militarized disputes between these two actors over this claim in the past five years before this observation.
- **Recfat10**: Total number of fatal militarized disputes between these two actors over this claim in the past ten years before this observation.
- **Recfat15**: Total number of fatal MID's militarized disputes between these two actors over this

claim in the past fifteen years before this observation.

- Recfatwt Number of recent fatal militarized disputes between these two actors over this claim, weighted by recency.

This weighting assigns an event in the year before the current observation a value of 1.0, with the weight of earlier events decreasing by 10% per year (thus an event ten years before the current observation has a value of 0.1 and earlier events do not contribute to this score).

- Recwar5: Total number of full-scale COW interstate wars between these two actors over this claim in the past five years before this observation.

- Recwar10: Total number of full-scale COW interstate wars between these two actors over this claim in the past ten years before this observation.

- Recwar15: Total number of full-scale COW interstate wars between these two actors over this claim in the past fifteen years before this observation.

- Recwarwt Number of recent full-scale COW interstate wars between these two actors over this claim, weighted by recency.

This weighting assigns an event in the year before the current observation a value of 1.0, with the weight of earlier events decreasing by 10% per year (thus an event ten years before the current observation has a value of 0.1 and earlier events do not contribute to this score).

- Recno5: Total number of unsuccessful peaceful settlement attempts over this claim in the past five years before this observation.

- Recno10: Total number of unsuccessful peaceful settlement attempts over this claim in the past ten years before this observation.

- Recno15: Total number of unsuccessful peaceful settlement attempts over this claim in the past fifteen years before this observation.

"Peaceful settlement attempts" include all rounds of bilateral negotiations, non-binding third party activities (good offices, inquiry, conciliation, mediation, or multilateral negotiations), and binding third party activities (arbitration or adjudication). Note that this includes all types of peaceful settlement attempts (procedural, functional, and substantive attempts to settle part or all of the issue). "Unsuccessful" attempts are those that did not produce an agreement at their end, or that did produce an agreement that at least one of the participants failed to ratify or carry out.

- Recnowt Number of recent failed peaceful attempts over this claim, weighted by recency.

This weighting assigns an event in the year before the current observation a value of 1.0, with the weight of earlier events decreasing by 10% per year (thus an event ten years before the current observation has a value of 0.1 and earlier events do not contribute to this score).

- Recyes5: Total number of successful peaceful settlement attempts (bilateral, non-binding, or binding) over this claim in the past five years before this observation. "Successful" attempts are those that produced an agreement that was ratified (if relevant) and carried out by all participants.

- Recyes10: Total number of successful peaceful attempts over this claim in the past ten years before this observation.

- Recyes15: Total number of successful peaceful settlement attempts over this claim in the past fifteen years before this observation.

"Peaceful settlement attempts" include all rounds of bilateral negotiations, non-binding third party activities (good offices, inquiry, conciliation, mediation, or multilateral negotiations), and binding third party activities (arbitration or adjudication). Note that this includes all types of peaceful settlement attempts (procedural, functional, and substantive attempts to settle part or all of the issue). "Successful" attempts are those that produced an agreement at their end, which neither of the participants failed to ratify or carry out.

- Recyeswt: Number of recent successful peaceful settlement attempts over this claim, weighted by recency.

This weighting assigns an event in the year before the current observation a value of 1.0, with the weight of earlier events decreasing by 10% per year (thus an event ten years before the current observation has a value of 0.1 and earlier events do not contribute to this score).

- Pacsett: Total number of pacific settlement commitments (from either global or regional treaties) shared by the claimants this year, based on the Multilateral Treaties of Pacific Settlement (MTOPS) data set, available at <<http://www.icow.org>>.

- Tergen: Total number of "general" territorial integrity commitments (requiring signatories to respect all borders of member states), based on MTOPS data.

- Terviol: Total number of "violent" territorial integrity commitments (requiring signatories to avoid violent change of borders), based on MTOPS data.

- Tertot: Total number of territorial integrity commitments (general+violent), based on MTOPS data.

- Version: Current version number of this data set.

Attempted Settlement Data File ("ICOWsettle")

Description of File

This data file includes information about attempts to manage or settle each ICOW claim through either peaceful or militarized techniques. This includes details of the settlement attempt (such as the date, participants, and scope of the attempt), the outcome of the attempt (whether or not an agreement was reached, the scope of the agreement if any, and whether or not the agreement was ratified and carried out by the claimants), and summaries of recent interactions over the claim.

