

## Notes on MID 3 Project Meeting of 8/13/2000-8/15/2000

Scott Bennett and Ric Stoll

### General plans, notes, and discussion

- There will be an official spring meeting the Midwest meeting, April 2001. There will be a roundtable discussion of the MID3 project as part of the IR panels organized by Paul Diehl.
- Next year's summer meeting will be held before the 2<sup>nd</sup> session of ICPSR to accommodate Brian Pollins in particular.
- The location of the Spring 2002 meeting has not been decided. ISA 2002 is scheduled for New Orleans, and may appeal to MID3 participants as a 2002 meeting site.
- There will be an unofficial MID3 gathering at the Peace Science Meeting in New Haven in October 2000, probably Friday evening.
- **All of the MID 3 participants agree that no one will use or release any part of the data, or a preliminary version, until the full data sets is completely assembled and finalized.**
- The final data will have 3 kinds of records, dispute, participant, dyad. The MID 3 project plans to release disputes and documentation simultaneously, with incident to follow somewhat later.
- The dyadic records will be constructed from the incident and MID records, and dyadic information will not have to be recorded separately. The dyadic codings will be obtained from incident data to ensure date overlap, actual interaction, and record the highest hostility level in each dyad. (There was some discussion of dyadic hostility level, with Stuart Bremer's recollection being that the highest non-directed hostility level would be recorded; this can be determined and set by construction later).
- Suggestion by Glenn Palmer (supported by Scott Bennett): We should consider doing directed dyads instead of non-directional. I don't think it will entail any more coding to do this. It would only entail a slightly different handling by the computer at MID Central. In particular, we already know from incident data the highest level of action taken by each actor against the other. But without the "directed" part, this will get compressed to (for instance) a coding that B occupied A's territory. If we keep the directed part, we could know that A threatened B, and then B occupied A's territory. This would be useful information. It wouldn't be hard to do. It might come close to doubling the number of cases in the file, but that's good, not bad. I'd like to see the issue addressed on the website.
- Followup note by Scott Bennett: If all we are talking about is the level of directed action, we need not even multiply the number of MIDs. We could have "Highest Hostility Level A to B," and "Highest Hostility Level B to A." But it may make sense to have either 1 or 2 directed dyads; if there is only one directed dyad A-B in a MID then it would be clear that state B did not undertake a separate incident against A.

### Important procedures:

- Monthly progress are REQUIRED and are VERY IMPORTANT. These reports should include dates through which incidents have been gathered.
- Special handling is required for cross-regional incidents and disputes.
  - o At the incident construction phase, in general both regions should initially code each incident. MID central will note cross regional incidents and notify the two (or more) regional centers. The two regional sites will then need to communicate and agree on what the final incidents are, to the letter. The regional PCPs (Principal Contact Persons) will then update one regional incident database to be the final ultimate cross-regional incident(s), and notify MID central about which regional version is correct.
    - Step 1: A cross-regional incident will be entered by 1 or both (or all) regions.

- Step 2: MID central flags cross-regional incidents, and sends notification back to the regional centers
- Step 3: The regional sites talk to each other and finalize the relevant incidents, to the letter. How the sites do this is up to the 2 PCPs. Note: of course, if a regional PCP notices a cross-regional incident, then the PCPs can feel free to talk to each other and get started on the coordination process. If PCPs agree that only one of the centers will collect information on incidents in the two cross-regional dyad, this is OK, but must be very clear to ensure that no incidents are missed. We are probably more certain to get all incidents accurately if both regions collect as much information as possible before delegating final responsibility.
- Step 4: One regional center enters/updates the final version in the regional database, marking an incident box for “Cross-regional incident, final version.”
- Step 5: The other regional center(s) checks an incident box for “Cross-regional incident now handled by other region.” [Alternative: MID central marks these cross-regional keep/delete boxes.]
- Step 6: The regional centers note that the cross-regional incident(s) have been resolved and notify MID central as to what the correct/final regional version is.
- At the MID construction phase, MID central will notify one of the two regions that they are in charge of constructing the final MID. All of the relevant information will then need to be at that one region. Probably incident reports from one regional center will have to be copied and mailed to the region assigned to handle the MID.

