

**Codebook for Maritime Claims Data
Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project**
Last updated 14 October 2002

Sara McLaughlin Mitchell
Department of Political Science
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-2230
Phone: 850-644-7324
Fax: 850-644-1367

sara@icow.org
<http://sara.icow.org>

Much of the material in this codebook was taken from the Territorial Claims Data Codebook, written by Paul R. Hensel. 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

Introductory Notes	
The ICOW General Codebook	1
Maritime Claims	1
Maritime Claim Salience	1
Maritime Claim Settlement Attempts	2
Sources and Coding Procedures	2
Dyadic Claim-Level Data File (MCCLAIM)	3
Dyad-Year-Level Data File (MCDYADYR)	7
Attempted Settlement Data File (MCSETTLE)	11
Appendix: Sample Codesheets	17

Introductory Notes

The General ICOW Codebook

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

Maritime Claims

A maritime claim involves explicit contention between two or more states over the access to or usage of a maritime area. Official representatives of the government of at least one state must lay explicit claim to a maritime area being administered or claimed by at least one other state. "Official representatives" include such individuals as a country's head of state, foreign minister, and other legitimate political or military officials speaking on behalf of the state's government. Claims by individuals or organizations without the authority to speak on behalf of a state government are excluded, unless official state representatives support their claim through explicit statements. An "explicit claim" must be a public statement by such an official representative, and must be phrased in unambiguous terms. That is, the official state representative making the claim must make clear that his or her government lays claim to the maritime area that is presently administered or claimed by one or more other specific states; vague or ambiguous statements are excluded.

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

Maritime Claim Saliency

A number of variables are used to measure the saliency of each individual maritime claim. Resources contained in the claimed maritime areas are obviously an important

determinant of the intrinsic importance of a claim. We code information on fishing, offshore oil, and minerals in the maritime area under contention. We code the relational importance of the contents of the claimed area for each nation's economy, indicating whether such resources are consumed primarily for domestic use or whether they are important commodities for export. We also code information on the existence of migratory fish stocks in the claimed areas and on the importance of the area for navigation (e.g., whether the area is considered to be a naval chokepoint).

Maritime Claim Settlement Attempts

To be included in the data set, settlement attempts during ongoing maritime claims must attempt to resolve part or all of the claim itself, or must at least attempt to manage the subject of the claim. As will be seen in the description of the attempted settlement data presented later in this codebook, this allows for four distinct types of settlement attempts: (1) functional, which involves attempts to manage the maritime area in question but not to settle the ownership of the area; (2) procedural, which involves discussion of future negotiations or procedures to settle the claim -- such as negotiations on submitting the claim to the World Court or to some other actor or body -- but not an attempt to settle the claim directly in the present talks; (3) attempts to settle the ownership/usage of part but not all of the claimed maritime area; and (4) attempts to settle the ownership of the entire claimed maritime area, which if successful would presumably be able to end the entire claim.

Each settlement attempt that meets any of these four descriptions is subjected to additional data collection. Variables to be collected cover the dates on which the attempt began and ended, the type of settlement attempt, and the effectiveness of the attempt. It must be noted that any attempt meeting one of these descriptions should be included in the data set, regardless of whether or not it led to agreement on a final treaty or agreement, or whether or not any resulting agreement is actually ratified or executed by the signatories.

Sources and Coding Procedures

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

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

A. CLAIM: Number of Claim

Number: An ICOW code number assigned to each claim to identify it (no substantive interpretation)

Notes

- Leave this space on the codesheet blank until all candidate cases have been collected for the entire geographic region that you have been assigned.
- Where possible, ICOW claim numbers should correspond to the COW nation-state numbers in each geographic region or sub-region (e.g., all South American ICOW claims should fall between numbers 100-199, just like South American COW nation-states).
- Within each geographic region or sub-region, ICOW claim numbers should follow the general order of the COW interstate system codes for the primary dyad in each claim (see "DYAD," below). That is, a Colombia-Peru claim (100-135) should be listed before a Venezuela-Brazil claim (101-140). For claims involving a colonial power on at least one side, try to assign a claim number based on the COW code for the dependency rather than for the colonizer (so the Guyana-Suriname claim should be assigned a number based on states #110 Guyana and #115 Suriname rather than #200 UK and #210 Netherlands); see the project director for COW codes for entities that are not currently members of the COW interstate system.
- When assigning claim numbers, be sure to leave at least one unused number between each two claims, to allow for the addition of future claims if needed.

