




Codebook:

IGO CAPACITY OF ENGAGEMENT DATASET

Brooke Coe & Kathryn Nash

25 February 2024



1. About the dataset

This dataset may be downloaded from: <https://pax.peaceagreements.org/downloads>

It builds on data accessed via the Peace Agreements Database:

PA-X (2017). Peace Agreements Database and Access Tool, Version 1. Political Settlements Research Programme, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh. www.peaceagreements.org

Bell, Christine, Sanja Badanjak, Robert Forster, Astrid Jamar, Jan Pospisil, Laura Wise (2017). PA-X Codebook, Version 1. Political Settlements Research Programme, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh. www.peaceagreements.org

Bell, C. and Badanjak, S. (2019) 'Introducing PA-X: A new peace agreement database and dataset', Journal of Peace Research, 56 (3).

PA-X is continually updated, and as of March 2024, the most recent version is PA-X Version 7. Our coding is based on Version 1.

2. Data collection procedure

Coding Round 1) A search of the PA-X database [Version 1 – originally accessed at <https://www.peaceagreements.org/search>] for agreements concluded in the African and Latin American regions during 1990-2015 generated 448 African agreements and 176 Latin American agreements. African agreements were read and coded for mention of each of the following IGOs (as applicable): UN, OAU, AU, ECOWAS, SADC, EAC, ECCAS, CEN-SAD, IGAD, COMESA, AMU. Latin American agreements were read and coded for mention of each of the following IGOs: UN, OAS, + any formal sub-regional IGO (e.g. UNASUR).

Coding Round 2) For each IGO mentioned in an agreement, a 6-variable Capacity of Engagement Coding Scheme was applied (see below). This coding scheme was developed based on work from coding round 1. While coding for the presence of IGOs, we noted patterns in IGO engagement in peace agreements to develop the variables and then developed the variable definitions based on peace agreement texts. For example, for variable 2, IGO recognized for encouragement and support, we identified language commonly used in peace agreements, such as 'welcomes support'.

3. Inter-Code Reliability

An inter-coder reliability (kappa) test was conducted at two stages: First, after agreements had been coded for AU & REC capacity of engagement (but not yet for UN capacity of engagement) for 2002-2015, a random subset of 32 agreements were re-coded for either AU engagement or REC engagement (Coder 1 recoded agreements originally coded by Coder 2, and vice-versa).

Percent agreement for all variables exceeded 90% and kappa scores for all variables exceeded 0.8 (0.7 is considered acceptable reliability).

ICR Test #1

	Var1	Var2	Var3	Var4	Var5	Var6
% agree	96.88	100.00	96.88	90.62	90.62	90.62
kappa	0.8904	1.0000	0.9344	0.8125	0.8110	0.8080

Second, after all agreements had been coded for UN engagement for 1990-2015, a random subset of 26 agreements were recoded for UN engagement only (Coder 1 recoded agreements originally coded by Coder 2, and vice-versa). Again, percent agreement for all variables exceeded 90% and kappa scores for all variables exceeded 0.8.

ICR Test #2

	Var1	Var2	Var3	Var4	Var5	Var6
% agree	96.15	100.00	92.31	100.00	100.00	92.31
kappa	0.9202	1.0000	0.8471	1.0000	1.0000	0.8385

4. Relevant PA-X Definitions & Variables

Peace Agreement: a formal, publicly-available document, produced after discussion with conflict protagonists and mutually agreed to by some or all of them, addressing conflict with a view to ending it.

Conflict: armed violence, causing more than 25 conflict-related deaths in one year.

Peace Process: a formal attempt to bring political and/or military protagonists of conflict, to some sort of mutual agreement as to how to end the conflict.

Further definitions and information on variables can be found in the PA-X Version 1 Codebook: https://www.peaceagreements.org/files/PA_X_codebook_Version1_Feb_20_20.pdf

Variable name	Variable	Definition
Con	Country	The country or jurisdiction in which the conflict originated.
Contp	Conflict type	Type of conflict the agreement is addressing. 'Government' refers to ideological or political disputes, and 'Territory' to purely territorial disputes.
PP	Peace Process ID	Unique identifying number for each of the peace processes.
PPName	Peace Process Name	The name of the peace process.