Note: This attempted settlement data set includes three different types of peaceful settlement attempts: functional attempts (which attempt to address the use of the claimed territory but don't address sovereignty questions), procedural attempts (which address future efforts to settle the claim -- e.g. negotiating over terms of submitting the case to a certain third party -- but don't address sovereignty directly), and substantive attempts (which address sovereignty over part or all of the claimed territory). Scholars interested in studying the effectiveness of various types of settlement attempts for resolving claims should exclude or add control variables for the procedural and functional attempts (based on the categorical variables Extentsa or Extents2 or the dummy variables Attproc, Attfunc, and Attiss), because these attempts (by definition) are unable to resolve the issue.

Variable List

- Issue: A categorical variable to help distinguish between the different ICOW issue types.
 - 1: Territorial claim
 - 2: River claim
 - 3: Maritime claim

- Terriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are territorial issues
 - 1: Territorial issue
 - 0: No

- Riveriss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are river issues
 - 1: River issue
 - 0: No

- Mariss: A dummy variable indicating which observations are maritime issues
 - 1: Maritime issue
 - 0: No

- Region: Geographic region in which this claim occurred. Note that this refers to the region in which the territory, river, or maritime zone is located; one or both claimant states may be located in a different region.
 - 1: Western Hemisphere
 - 2: Europe
 - 3: Africa
 - 4: Middle East
 - 5: Asia and Oceania

- **Claimdy:** A claim-dyad identifier (CCCCDD), where CCCC is the ICOW 4-digit "Claim" variable and DD is the ICOW 2-digit "Dyadnum" variable. Users may find this useful for sorting cases or for merging various ICOW data sets (such as merging salience or recent interactions variables from the dyad-year data into the attempted settlement data, or aggregating and merging data from the dyad-year or attempted settlement data to the dyadic claim data).

- **Claim:** An ICOW code number assigned to each claim to identify it (0-999 represent territorial claims, 1000-1999 represent river claims, 2000 and higher represent maritime claims).

- **Dyadnum:** An ICOW code number assigned to identify each dyad involved in each claim.

- **Chal:** COW country code of the actor in this dyad making the initial claim (the challenger).

- **Tgt:** COW country code of state in this dyad that was targeted by the challenger.

Note that one of the maritime claims codes the European Union as an actor, with actor code 2220 (the code for the EU on our Non-State Actors list, which is available on the ICOW web site). This is not a typo or a coding error; the EU actually negotiated as an interested participant during the "Turbot War" case that is more typically associated as a claim between Spain and Canada. Please contact Sara Mitchell with any questions about the coding of this maritime case.

- **Dyad:** A combination of the two claimants' COW country codes, intended to facilitate merging this with other dyadic data sets. This combination takes the form AAABBB, where AAA is the smaller of the two country codes and BBB is the larger (e.g., a U.S.-Russia dyad would be 2365, where AAA is 002 and BBB is 365).

Note that the "Dyad" variable is coded as missing for dyadic claims involving the EU. This was necessary because the EU is coded with 4 digits rather than 3, rendering an AAABBB format unusable. This is unlikely to pose a problem for most uses, though, as none of the dyadic data sets that would be merged with this one will have data for the EU anyway.

- **Settnump:** Chronological number of settlement attempt within this dyadic claim -- peaceful attempts only (excluding militarized disputes over the issue).

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)

- **Settnumt:** Chronological number of settlement attempt within this dyadic claim -- including both peaceful attempts and militarized disputes over the issue.

- **Begsett:** Beginning year and month of settlement attempt (YYYYMM)

- **Endsett:** Ending year and month of settlement attempt (YYYYMM)

Missing values: settlement attempt ongoing past the current end of this data set

- **Year:** Year when settlement attempt began

- **Yearend:** Year when settlement attempt ended

Missing values: settlement attempt ongoing past the current end of this data set

- Durmid: Did this settlement attempt begin during an ongoing MID over this issue? (This is intended for studying such questions as whether events begun during ongoing armed conflict are more/less likely to be successful than those begun in a more peaceful context.)

- 1: Yes

- 0: No

- Durfat: Did this settlement attempt begin during an ongoing fatal MID over this issue? (This is intended for studying such questions as whether events begun during ongoing armed conflict are more/less likely to be successful than those begun in a more peaceful context.)