B. NAME: Name of Claim

Text: Name of the maritime area or claim under dispute

Notes

- If the claimed area is not commonly referred to by a single name, choose the most important geographic feature located in the claimed area (such as an island) -- i.e., something that will make it obvious which maritime zone is being claimed.

C. DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim

Number: An ICOW code number assigned to identify each dyad involved in each claim

Notes

- Dyadic claims all have a Dyadnum value of "1"
- Multilateral claims are divided into dyads in approximate chronological order, as well as can be determined. For overlapping periods in which multiple dyadic claims are active, order dyads by chronological involvement in the claim.

D. CHAL - TGT: Challenger and target state in this dyadic claim

Number: COW country code of the actor in this dyad making the initial claim (the challenger) and COW country code of state in this dyad targeted by the challenger.

Notes

- When one state owns or administers the entire maritime area in question, the other state is coded as the claim challenger, because it seeks to obtain an area that another state currently possesses.
- Where both states lay claim to a maritime zone, "side A" refers to the state that is most active in pressing the claim, or if this can not be determined, the state that possesses or administers less of the maritime area in question at the start of the claim

E. BEGCLAIM: Start Date of Dyadic Claim

Number: The month and year that the claim began

Notes

- This date takes the form YYYYMM.

F. ENDCLAIM: End Date of Dyadic Claim

Number: The month and year that the claim ended

-999: Claim coded as ongoing past the current end of the data set

Notes

- This date takes the form YYYYMM, as in 181601, 194508, or 200012.

G. RESOLVED: Type of Resolution of Claim

0: Ongoing: The claim is not resolved (as of the current end of the data set)

1: Dropped by Challenger: The claim is simply dropped (the challenger simply stops pursuing it sometime during this year, and does not pursue it any further)

2: Renounced by Challenger: The claim is renounced through an official statement by the leadership of the challenger (but not through any bilateral agreement with the adversary, or any third-party assistance)

3: Third Party: The claim ends with third-party assistance (including any type of third party assistance: inquiry, conciliation, mediation, adjudication, or arbitration).

4: Bilateral: The disputants formally settle the claim in a bilateral treaty or agreement (including any bilateral agreement qualifying for inclusion in MCSETTLE)

5: Independence: This dyadic claim is replaced by a new claim due to the independence of a former dependency (e.g., The territorial and maritime claim over Courantyne evolves from an initial claim involving UK and Netherlands, into one involving Surinam and Guyana after both states achieve independence.)

6: Actor Leaves System: This particular dyadic claim ends when either the challenger or target state leaves the COW interstate system (e.g., **NEED EXAMPLE**).

7: Dropped by Target: The target state simply stops its objections to the challenger's claims, without any formal agreement

8: Renounced by Target: The target state explicitly renounces its objections to the challenger's claims, without any formal agreement

9: Plebiscite: The claim ended because of a plebiscite in the disputed area, the results of which were accepted by both sides. (This is probably only relevant to territorial claims, but is included here for complete comparability in values across the different data sets)

10: Claim No Longer Relevant: The claim is no longer relevant because the area has ceased to exist. For example, a river has ceased to exist (probably because it dried up), or because it has

lost its status as an international river (probably because the full river basin changed hands in a territorial change, or because the river shifted course in such a way as to leave one or both claimants holding none of the territory in the river basin any more.) Again, this variable is probably not relevant to maritime claims, but is included here for comparability.

Notes

- This variable should be consistent with the "Claimend" variable from MCSETTLE. If the claim is considered settled through bilateral or third party means, then this coding should be reflected in one of the settlement attempts included in MCSETTLE (and if a settlement attempt is coded as ending the claim in MCSETTLE, then this coding should be reflected in the "Resolved" variable in MCCLAIM).