#### **PCP to do list:**

- Preliminary Administrative Tasks:
  - Settle any internal division of labor if necessary (if many PCPs)
  - Buy a good (large) map
  - Buy/order *Merriam Webster Geographical Dictionary*
  - Finalize coders for project. It was suggested that if possible you try to get people that you can/will have for 2 years, but tradeoffs between time and quality must be decided by PCPs.
  - Stuart will be asking for info about who is working on project. Names, emails, etc.
- Preliminary data collection tasks:
  - Familiarize yourself with the sources.
  - Identify and examine regional search sources that will be routinely consulted. But also check because many of these may be academic universe.
  - Set search strategy (see below)
  - Train coders
- Begin collecting data:
  - Coders collect incidents for 1993.
  - PCPs review incidents
  - Coders enter incidents at website.
  - PCPS submit first report, due at end of September (first week of October). In this report, you should:
    - Report search strategy
    - Give summary of incidents identified as possibilities for 1993
    - Give summary of incidents reviewed and entered

**MID central to do list:**

- Finish web site
- Write up report of this meeting and post it.
- Update coding materials
- Create a search form and post it on the web site (worksheet for coders to check off that materials have been searched)
- Put updated state membership list on website.
- Post a list of all contiguous dyads.
- Identify disputes ongoing at end of 1992 and post this list on the website
- Supply information on wars from 1993-1997.
- Create/post calendars for 1993-2001.

**Documentation notes and procedures**

- The initial stage of data gathering is to collect reports. Note that multiple reports may be merged into 1 incident, may relate to multiple incidents, or may lead to no incident upon further review. Each report should be copied and with incident. **If a single report relates to multiple incidents, multiple copies of the report should be made for inclusion in each incident folder.**
- We will probably want to print more reports than will actually be used in final incidents.
- Initially err on side of printing reports and coding incidents, rather than excluding them. For example, you may initially want to collect reports of unofficial or questionable forces. Then, collection into final incidents and MID will filter or combine these reports.
- In all of the reports, you can encourage coders to highlight, underline etc. relevant information from each report, as long as report stays legible.
- Keep all documentation and reports! One suggestion: keep 3 hole notebook of all reports on India/Pakistan. Eventually, all reports related to an incident will be in the packet for that incident. Copies of all of these materials will ultimately be stored at Penn State.
- **Regional incident number will be filled in BEFORE SHEETS DISTRIBUTED TO CODER. DO NOT reuse any numbers. If a sheet is "spoiled," discard it and its number.**
- **In Note section, all notes should have a note type corresponding to the section of the incident/MID the note refers to.** E.g. if the note is about start or end dates, it should be marked as a type 4 note.
- **All PCPs must review each incident coding sheet and initial and date in the final reserved box on the coding form.**
- The PCP will frequently have to assign specific tasks to coders, to gather specific pieces of info to fill in missing or uncertain information on particular incidents and MIDs.
- For very complicated incidents with many overlapping reports (e.g. Ethiopia/Eritrea), creating a chronology may be a very good strategy. This will also help with (and can become part of) the narrative to be attached to the MID.

**Searching and search strategy**

- Sources to be searched:
  - o All regions should search Academic Universe (the world news and regional areas), NYT index, London Times Index, Facts on File, and Keesing's Contemporary archive.
    - Search procedure for Academic universe will be to 1) enter dyad or state name along with date range; 2) scan headlines and identify those that look like possible militarized incidents; 3) review selected stories and print them.
  - o Some regions should also routinely consult other sources. Regional PCP should determine what set of sources they will routinely consult after some investigation, looking over standard source list; that list was included in documentation and will be on

website. For instance, the African region should always review Africa Bulletin. Major regional specialty sources should always be examined.