Reg	Region	Region in which the conflict addressed by the agreement is taking place.
AgtID	Agreement ID	Unique identifying number for each of the agreements.
Agt	Agreement Name	The name of the agreement as found in the text of the agreement. Where appropriate, popular names of the agreements are included in parenthesis.
Dat	Date Signed	Listed in the dataset as YYYY-MM-DD The date on which the agreement was signed or agreed.

5. Coe-Nash Capacity of Engagement Coding Scheme

Note: We coded individual agreements rather than coding the wider peace processes in which these agreements are situated. For example, if an agreement mentions an existing AU implementation panel but does not actually prescribe a (new) implementation role for the AU, this language alone does not support coding 1 for Var5.

Var1: Presence of IGO

Coded 1 for the IGO in question if a representative of that IGO is indicated to be present at negotiations for the peace agreement or if they sign the agreement in any capacity.

At least one of the following must apply:

- IGO official indicated present at negotiations in peace agreement. For instance, by the agreement stating negotiations happened in the presence of X, IGO official.
- IGO official signed as a witness or third party.
- The IGO is a signatory to the agreement (not as a third party or witness).

Additional notes:

- If the agreement is coded 1 for Var4 (see below), then it logically follows that an IGO representative was present (but not vice-versa)
- PA-X indicates which actors/organizations are signatories/witnesses on the agreement’s coding page.

Var2: Recognition of IGO

Coded 1 for the IGO in question if the text of the agreement recognizes or thanks the IGO for its support.

Criteria:

- This includes any provisions that thank or commend the IGO or officials representing the IGO.
- Other common language: the agreement “welcomes” support from or activities of the IGO.

Var3: Reference to IGO law or plans

Coded 1 for the IGO in question if the text of the agreement takes into account or refers to IGO law or plans.

Criteria:

- This includes any mention of the IGO’s Charter or organizational protocols or decisions.
- This includes charters negotiated through the regional organization, such as the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights.
- This includes any provisions that specifically mention that the peace agreement (in whole or in part) is based on a plan made by the IGO.
- This does **not** include references to past peace agreements that may have been facilitated by an IGO.

Var4: Facilitation

Coded 1 for the IGO in question if the IGO facilitated the peace process and/or acted as a negotiator.

Criteria:

- The IGO facilitation or negotiation role must be indicated in the text of the agreement.
- Such indications could include a note stating that the agreement was made under the auspices of the IGO or a provision thanking the IGO for facilitating the negotiations. The second example would be coded as both thanks/recognition (Var2) and facilitation (Var4).
- Language indicating that the conflict parties met at the invitation of X, acting in his/her role as an IGO mediator or negotiator, **does** meet the criteria.
- Language inviting/requesting the IGO to facilitate does **not** meet the criteria.

Var5: Commitment to Implement

Coded 1 for the IGO in question if the IGO will serve as guarantor of the agreement or if it has some responsibility to implement the agreement.

Criteria:

- This includes provisions that mention the IGO as a guarantor. The IGO does not need to be the sole guarantor.
- This includes provisions that assign the IGO a specific task to implement the agreement. For instance, if there is a mention that the African Union will serve on committee to demarcate a boundary line.
- This includes provisions that indicate that the IGO is to help implement the agreement or an IGO representative is included on an implementation committee.
- If the IGO has the power to make binding decisions (in response to disputes between the parties) and/or impose sanctions on the parties, this is considered implementation.
- Language inviting/requesting the IGO to assume an implementation role does not count as implementation unless it seems clear that the IGO will assume this role (and the “invitation” language is therefore a formality).

Var6: Commitment to Monitor

Coded 1 for the IGO in question if the IGO will monitor a ceasefire or another aspect of the agreement.

Criteria:

- This includes provisions indicating that the IGO is to monitor the progress of the agreement or that an IGO representative is included on a monitoring committee.
- The distinction between implementation (Var5) and monitoring (Var6) is that, in the former, the IGO being given a specific task (e.g. to assist with DDR) . The use of ‘implement’ (Var5) or ‘monitor’ (Var6) in the text of the agreement is also indicative.
- If the parties are to update/report to the IGO, this is coded as monitoring (Var6) rather than implementation (Var5).
- If the parties can bring disputes to/appeal to the IGO when disputes arise but the IGO’s recommendations are not binding, then this is coded as monitoring (Var6) rather than implementation (Var5).
- Language inviting/requesting the IGO to assume a monitoring role does not count as monitoring unless it seems clear that the IGO will assume this role (and the “invitation” language is therefore a formality)