H. ENDSVIOL: Role of Organized Violence in End of Claim

1: Violence: This claim ended due to large-scale organized violence between the two claimant states

0: None: The claim did not end in this way

-9: Claim is ongoing as of end of dataset'

Notes

- "Violence" refers to large-scale organized violence -- which does not necessarily have to meet the COW definition of interstate war (1000 dead in sustained combat between regular forces...)
- This includes cases where a negotiated settlement is reached to end the violence/war and also ends the claim (e.g., **NEED EXAMPLE**)
- This includes cases of unsuccessful violence/war, followed by one side dropping its claim (e.g., **NEED EXAMPLE**)
- This does NOT include cases where the violence was not organized (e.g., riots or non-official forces) or did not involve the two claimants in the dyad (e.g., **NEED EXAMPLE**)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Actors

- Be sure to list all nation-state actors involved in the claim, along with their COW code numbers

Dyads

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

Brief Chronology

- What significant events (if any) occurred during (or because of) the claim?
- When do we consider the claim to have ended, and how/why?

Coding Notes

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

References

- List of sources consulted (provide full bibliographic citation for each source)

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

- A. **CLAIM: Number of Claim** (See description under MCCLAIM data)
- B. **DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim** (See description under MCCLAIM data)
- C. **DYAD: Members of Dyad** (See description under MCCLAIM data)
- D. **CHAL - TGT: Challenger and Target State** (See description under MCCLAIM data)

E. **YEAR: Year of This Observation**

- Because MCDYADYR is a dyad-year-level data set; this variable only appears in the computerized dyad-year version of the data set, not the hand-written dyad-level codesheet.

F. **HOMECHAL: Homeland / Colony Claim Dummy for Challenger State**

G. **HOMETGT: Homeland / Colony Claim Dummy for Target State**

- 1: Homeland** The claimed maritime area is administered or claimed as an extension of homeland territory of the state in question (i.e., it is not seen as a colony or dependency)
- 0: Dependency/Other** The claim only involves a maritime area that is part of the state's colony, possession, other dependent territory (i.e., not part of the state's homeland), or the open sea.

Notes

- The challenger and target may have different values for this variable. For example, starting in 1947, the United States challenged Peru's claim to a 200 nautical mile territorial sea zone. In this case, the United States is the challenger and would be coded as Dependency/Other because it involves an open sea area from its perspective (see final note in this section below). The claim from the target's perspective (Peru) would be a homeland claim.
- This variable may change in value across dyadic claims. For example, **NEED EXAMPLE.**
- If the claim involves an open sea area (which is neither off the homeland or dependency territory for a given state), code as dependency/other, and note this on the coding sheet. For example, in the tuna wars between US-Ecuador, the US is claiming a right to fish in the 200 nautical mile territorial sea zone claimed by Ecuador. This would be coded as homeland for the target (Ecuador), but dependency/other for the challenger (US), with a note that the United States' claim is in the open sea (from its perspective).

H. **OFFSHORE: Offshore / Mainland Claim Dummy**

- 1: Offshore** The claim only involves one or more islands (NOT including claims to maritime areas located off the shores of the primary territory of island countries, such as Cuba, Australia, or the four islands of Japan -- but offshore islands such as the Kuriles WOULD be treated as islands)
- 0: Mainland** The claim only involves a maritime area adjacent to a nation's mainland territory (including the primary territory of island countries)

Notes

- This variable can change values across dyadic claims. For example, **NEED EXAMPLE.**

I. **RESOURCE: Resource Basis for Claim?**

- 1: Yes** The claim involved explicit contention over resources known or thought to be included in the maritime area

0: No No explicit reference to resources contained in the maritime area

Notes

- Be sure to note on the codesheet exactly which resource(s) are involved, and note also on the codesheet whether the resources are actual, potential, or both.
- Where possible, be sure to note when these resources are first discovered in the claimed zone (or first believed to be present) -- this will be important in constructing the dyad-year data set for claims to area whose known (or believed) resource supply changes over the course of a claim.
- Where relevant, also note if and when these resources are discovered *not* to be present (e.g., oil was thought to be present in the zone, until drilling in 1962 revealed otherwise).