- Search strategies:
  - o Centers must think about and probably do some experimentation for region to find out an effective strategy.
  - o Centers should develop an organized and consistent strategy to ensure we have truly reviewed cases without dispute (so our coded non-events are really non-events).
  - o Probably a small # of dyads will have disputes. Many pairs never have anything. One effective search for disputatious dyads is to search by dyad; in Academic Universe this involves simply entering “India and Pakistan” for instance.
  - o Absolutely should search all dyads that have a dispute in MID II. A list of all dyads with a MID in MID II can be found under Paul Diehl’s web site in his list of rivalries (examine enduring, proto, and all other types of rivalry).
  - o Another strategy: look at all pairs of a state with its direct neighbors. MID central will post a list of all contiguous dyads.
  - o For countries that you suspect have little interaction, you can probably just search for reports with that country name (e.g. Narau).
  - o Initial searching has revealed that searching for 2 country names is good. However, adding terms like “clash” “threat” etc. turned out to not be very useful because those specific terms vary from report to report.
  - o Phil Schafer’s list can be reviewed for possible incidents. Not all of these will be, but may provide dyads to investigate. Think of this list as a set of candidate incidents.
  - o A search worksheet will be developed to check off when sources have been searched.
  
- Sources: Miscellaneous notes.
  - o When entering the Academic Universe (Lexis/Nexis) database, there are 3 major areas to search: General news, world news, and wire services. Within world news, you must then select 1 of 4 regional areas, Americas, European, Africa/Middle East, Asia. These regional areas include regional sources; there is some overlap between regions but not complete overlap. After review, Stuart’s conclusion is that the best area to start in is the World News; it seems to encompass everything in the general news section.
  - o New York Times index: look under Middle East as well as country names.

#### **Incident coding clarifications/notes:**

- Interpretation of evidence: Claims and alleged incidents should be treated as flags for the occurrence of an incident, but not necessarily as proof of an incident. Allegations must be evaluated later along with evidence from further reports. Initially such alleged incidents should be collected and evaluated. We must err on the side of inclusion because we often won’t have independent sources, although for any statements by governments, or state press sources, coders should look for confirmation. In cases without outside confirmation but which seem credible, add a source note that the sources are from one side, a government source, etc.
- Interpretation of evidence and dates: If a report refers back to something (an event) occurring some time before the report, this should prompt coders to go back and look for sources around the date of event. If no further (concurrent with actual date) evidence can be found, then an incident can be coded from a retrospective report (with appropriate notation). But we should always look for current reports, which are likely to contain more details about dates, fatalities, actions, etc.
- Incident definition: Incidents are defined by type (one of 21 categories), the actor or coordinated actors, and a single target. The same thing must be done vs. same target