- 1: Yes

- 0: No

- Durwar: Did this settlement attempt begin during an ongoing full-scale COW interstate war over this issue? (This is intended for studying such questions as whether events begun during ongoing armed conflict are more/less likely to be successful than those begun in a more peaceful context.)

- 1: Yes

- 0: No

- Typesett: Type of peaceful settlement attempt -- full range of values

- Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)

- 1: Bilateral Negotiations

- 2: Good Offices

- 3: Inquiry or Conciliation

- 4: Mediation

- 5: Arbitration

- 6: Adjudication

- 7: Other Third-Party Settlement Attempt

- 8: Multilateral Negotiations

- 9: Peace Conference

- Typeset3: Type of peaceful settlement attempt -- 3 categories

- Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)

- 1: Bilateral Negotiations

- 2: Non-binding Third Party Attempt

- 3: Binding Third Party Attempt

- Typesetm: Type of settlement attempt -- 4 categories

- 1: Bilateral Negotiations

- 2: Non-binding Third Party Attempt

- 3: Binding Third Party Attempt

- 4: Militarized Dispute

- Bilat: Bilateral settlement attempt dummy

- 1: This is a bilateral settlement attempt

- 0: This is some other form of settlement attempt (non-binding, binding, or MID)

- Nonbind3: Non-binding third party settlement attempt dummy
 - 1: This is a non-binding third party settlement attempt
 - 0: This is some other form of settlement attempt (bilateral, binding, or MID)

- Binding3: Binding third party settlement attempt dummy
 - 1: This is a binding third party settlement attempt
 - 0: This is some other form of settlement attempt (bilateral, non-binding, or MID)

- Midiss: Is this attempt a militarized dispute over the dyadic claim in this case? (Note that this only includes MIDs that directly involved attempts to settle this specific issue; MIDs between the claimants over other issues are not counted here.)
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No

- Typeact: Type of third party actor, if any
 - Missing values: Not a third party attempt (bilateral negotiations or militarized dispute)
 - 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

- Actor1: 1st third party actor in attempt, if any (3-digit COW country codes for state actors, and 4-digit ICOW actor codes for non-state third parties; the list is available on <<http://www.icow.org>>.)
 - Missing values: No third party in attempt (bilateral negotiations or militarized dispute)

- Actor2: 2nd third party actor in attempt, if any (3-digit COW country codes for state actors, and 4-digit ICOW actor codes for non-state third parties; the list is available on <<http://www.icow.org>>.)

Missing values: No 2nd third party (bilateral, militarized, or less than two third parties)

- Actor3: 3rd third party actor in attempt, if any (3-digit COW country codes for state actors, and 4-digit ICOW actor codes for non-state third parties; the list is available on <<http://www.icow.org>>.)

Missing values: No 3rd third party (bilateral, militarized, or less than three third parties)

- Actor4: 4th third party actor in attempt, if any (3-digit COW country codes for state actors, and 4-digit ICOW actor codes for non-state third parties; the list is available on <<http://www.icow.org>>.)

Missing values: No 4th third party (bilateral, militarized, or less than four third parties)

- Actor5: 5th third party actor in attempt, if any (3-digit COW country codes for state actors, and 4-digit ICOW actor codes for non-state third parties; the list is available on <<http://www.icow.org>>.)

Missing values: No 5th third party (bilateral, militarized, or less than five third parties)

- Actor6: 6th third party actor in attempt, if any (3-digit COW country codes for state actors, and 4-digit ICOW actor codes for non-state third parties; the list is available on <<http://www.icow.org>>.)

Missing values: No 6th third party (bilateral, militarized, or less than six third parties)

- Typeio3: Role of institutional actors in peaceful settlement attempt - 3 categories

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)

- 1: Bilateral negotiations
- 2: At least one international organization involved as third party
- 3: Only non-international organization(s) involved

- Typeio5: Role of institutional actors in peaceful settlement attempt - 5 categories

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)

- 1: Bilateral negotiations
- 2: At least one international organization involved / non-binding activity
- 3: Only non-international organization(s) involved / non-binding activity
- 4: At least one international organization involved / binding activity
- 5: Only non-international organization(s) involved / binding activity

- IO: International organization involved as third party?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)

- 1: Yes (at least one IO involved)
- 0: No (no IOs involved)