J. STRATLOC: Does Claim Involve a Strategic Location?

1: Yes The claim involves a maritime area that is thought to have strategic value, such as a chokepoint

0: No The maritime area is not thought to be strategic at the time of the claim

Notes

- A chokepoint is a strategic strait or canal which could be closed or blocked to stop sea traffic (especially oil) (<http://geography.miningco.com/science/geography/library/weekly/aa052997.htm>). There are several important chokepoints that affect important trade and navigation routes including the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the Strait of Gibraltar, the Cape of Good Hope, the English Channel, the Strait of Hormuz (exit to the Persian Gulf), the Taiwan Strait, the South China Sea, Cape Horn, the Straits of Malacca, the Sunda Straits, the Straits of Lombok, Bab el-Mandab, Borporus/Turkish Straits, Strait of Magellan, and Kattogat Strait.
- Be sure to indicate on the codesheet and in the coding notes what makes the maritime zone strategically valuable.

K. FISHING: Does Claim Involve a Maritime Area with Fishing Resources?

0: The claimed maritime area does not contain fishing resources that are harvested either for local consumption or export.

1: The claimed maritime area contains fishing resources harvested by the challenger and/or target state (or citizens of that state) for local consumption only

2: The claimed maritime area contains fishing resources harvested by the challenger and/or target state (or citizens of that state) for export

Notes

- Please note on codesheet any particular information you can find about the fishing resources, such as what type of fish are being caught, what amount of fish is being caught, etc.

L. MIGRATE: Does Claim Involve a Maritime Area with Migratory Fish Stocks?

1: Yes The claimed area contains fishing stocks that migrate into adjacent maritime zones and/or open sea

0: No The claimed area does not contain migratory fish stocks

Notes

- Please note on codesheet any particular information you can find about the migratory fish stocks, such as what type of fish are being caught, what amount of fish is being caught, etc.

M. OIL: Does Claim Involve a Maritime Area with Oil Resources?

0: The claimed maritime area does not contain oil resources that are extracted either for local usage or export.

1: The claimed maritime area contains potential oil resources that are thought to exist, but have not yet been extracted.

2: The claimed maritime area contains oil resources that are extracted by the challenger and/or target state (or citizens of that state) for local usage only

3: The claimed maritime area contains oil resources that are extracted by the challenger and/or target state (or citizens of that state) for export

Notes

- Please note on codesheet any particular information you can find about the oil resources, such as when oil was discovered, how much is drilled per year, etc.

N. TERRCLM: Is This Maritime Claim Related to an Ongoing Territorial Claim?

1: Yes The maritime claim stems from a dispute over land territory (if so, note the ICOW territorial claim number)

0: No The maritime claim is not related to an ongoing territorial claim

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Coding Notes

- Details on the coding for the case, where relevant (explanations of why the case was coded as it was, particularly in controversial or unclear situations, with references where possible)
- Note any time that claim characteristics change (e.g., initial discovery of oil resources)

Brief Chronology of Claim

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

Militarized Conflict between the Participants

- Make separate lists of all disputes & wars directly related to the claim, as well as those apparently not directly related to the claim itself

Attempted Settlements

- Did the claimants ever attempt negotiations, sign treaties, turn to international legal means, etc., to help settle their claim?
- (This serves to identify cases for our attempted settlement data set; each such attempted settlement should receive a separate entry in the settlement-level data set MCSETTLE)

References

- List of sources consulted (provide full bibliographic citation for each source)

Variables in the Attempted Settlement Data Set (MCSETTLE)

- A. CLAIM: Number of Claim** (See description under MCCLAIM data)
- B. NAME: Name of Claim** (See description under MCCLAIM data)
- C. DYADNUM: Number of Dyadic Claim** (See description under MCCLAIM data)
- D. DYAD: Members of Dyad** (See description under MCCLAIM data)

E. SETTNUM: Number of Attempted Settlement

Number: An ICOW code number for this settlement attempt

Notes

- These code numbers are chronological, so the first settlement attempt for a given claim should have the number 01

F. BEGSETT: Start Date of Attempted Settlement

Number: The month and year that the settlement attempt began

Notes

- This date should take the form YYYYMM
- This is the date that the actual attempted settlement began, not the date on which it was first suggested; additional details such as the date it was suggested should go in the case's brief chronology (if it can be determined)

G. ENDSETT: End Date of Attempted Settlement

Number: The month and year that the settlement ended

-999: Settlement attempt coded as ongoing past the current end of the data set

Notes

- This date should take the form YYYYMM
- For cases ending in successful agreements, use the date of the agreement
- For other cases, use the date that the settlement attempt stopped (negotiations were broken off, an arbitration decision was handed down but rejected, etc.)