- Incident definition: There is only one type per incident. If an action/event/report involves 2 or more types of incident, there will be multiple incidents. New/different incident type will mark start of a new incident, possibly on same day as another incident (either an ongoing or new incident). If 2 separate types of action, then separate incident although they will be merged in MID.
- Incident definition: Incidents are also defined by location. Two clashes at substantially different locations are two incidents (e.g. opening a new front in a conflict).
- Multiple incidents may overlap: For example, we could have one incident which is a clash continuing for several weeks/months, and have several threats displays during that period that should be coded separately (they are a separate incident type).
- Incidents and incidental actions: Events that occur incidental to or en route to another, more serious, more central event are to be considered part of the same incident, and only one incident type will be recorded. For example, if a border violation occurs on the way to a clash, we will only code a clash, certainly if the border violation and clash occur the same day. Similarly, if planes violate the border to undertake an attack, the attack will be coded. Normally, the coded event will be the more serious action. To be coded as multiple incidents, the events must be clearly separate.
- On the other hand, if a state crosses a border on day 1, then the next day crosses the border and is shot at, day 1 is border violation and day 2 is clash.
- General incident disclaimer: Note that the primary purpose of the data gathering is MID construction. The secondary purpose is to construct and release incident data that could be used for other purposes, but the primary purpose is not to have an events data set or something like that. This is NOT BCOW data. If we find ourselves bogged down in determining incident details, but these will disappear at the MID level, then the MID construction is ultimately more important. Because of conflicting reports, claims, and uneven reporting, we cannot guarantee to the level of day what's in the data.
- Targets: There will be only one target per incident.
- Actors: Are overt, official government forces. Incidents like SEALS would be incident if it can be authenticated b/c official forces. But unofficial forces or covert ops are not coded.
- Actors: Paramilitary forces and whether they are government controlled varies from country to country. Additional research may be required to identify the degree of direction received from the government. Paramilitaries should be coded only if they are part of government forces, under clear state direction. If they have an official title/unit, they are probably part of state forces. But research is needed to know for certain.
- Actors and paramilitary research: Paul Diehl mentioned that he had a Ph.D. student who worked on the question of paramilitaries. The student's name is Sunil Dasgupta and he can be reached at [sdasgupta@brook.edu](mailto:sdasgupta@brook.edu) -- Brookings Institution. According to Paul, he is still struggling with the definition problem, but would probably be willing to discuss the problems and the literature. [Note: MID 3 has not contacted Dr. Dasgupta, so please let us know if you contact him.]
- Actors and "official" action: actions must be approved by central government, not disavowed later or apologized for. If disavowed later (within a few days, typically), then it will not be an incident. E.g. US bombing of Chinese embassy in Yugoslavia is not a MID vs. China. We can't really look for government confirmation of official statements; there will often not be an official endorsement. On the other hand, there will sometimes be disavowal, though. So, absence of disavowal will constitute an official remark.
- Actors and target invitation: Note that if some action occurs at the invitation of the government, or is accepted by a state government, or is coordinated, it will not be an incident. A Marine rescue mission to save civilians, if accepted by the government, is not an incident. BUT, if the are protests of action or a response, then it would be an incident. An invitation by a government

to some outside force to enter the government's territory would not be an incident against the government.

- Actors and coordination: for 2 or more actors to be in the same incident as joint actors, there must be evidence of actual, active, planned coordination. Add a note about what kind of coordination/what evidence of coordination there was.
- Actors and Targets: Differentiating: Try to identify the actor that made the first move in any kind of action, always put this "first mover" in the actor box. But also put notes about whether this "first mover" is clearly identifiable in the Notes section of the incident report. Note that clashes by definition involve reciprocation, and it is typically assumed in this case that the actor/target distinction is not meaningful. But if there is any suggestion of who shot first, put that as first actor and make a note.
- Actors in IOs: What if NATO states a threat to Yugoslavia? Who is a threat coded between? All members of NATO? some? none? Also, what distinguishes NATO from other IOs? We discussed that we would want to code a NATO threat, but not a UN threat.
  - o The key to coding joint threat in keeping with other joint actions is that the actors must be acting in a unified way. NATO is simply a mechanism for aggregation of individual decisions. All voters (all those who sign off on the aggregation) are then threateners in this incident, and hence in a resulting MID. The key is that membership in an organization does not necessarily mean you will be part of the incident; only your actions (a vote, or a bombing) make you part of the incident.
  - o It was suggested that organizations that clearly have their own forces (e.g. NATO) will be considered as possibly making threats from multiple national actors. This codes NATO, but not UN.
  - o For later actions, e.g. actual bombing, if US planes carry out bombing then only US is coded as using force, NOT the other members of NATO.
  - o So in the example discussed, if 8 countries vote yes in NATO, and NATO issues a threat, then it is an incident of threat by those 8 countries. Several days later, if some countries bomb, then that subset of countries only are coded as doing a use of force.
  - o With UN, votes to authorize forces are not threats or displays of force. Such a vote only authorizes national forces to act.
  - o When national forces are under an IO flag (e.g. forces under UN flag) and are attacked, it is not an incident. e.g. if Israel attacks UN troops in S. Lebanon, not an incident against the state from which forces were drawn.
  - o It was agreed that when we discover incidents involving international organizations, we should discuss these on the website/discussion board.
  - o Right now only NATO counts as an IO with the requisite forces-in-being to code in this way.
  - o Glenn Palmer and Ric Stoll will be working to further clarify the rules on this issue.
- Dates: We want to be as precise as possible about dates. If there is uncertainty, be as precise as possible, and put notes about the uncertainty or range of possibilities in the note section.
- End date questions: We discussed what to do about breaks in action. The problem was what if action (e.g. fighting) stops for a day or so, then starts again. Should this be coded as one continuing incident, or two? A variety of options were discussed, with suggested criteria including that it should be a new incident if and only if the 2<sup>nd</sup> action was a clear change in policy, was a separate influence attempt, was not part of a single planned operation, if it required new orders to be undertaken, or was a new decision. All of these were fuzzy and not particularly replicable. We agreed in the end that a break of up to 3 days was acceptable in coding a single incident as ongoing. If more than 3 days pass, it would mark a new incident.