- IOreg: Regional IO involved as third party?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)

- 1: Yes (at least one regional IO involved)
 - 0: No (no regional IOs involved)
- IOglob: Global IO involved as third party?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: Yes (at least one global IO involved)
 - 0: No (no global IOs involved)
- IOacttype: Type of IO involvement in settlement attempt (if any)
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 0: None
 - 1: Non-binding activity
 - 2: Binding activity
- IObind: At least one IO involved in binding capacity?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No
- IOnon: At least one IO involved in non-binding capacity?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No
- Other3rd: Only non-IO third party settlement activity?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: Yes (third party activity by non-IO actors only)
 - 0: No (other types of activities and/or actors)
- Oth3bind: Binding settlement attempt by only non-IO third parties?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: Yes (binding activity by non-IO third parties)
 - 0: No (other types of activities and/or actors)
- Oth3non: Non-binding settlement attempt by only non-IO third parties?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: Yes (non-binding activity by non-IO third parties)
 - 0: No (other types of activities and/or actors)
- Extentsa: Scope of settlement attempt
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 0: Functional attempt
 - 1: Procedural attempt
 - 2: Substantive attempt - covering part of claim
 - 3: Substantive attempt - covering all of claim

- Extentsa3: Scope of settlement attempt - 3 categories (combining substantive attempts)
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 0: Functional attempt
 - 1: Procedural attempt
 - 2: Substantive attempt - covering part or all of claim

- Attfunc: Functional settlement attempt dummy
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: This is a functional settlement attempt
 - 0: This is a procedural or substantive settlement attempt

- Attproc: Procedural settlement attempt dummy
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: This is a procedural settlement attempt
 - 0: This is a functional or substantive settlement attempt

- Attiss: Substantive (issue) settlement attempt dummy
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute)
 - 1: This is a substantive settlement attempt (covering part or all of the claim)
 - 0: This is a procedural or functional settlement attempt

- Agree: Did settlement attempt produce an agreement/treaty/award? (Note that this agreement does not necessarily cover the original focus of the settlement attempt -- a substantive attempt may produce a procedural agreement to meet again for further talks in six months' time, for example. See also "Agreeall" below.)
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No

- Agreeall: Did agreement cover entire scope of settlement attempt? (i.e., did a substantive attempt produce a substantive agreement, a procedural attempt produce a procedural agreement, or a functional attempt produce a functional agreement?)
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No (note that an agreement over some lesser scope could have been reached, but the attempt did not produce an agreement over its main focus)

- Extentag: Scope of agreement, if any
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
 - 0: Functional agreement
 - 1: Procedural agreement
 - 2: Substantive agreement - covering part of claim
 - 3: Substantive agreement - covering all of claim

- Extentag3 Scope of agreement (combining substantive agreements)
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
 - 0: Functional agreement
 - 1: Procedural agreement
 - 2: Substantive agreement - covering part or all of claim

- Agreefun: Functional agreement dummy
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
 - 1: Functional agreement
 - 0: Procedural or substantive agreement

- Agreepro Procedural agreement dummy
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
 - 1: Procedural agreement
 - 0: Functional or substantive agreement

- Agreeiss Substantive (issue) agreement dummy
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
 - 1: Substantive agreement - covering part or all of claim
 - 0: Functional or procedural agreement

- Terrchag: Did agreement involve a territorial change?
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set, OR river or maritime claim (this is only coded for territorial claims)
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No

- Allocag: Did agreement change river allocation?
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set, OR territorial or maritime claim (this is only coded for river claims)
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No

- Marchag: Did agreement change delimitation or ownership of the maritime zone?
 - Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set, OR territorial or river claim (this is only coded for maritime claims)
 - 1: Yes
 - 0: No

- Sqchgag: Does agreement change the issue-related status quo? (This means different things for the different issue types: for territorial claims it refers to a change of territorial sovereignty, for river claims it refers to a change in the allocation of water from the river, and for maritime claims it refers to a change in the status of the maritime zone.)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes

0: No

- Concesag: Concessions in agreement

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

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 concessions by 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)

- Conceven: Did agreement involve roughly even concessions?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes

0: No

- Conceslo: Did agreement involve minor concessions?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes

0: No

- Conceshi: Did agreement involve major concessions?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes

0: No

- Concanyc: Did agreement involve uneven (minor or major) concessions?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
1: Yes
0: No
- Concchal: Did agreement involve greater concessions by the challenger state?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
1: Yes (major or minor concessions by challenger state)
0: No (even concessions or major/minor concessions by target)
- Conctgt: Did agreement involve greater concessions by the target state?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set
1: Yes (major or minor concessions by target state)
0: No (even concessions or major/minor concessions by challenger)
- Conctr3: Did agreement involve greater concessions by a stronger state (with at least a 3:1
advantage in relative capabilities, based on CINC)?³
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set,
OR missing COW capability data
1: Yes (minor or major concessions by a claimant that has at least a 3:1 advantage in
CINC compared to the other claimant)
0: No (even concessions, or minor/major concessions by a state that is weaker than its
opponent or has less than a 3:1 advantage in CINC)
- Conctr1: Did agreement involve greater concessions by a stronger state (with any advantage
in relative capabilities, based on CINC)?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set,
OR missing COW capability data
1: Yes (minor or major concessions by a state that has a larger CINC score than its
opponent)
0: No (even concessions, or minor/major concessions by a state with a smaller CINC
score than its opponent)
- Concw3: Did agreement involve greater concessions by a weaker state (with at least a 3:1
disadvantage in relative capabilities, based on CINC)?
Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set,

³ Conctr3, Concw3, Conctr1, and Concw1 are all based on the Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC) score from the COW project's National Material Capabilities data set, which is available online at <<http://www.correlatesofwar.org>>. For more information on this data set see Singer, J. David. (1987), "Reconstructing the Correlates of War Dataset on Material Capabilities of States, 1816-1985." *International Interactions* 14: 115-32.

OR missing COW capability data

- 1: Yes (minor or major concessions by a claimant state that has at least a 3:1 disadvantage in CINC compared to the other claimant)
- 0: No (even concessions, or minor/major concessions by a state that is stronger than its opponent or has less than a 3:1 disadvantage)

- Concwk1: Did agreement involve greater concessions by a weaker state (with any disadvantage in relative capabilities, based on CINC)?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set, OR missing COW capability data

- 1: Yes (minor or major concessions by a state that has a smaller CINC score than its opponent)
- 0: No (even concessions, or minor/major concessions by a state with a larger CINC score than its opponent)

- Ratfailc: Did challenger fail to ratify agreement?

- Ratfailt: Did target fail to ratify agreement?

Not every political system requires ratification of all types of international agreements, and details of ratification requirements -- particularly in the early-mid 19th century -- can be very difficult to obtain. These two variables give the best information that we feel confident in providing, which is evidence of ratification *failure* rather than positive ratification. A value of 1 means that we know that the agreement needed to be ratified but was not; a value of 0 could mean either that the agreement was ratified or that no ratification was needed. Also, note that if one state fails to ratify an agreement, the other state may not even submit the agreement to its own ratification process if needed -- so the combined measure Ratfail, described below, is generally preferable to these two individual state-level measures.

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

- 1: Yes (agreement was not ratified)
- 0: No (agreement was ratified, OR no ratification was needed)

- Ratfail: Did at least one claimant fail to ratify agreement? (See comments above for Ratfailc and Ratfailt)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

- 1: Yes (at least one claimant failed to ratify the agreement)
- 0: No (agreement was ratified, OR no ratification was needed, by each claimant)

- Compchal: Did challenger comply with agreement?

- Comptgt: Did target comply with agreement?

- Comply2: Did both the challenger and target comply with agreement?

Note: the state-level compliance variables "Compchal" and "Comptgt" are not as useful as one might hope; it is generally preferable to use the combined variable "Comply2." In many cases, once one state fails to comply with a treaty, the other does not even bother to attempt to comply. As a result, one state's failure to comply may reflect the other claimant's actions rather

than its own domestic or other characteristics, and compliance is better measured and studied dyadically.

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes

0: No

- Clmend: Did agreement end contention over claim? (with no agreement coded as missing)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

2: Agreement ended contention over all of claim

1: Agreement ended contention over most, but not all, of claim

0: Agreement did not end contention over most or all of claim

- Clmendatt: Did settlement attempt end contention over claim? (with no agreement coded as zero rather than missing)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

2: Agreement ended contention over all of claim

1: Agreement ended contention over most, but not all, of claim

0: Agreement did not end contention over most or all of claim, OR no agreement

- Clmendma: Did agreement end most OR all of claim?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes (agreement ended contention over most or all of claim)

0: No

- Clmendall: Did agreement end entire claim?