H. TYPESETT: Type of Attempted Settlement

- 1: Bilateral Negotiations** (between the claimants, without any third-party assistance)
- 2: Good Offices** (third party attempts to facilitate communication between claimants)
- 3: Inquiry or Conciliation** (essentially fact-finding mission by third party)
- 4: Mediation** (third party is allowed to make suggestions toward settlement)
- 5: Arbitration** (claimants submit claim to ad hoc third party for binding decision)
- 6: Adjudication** (claimants submit claim to established third party legal institution for binding decision)
- 7: Other Third-Party Settlement Attempt** (describe on codesheet)
- 8: Multilateral Negotiations** (third parties included in negotiations as equal, interested participants, rather than as neutral parties attempting to facilitate a bilateral settlement between the claimants)

9: Peace Conference: (after the end of a regional or global war, a peace conference of war participants and perhaps other interested parties attempts to adjust borders, as well as settling other postwar issues such as war guilt or reparations -- an example is the post-World War I Paris Peace Conference and its associated Treaty of Versailles. This is somewhat similar to the other binding settlement attempts, in that the claimants themselves become subject to the decision reached by the peace conference, but the defeated party from the war may not be treated as possessing equal rights during the process, and may not even have the ability to present its own case).

Notes

- See the above discussion of types of settlement attempts for more detail on each type
- When one actor offers good offices as a way to facilitate arbitration or mediation by another actor, code the more involved settlement attempt (in this case, the arbitration or mediation), but make a note of the good offices on the codesheet for the case. Similarly, if a third party becomes involved in the middle of a period of bilateral negotiations by offering good offices to keep the negotiations from ending, code the entire settlement attempt as involving good offices rather than bilateral negotiations, and make a note on the codesheet.

I. TYPEACT: Type of Third Party Actor in Attempted Settlement

-9: None (Bilateral settlement attempt)

0: Claim participants themselves (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

Notes

- "Region" refers to the traditional COW conception of regions, as given in the COW interstate system list (actors 1-199 = Americas, 200-399 = Europe, 400-599 = Africa, 600-699 = Middle

East, 700-899 = Asia, and 900-999 = Oceania). Note that this means that (for example) North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean are all considered to be part of the same region.

- "Major power" status is taken from the latest version of the COW interstate system list.
- Record any details about the specific individual or organization involved on the codesheet, if possible (was this a foreign king? foreign minister? military or religious leader?)

J-K-L-M-N-O. ACTOR1-ACTOR6: Third Party Actor(s) in Attempted Settlement

Number: Code number for third party actor involved in settlement attempt

0: Claim participants (e.g., when the claimants appoint their own citizens to an arbitral tribunal to settle the claim)

-9: None (bilateral attempt, no third party involved)

Notes

- Due to the difficulty of rating as many as six or more actors for the prominence or effectiveness of their efforts as third parties, the actors should be recorded in ascending order of COW nation-state code numbers. If there are more than six actors, though, try to determine the six most active third parties in the settlement attempt to determine which six to include; if this is not possible, use the first six COW code numbers, but please leave a coding note indicating the other actors that were involved.
 - Nation-state actors: use the COW project's nation-state code number
 - Non-state actors: see the ICOW list (available on the ICOW web site)
- if the specific actor is not listed in either the COW interstate system list or the ICOW non-state actor list, please type in the name or abbreviation of the actor(s) on the codesheet, and we can give them official code numbers later

P. EXTENTSA: Extent of claim covered by settlement attempt

0: Functional The settlement attempt doesn't cover ownership of the claimed maritime area, but rather covers the usage of the area by one or both participants (e.g., negotiations over "treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation")

1: Procedural The settlement attempt doesn't cover any of the maritime area in the claim, but rather covers procedures to be used in settling any (present or future) problems between the claimants (e.g., negotiations over submitting the claim to arbitration or adjudication would be coded as procedural, although the actual arbitral or adjudication process would be a later settlement attempt covering part or all of the claim)