- Example: There is a clash on June 1, and then again June 4. These are coded as part of the same clash (they are within 3 days) (this assumes the same actors, location, and issue).
- End dates: In absence of information about end, we assume that reported incidents end in one day. In particular about a clash, then must assume it was one day. Many other incidents (border violation, threat) will be 1 day by definition.
- Threats: must be very specific, and specify contingent action. Phrases like “dire consequences” will probably not be a threat. Has to have specific action stated.
- Threats: A threat to join some kind of ongoing action like a war would include a threat to join a civil war or interstate war as long as the threat is against a state actor. This may involve paying close attention to who controls the capitol.
- Threats: A Threat to give aid in a conflict is not enough, must threaten to send forces.
- Threats: For coding threats, note in the incident report what the threat or contingency is. Record statements like “Threat to bomb Kashmir if India didn’t pull back by April 7.”
- Threat location: In cases of threat, we agreed that where it was issued was not particularly important. More important is what is targeted. If a threat is specific as to the likely location of specified action, put that targeted location in the location box, e.g. we will attack addis ababa, location of incident is Addis Ababa.
- Threats: reception. Note to be added to documentation about a threat being “received:” “or it is reasonable that the threat was/would have been received.” We want to avoid secret threats, but public statements, news reports, etc. are such that a threatened government would see it.
- It seems that discussion of particular threats and this issue of specific threat (similarly with displays of force) could be a topic for discussion on the website/discussion board.
- Displays of force: These must be very specific, and the target must be clear. A general missile test firing is not a display of force (the problem is if it is, then all weapons test would spark an incident). Targeted threats or displays need a statement by the actor about the target (it is a targeted display of force), or be involved in a particular context that makes the threat very clear. Routine acts (e.g. missile tests) are not displays of force. If the target is not specific, then it is not a display. General statements that if we are defeated, we will use nukes are thus not enough. Finally, even if the supposed target says something, that isn’t enough to make it a display of force (which must be aimed specifically at a target). For example, if USSR protests a US weapons test, the protest does not make the US act a display of force (in the MID sense).
- Seizure: Seizure of private stuff, tuna boats as follows. Seizure if seizure of government material/property, or seizure of private property ONLY if the government of the seized property protests the seizure.
- Occupations: Note that a change of the status quo marks incidents – not necessarily change of the government or UN recognized border. If I occupy territory you claim, even if international law doesn’t recognize it as yours, it could be an occupation.
- Occupation: note that if forces are invited by government, it is not an occupation.
- Occupation vs. violation: We discussed whether the difference between a “violation” and an “occupation” was really that an occupation requires some kind of control, or if it was more the time factor (there are 2 criteria in the coding manual). It was decided that the main difference was time, violations are less than 24 hours, and occupations are more than 24 hours.
- Border violations: Violations are non violent, unlike attacks or clashes.
- Border violations: If an unarmed plane from x flies over y, and x is shot down, then the coding would be that x violated y’s airspace, and y attacks x. If x flies over y, bombs a target in y, and is not shot at (no resistance), then it would be an attack (the border violation was incidental to the

- goal of attacking the target). If x flew a bombing mission over y and was shot down, it would be a clash (the border violation was incidental to the goal of attacking/clashing with the target).
- Border violations: Every overflight would be an incident, whether protested or not. Overflights need not be protested, if we know about them. Knowledge on the part of the target is NOT a requirement for a violation to occur.
  - FOLLOWUP NOTE FROM GLENN PALMER ON THIS ISSUE. This is indeed what we decided, but it still seems very strange to me. You can be in a MID and not know it? What does that mean? It would seem to me that if the use of force by one state against another is meant to accomplish something, at minimal the target must be aware that the action has taken place. Indeed, we require that threats be received, or that there be a reasonable expectation that they've been received, I think for that very reason. But now we say that knowledge that your airspace has been violated is not necessary. Why? I think those two things are inconsistent.
  - We had discussion of spy plane flights over the USSR. Normally, official forces which cross borders, unless there is a specific agreement, is a hostile act. So routine spy overflights would be border violations. The problem is that we usually don't know about them, so can't code them. BUT – we also have a rule that MIDs must be overt. So it seems that some uncertainty remained about general rules in this case.
  - Mobilization: Note that mobilization is of inactive reserves, not just taking new recruits. A recruitment drive is not mobilization.
  - Mobilization: troops continuing to move to the front is not a new mobilization.
  - Mobilization end dates: We recognize that mobilizations are not completed in a day, but we are unable to know when a mobilization is completed. (This is an incident type that continues without a clear end date.) All mobilizations should be coded as occurring (starting and ending) on one day, the first day of the mobilization, although in reality they are likely to continue for many days.
  - Attack: Attack is new name for old code of raid. Attack is one sided and involves only military of one side, while clash involves return fire or involvement of military forces on both sides. If there is no indication of defense, return fire, then it is coded as an attack. If planes are shot down, for instance, it is a clash. If it was an unopposed bombing run, it would be an attack.
  - Alerts should be coded in notes with location or scope when possible, e.g. country-wide, regional, “alerted all forces on border with x.”
  - Issue Type: just because an actor is occupying territory, there should not necessarily be a territorial issue coding. It is a territorial issue only if seeking permanent sovereignty.
  - Issue Type: be sure to give a description, being as specific as possible, e.g. distinguish whether this incident is about a territorial claim to Maine or Michigan, or is seeking overthrow of entire govt. vs. seeking change of one minister. As much as possible for policy issues, give the specific policy the actor is seeking to change.
  - Location: Specific location coding needs to be very specific. Landmarks, town, province, river. Be as specific as possible. Put down as much verbal description of location as possible. It is very helpful if it also says things like “on the border with Y,” “in the territory of Z which is a former colony of Y,” or “In the sea lanes between X and Y, within 20 miles of each.”
  - Location: “Specific Location(s)” to be renamed “Specific Location(s) and Description.”
  - Location type: We discussed whether we wanted any typology, and whether this is the right typology (it is not currently mutually exclusive, meaning of categories was not well documented previously, and the criteria are not the same for each category). Alternative typologies were

discussed and the useful alternatives appeared to be obtainable already through the contiguity data set. The final decision was to drop location type.

- Fatalities: If reports are only of casualties, these CANNOT BE ENTERED AS FATALITIES. However, encourage coders to add notes of type 9 and 10. In some cases, we may be able to code fatality level from casualties on a case by case basis. E.g. if 50 casualties, but carried some bodies away, then could code 1-25 deaths. But, if there is ONLY reference to casualties, and no reference to fatalities, then it will probably be the case that fatalities are missing. Also note that we only want data on MILITARY fatalities, not civilian.

### **MID coding clarifications/notes:**

- MID creation: Common actors, issues, and temporal proximity of incidents define MIDs.
- MID creation: Multiple MIDs may be going on between common actors at the same time, if the issues in dispute are distinct. For instance, India and Pakistan could have MID over Kashmir, and one over Bangladesh, Bay of Bengal at the same time.
- MID Procedures: Initially MID central will generate a list of regional incidents that look like likely candidates for a single MID based on proximity in space and time. MID Central cannot reliably evaluate issue commonality, however, which will be a major part of what the regional center will need to examine (with appropriate contextual information).
- MIDs and common issues: When MID central generates cases, it will try to flag a series of incidents with multiple issues to look at carefully for whether different issues are part of same MID. However, regional coders will have to make the case strongly that there are multiple MIDs if they are overlapping in time and space.
- MIDs and multiple issues: try as much as possible to code only one issue. If multiple issues in a MID, consider whether it is really 2 MIDs.
- MIDs and common incidents: An incident can only be part of 1 MID. Since an incident is defined by issue, time, and space, and MIDs are similarly defined by issue, time, and space, then if 2 MIDs exist they must be about different issues or at different points in time/space, and so they MUST involve different incidents.
- Actors and Targets: Side A (the first state to cross the MID threshold, normally the actor of the first incident in a series) must always be noted. But if the identity of Side A vs. B is unclear, then note this in the notes section.
- MID dates: We **MUST** have the year and month; the day is highly preferred. If best guess is within a couple of days, that's OK, and put the best guess. If within 2 days [e.g. MID started on 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, or 15<sup>th</sup>, and best guess is 13<sup>th</sup>, put 13<sup>th</sup>.
- State participation dates: States can drop in and out, and can switch sides. BUT cannot ever be on opposite sides at same time.
- Beginning and end date coding: We agreed that the wording in the dispute manual was somewhat confusing. The following are a set of clarified rules about coding the end date of MID (and joining incidents into a MID):
  - o The beginning date of a MID is the beginning date of the first incident.
  - o Ending date of a MID is determined in one of several ways. In general, 2 incidents may be part of same MID if they occur within 6 months of each other and are about same issues in essentially the same location. More specifically:
    - If an incident is settled by a formal resolution, then look ahead for 1 month with no further incidents.

- If there is no incident within one month, then the end date of the dispute is backdated to the date of the treaty, which should also mark the end of the incident.
- If another incident DOES occur within one month (and concerning the same issue and location) then the formal resolution does not end the MID, and MID should be coded as continuing through (at least) that next incident.
- If an incident is settled by a cease-fire, or mutual troop withdrawal, then look ahead for 3 months with no further incidents. [Note to Paul Hensel especially: Is this only an explicitly agreed to withdrawal, rather than mutually exhausted retreats?]
- If there is no incident within three months, then the end date of the dispute is backdated to the date of the cease-fire or withdrawal, which should also mark the end of the incident.
- If another incident DOES occur within three months (and concerning the same issue and location) then the cease-fire/withdrawal does not end the MID, and MID should be coded as continuing through (at least) that next incident.
- If an incident is not settled by any type of agreement, then look ahead for 6 months with no further incidents.
  - If there is no incident within six months, then the end date of the dispute is backdated to the end of the incident.
  - If another incident DOES occur within six months (and concerning the same issue and location) then the end of the first incident does not end the MID, and MID should be coded as continuing through (at least) that next incident.
- If an incident is followed by an ongoing action, such as a continuing blockade, occupation, or holding of seized personnel, and this ongoing action continues longer than 6 months after the end of the militarized incident, then the end of the dispute is coded at 6 months after the last other type of militarized incident. In such a case, coders should look for evidence that blockade/occupation continues past 6 months.
  - For example, A occupies B's territory on May 1. On May 10, there is a clash. No further incidents are observed during the year, but there is evidence that occupation continued. This MID runs from May 1 to November 10.
- If an incident is followed by an ongoing action, and this ongoing action continues for less than 6 months and then ends, and there are no other incidents, then the end of the dispute is coded at the end of the blockade/occupation/etc. In such a case, coders should look for clear evidence of when the blockade/occupation ends.
- NOTE that at incident level, ongoing events such as occupations will be coded as ongoing, with actual real (or no settled) end dates. However, MIDs will be coded as ending.
- In the absence of reports of withdrawal, treaty, or other resolutions, we should normally assume that occupation continues, e.g. we assume that Eritrea is still occupying Ethiopia in the MID coding exercise.

- Fatalities: What if we have fatality estimates for only 1 side? We may have to make an estimate, e.g. if 100 fatalities on side A and no info on side B, then might put down category 101-250.
- Fatalities: Fatality info can certainly come from another source than incident reports.
- Outcome type: Glenn Palmer is revising the coding scheme to fit with the intent of prior data set, not the current wording in the coding manual about SQ. The new scheme (possibly a flow chart) looks at whether a settlement clearly favors one side, or is a mutual giving-in.
- Outcome type: initial language suggested a top level decision of “decisive/indecisive.” Because of multiple interpretations, we agreed that new wording was desirable, possibly “Clearly favors one side” or doesn’t.
- Revisionist states: both can be revisionist, or neither can be revisionist.
- Revisionist states are coded based on an overarching description of what the state was as a whole, over the whole dispute. This is a synthetic coding across multiple incidents, focusing on who wished change in the fundamental issues at stake in the MID.
- Revisionist states: Coders should only mark 1,2,3,4 for revisions sought - no text need be added, and text lines will be dropped from coding sheets.
- Revisionist states and multiple revisions sought: coders should try to code only 1 state and only 1 category as revisionist when possible. Coders should THINK TWICE before doing multiple codings. If you think there are actually multiple issues leading to multiple revision types sought, then ask yourself if there should actually be separate MIDs. Only if these sought revisions were linked in some way or clearly pursued together would there be multiple revision types.
- Links: We discussed links, and Paul Hensel provided a useful typology of link types including spillover links (war or dispute spills across border), actor (participant) overlap or temporal actor overlap, historical issue overlap (issue is similar to previous issues), and historical non-issue overlap. However, despite usefulness of new typology, the old data codings of linkage are basically worthless (hopelessly confused) in MID 2.1.
- Links: Final decision was that we will drop section 11, “links to wars or other disputes” as a formal coding sheet category. However, coders should be encouraged to take notes on the relationship of this MID to any other MID (or war, or civil war) if they know it. This will be a type 1 note.
- Wars: A war will terminate (transform?) a dispute. Regional centers will be told when there is a war. But in the absence of this information (or even with it), regional centers should continue gathering information about incidents, although this information may ultimately be superseded by war coding. Note: We discovered that in version 2.1 MIDs that lead to wars are coded as ending when the war ends. This should not affect our incident coding, however.
- If a MID is discovered that looks like a war, send email to Phil Schafer and MID Central and the potential war will then be reviewed.

**Notes for documentation / coding sheets (there are probably others in the above notes):**

- Threats: reception. Note to be added to documentation about a threat being “received:” “or it is reasonable that the threat was/would have been received.” We want to avoid secret threats, but public statements, news reports, etc. are such that a threatened government would see it.
- [Add note to codebook.] Call it “beginning of mobilization” rather than mobilization.
- Add note: “For it to be coded as a clash, there must be some indication of return fire or defense.”
- Rename related incidents to component incidents.
- New language on end dates
- New chart of settlement types

**(Stuart):**

- Include flag in the regional databases (for incidents and disputes) to be marked by MID central marking “finalized” or “problem free” incidents and disputes, which will then be the incidents/disputes that end up in final the “All Incidents” and “All Disputes” databases.
- Similar to above, in data base, perhaps flag/field marking “incident removed” if we need to remove it.
- On coding form, Do we want to add a box for “precise date” or “fuzzy date”? Or, just put this in notes?
- Note plans for some type of inter-coder reliability check sometime during the process.
- Will regions be able to delete incidents once they are entered?
  - o If not, then need a check box accessible to region for “delete record” or “record not to be included.”
  - o If yes, then for cross-regional incident we could simply say that one region will enter and keep a final record, while the 2<sup>nd</sup> region will delete their incident.
  
- Check WWII, Phil Schafer suggests that the issues of March 1939 between Poland and Germany are distinct from the September 1939 issues and dispute!! Issue of Sept 1939 is separate from the Memel dispute of March 1939. This would fix this case...