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes (agreement ended contention over entire claim)

0: No (agreement ended contention over part or none of claim)

- Clmend2: Does claim end within two years of the end of this settlement attempt? (Even if this attempt doesn't end the claim directly, it may contribute to its ending.)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set,
OR settlement attempt ends less than two years before end of current data set

1: Yes

0: No

- Clmend5: Does claim end within five years of the end of this settlement attempt? (Even if this attempt doesn't end the claim directly, it may contribute to its ending.)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes
0: No

- Clmend10: Does claim end within ten years of the end of this settlement attempt? (Even if this attempt doesn't end the claim directly, it may contribute to its ending.)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

1: Yes
0: No

- Effect4: Settlement attempt effectiveness - 4 categories

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

4: Agreement ended claim
3: Both complied with agreement, but claim didn't end
2: Both ratified agreement, but at least one didn't comply
1: Agreement reached, but at least one didn't ratify
0: Attempt did not produce an agreement

- Effect3: Settlement attempt effectiveness - 3 categories

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set

3: Agreement ended claim
2: Both complied with agreement, but claim didn't end
1: Agreement reached, but at least one didn't ratify or comply
0: Attempt did not produce an agreement

- Nomid5: Does dyad avoid new MIDs over this issue for at least five years after this attempt ends? (Of course, ending the claim qualifies, since there can't be any more MIDs over the claim when there is no claim, but this also includes situations where the claim goes on but the claimants avoid armed conflict.)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set,
OR less than 5 years have passed before current end of data set

1: Yes
0: No

- Nomid10: Does dyad avoid new MIDs over this issue for at least ten years after this attempt ends? (Of course, ending the claim qualifies, since there can't be any more MIDs over the claim when there is no claim, but this also includes situations where the claim goes on but the claimants avoid armed conflict.)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set,
OR less than 10 years have passed before current end of data set

1: Yes
0: No

- Nomid15: Does dyad avoid new MIDs over this issue for at least fifteen years after this attempt ends? (Of course, ending the claim qualifies, since there can't be any more MIDs over the claim when there is no claim, but this also includes situations where the claim goes on but the claimants avoid armed conflict.)

Missing values: not a peaceful settlement attempt (militarized dispute), OR
no agreement, OR settlement attempt has not ended by end of current data set,
OR less than 15 years have passed before current end of data set

1: Yes
0: No

- MID: COW code number for this MID (taken directly from the MID data set)
Missing: Not a militarized dispute (peaceful settlement attempts)

- MIDhost: COW level of hostility code for this MID (from the MID data set; for multilateral MIDs, this is the highest level of hostility reached by either of these actors, which may be lower than the highest level of hostility in the entire dispute if some other actor undertook a more hostile act; note that where only one of the two claimants is coded with a 5 for war, that is changed to a 4 for use of force, because the other claimant's actions in the dispute did not reach a level that could be coded as war participation)

Missing values: Not a militarized dispute (peaceful settlement attempts)

0: No MIDs occurred
2: Threat to use force
3: Display of force
4: Use of force
5: Full-scale war

- MIDwar: Does this MID escalate to COW full-scale interstate war?
Missing values: Not a militarized dispute (peaceful settlement attempts)
1: Yes
0: No

- MIDfat: Number of fatalities in MID, if any (using COW's MID fatality categories)
Missing values: Not a militarized dispute (peaceful settlement attempts), OR fatality data missing in original MID data

0: No fatalities occurred
1: 1-25 fatalities
2: 26-100 fatalities
3: 101-250 fatalities
4: 251-500 fatalities
5: 501-999 fatalities
6: 1000+ fatalities

- MIDfatany: At least 1 fatality in this MID?
Missing values: Not a militarized dispute (peaceful settlement attempts), OR fatality data missing in original MID data

1: Yes

0: No

- MIDendiss: Does this MID end this claim?

Missing values: Not a militarized dispute (peaceful settlement attempts)

2: Yes (the MID directly ended explicit contention over the dyadic claim in question)

1: Contributed (the MID led to the beginning of a peaceful settlement attempt that ended the dyadic claim in question, or to the conclusion or ratification of an agreement in such a settlement attempt)

0: No (the claim continued despite the occurrence of this militarized dispute)

- Version: Current version number of this data set.