2: Part of Claim Part, but not all, of the claim is covered by the settlement attempt (i.e., they are trying to settle one portion of the overall disputed area)

3: Entire Claim Entire claim is covered (i.e., they are trying to settle the entire disputed maritime zone)

Q. AGREE: Did attempted settlement lead to an agreement by the claimants?

1: Yes The claimants sign a treaty or agreement as a result of the settlement attempt

0: No No agreement is signed as a result of the attempt

Notes

- For settlement attempts involving third party decisions, "agreement" refers to the handing down of an arbitral or adjudicated award.

R. EXTENTAG: Extent of claim covered by agreement, if any

-9: No agreement

0: Functional

1: Procedural

2: Part of Claim

3: Entire Claim

Notes

- See the description of the values above (under EXTENTSA).
- Note that the eventual agreement -- if any -- may actually be different from the original goal of the settlement attempt, as expressed in EXTENTSA; for example, a settlement attempt that originally attempts to settle the entire claim may only lead to a procedural treaty as the parties find that they can only agree to meet again or to submit their claim to some third party.

S. MARCHAG: Did agreement call for a change in maritime delimitations?

-9: No agreement

1: Yes The agreement calls for a change in the current territorial sea or exclusive economic zone limits for one or both sides.

0: No The agreement does not call for a change in the current territorial sea or EEZ limits (although it may recognize the status quo).

T. CONCESAG: Which side made more concessions in the agreement?

-9: No agreement

1: Major Challenger Concessions The agreement involves major concessions by the challenger state, without comparable concessions by the target state. (e.g., challenger gives up its entire claim without receiving concessions from the target)

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

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

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

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

Notes

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

U-V. RATCHAL / RATTGT: Did challenger/target ratify the agreement (if any)?

-9: No agreement

0: No This state did not ratify the agreement

1: Yes This state ratified the agreement

Notes

- Ratification must be completed within a reasonable time. If the agreement specifies a specific time frame (e.g., within one year of the treaty's signature), then ratification must be completed within that time frame to be coded. When no time frame is specified, the time frame for ratification should be five year from signature.
- If an agreement does not require formal ratification in one or both states' political systems, and the state in question attempted to comply with or carry out the terms of the agreement, then it should be coded as ratifying the agreement. The main purpose of this variable is to identify cases where ratification was not completed (indicating the failure of the attempted settlement), rather than to identify specific details of each state's political process.

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

-9: No agreement

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

1: Yes This state implemented/carried out the agreement

Notes

- Note that "compliance," "implementation," or "carrying out" refer to the claimants taking the required actions. If an agreement fails for reasons beyond their control (e.g., both sides submit their cases to a third party but the third party refuses to hear them or dies before rendering an award), the claimants should still be coded as implementing the agreement.
- Compliance must be completed within a reasonable time. If the agreement specifies a specific time frame (e.g., within one year of the treaty's signature), then compliance must be completed within that time frame to be coded. When no time frame is specified, the time frame for compliance should be five year from signature.
- Compliance can always be withdrawn later, so any coding of compliance with a given agreement is necessarily an inexact decision that could be reversed. As a result, compliance should be coded based on a five-year period -- so a state that complies for less than five years should be coded as not complying with the agreement. An agreement that is meant to be carried out once (e.g., an agreement to submit cases to a third party arbitrator) should be coded based on whether or not the required action was carried out within the specified time frame (as described above).

Y. CLAIMEND: Did attempted settlement lead to the end of the maritime claim?

-9: No agreement

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

1: Most of Claim The agreement produced a division or settlement of the claimed maritime area that was followed by the end of explicit contention over most of the claim

2: All of Claim The agreement produced a division or settlement of the claimed maritime area that was followed by the end of explicit contention over all of the claim

Notes

- "All" of the claim means the end of contention over the entire maritime area covered by the claim. When a settlement attempt is coded with this result, the claim should be coded as ending in the claim-level data (MCCLAIM).
- "Most" of the claim means the end of contention over most of the maritime area covered by the claim, although some of it remains ongoing. Examples include NEED EXAMPLE. When a settlement attempt is coded with this result, the full claim should not be coded as ending in the claim-level data (MCCLAIM), although the dyadic claim may be coded as ending and being replaced by a different dyadic claim focused on the remaining pockets being claimed, presumably with a much smaller claimed area and likely with different salience indicators.
- This variable may be complicated by maritime claims that appear to end following a treaty, only to be raised anew within several years (due to new information about the area, new leadership in one or both former claimant states, or other factors). If explicit contention over most/all of the claim does indeed end following a treaty or award, this variable should be coded accordingly, even if a new claim between the same states begins within a year or two.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CODESHEET

Initiator of Settlement Attempt

- Who proposed the settlement attempt? (this could be one of the participants, or it could be an outside actor)
 - this isn't being entered into our computerized version data set, but it may prove to be useful to have around for future reference
 - this isn't always easy to determine, especially for older settlement attempts that are covered only briefly in historical sources.

Brief Chronology of Settlement Attempt

- Who was involved in the settlement attempt, what they did, when, etc.
- Brief summary of the result of the settlement attempt (how did it end? summarize the agreement that was reached and any details on its ratification or implementation if possible, or explain the impasse that prevented agreement / ratification / implementation)

Coding Notes

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

References

- Annotated list of sources consulted for each claim in the data set

APPENDIX I: SAMPLE CODESHEETS
ICOW Maritime Claim Coversheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*):

NAME (*Name of claim*):

ACTORS (*States involved in claim*):

COW Code Name of Actor COW Code Name of Actor

DYADS (*Dyads involved in claim*):

Dyadnum Challenger - Target Begdate Enddate Resolved Endviol

Brief Description of Issue:

Brief Chronology of Claim:

Coding Notes:

References:

ICOW Dyadic Maritime Claim Codesheet

CLAIM (*Code number of claim*):

NAME (*Name of claim*):

DYADNUM (*Number of dyadic claim*):

CHAL - TGT (*Challenger and target*):

BEGCLAIM (*Beginning of dyadic claim*):

ENDCLAIM (*End of dyadic claim*):

RESOLVED (*Type of resolution of dyadic claim*):

ENDVIOL (*Did claim end through large-scale violence?*):

HOMECHAL (*Homeland territory for challenger? 0=dependent/other, 1=homeland*):

HOMETGT (*Homeland territory for target? 0=dependent/other, 1=homeland*):

OFFSHORE (*Offshore claim?*):

RESOURCE (*Resource basis?*):

Resource(s):

STRATLOC (*Strategic location?*):

Details:

FISHING (*Fishing in claimed zone?*):

MIGRATE (*Migratory fish stocks?*):

OIL(*Oil in claimed zone?*):

TERRCLM (*Related to Territorial Claim?*):

ICOW Case #:

Coding Notes:

Brief Chronology of Claim:

Militarized Conflict between the Participants:

Attempted Settlements :

References:

ICOW Maritime Attempted Settlement Codesheet

CLAIM (*Number of claim*):

NAME (*Name of claim*):

DYADNUM (*Number of dyadic claim*):

DYAD (*AAABBB*):

SETTNUM (*Number of attempted settlement*):

BEGSETT (*Beginning date of attempted settlement*):

ENDSETT (*End date of attempted settlement*):

TYPESETT (*Type of attempted settlement*):

TYPEACT (*Type of third party actor, if any*):

ACTOR1-ACTOR6 (*Third party actor(s), if any*):

EXTENTSA (*Extent of claim covered by settlement attempt*):

AGREE (*Did attempt produce a treaty / agreement / decision?*):

EXTENTAG (*Extent of claim covered by agreement, if any*):

MARCHAG (*Did agreement, if any, call for change in delimitation?*):

CONCESAG (*Which side made more concessions in agreement?*):

RATCHAL (*Did challenger ratify agreement?*):

RATTGT (*Did target ratify agreement?*):

COMPCHAL (*Did challenger comply with agreement?*):

COMPTGT (*Did target comply with agreement?*):

CLAIMEND (*Did agreement lead to end of maritime claim?*):

Initiator of Settlement Attempt

Brief Chronology of Settlement Attempt:

Coding Notes:

References: