Codebook for IOCM dataset Version 1.0

Magnus Lundgren
Stockholm University

March 2, 2015

”Institutional Conflict Management Capabilities Data” Code Book

This is the codebook for the Institutional Conflict Management Capabilities (IOCM) data.

Citation: Lundgren, M. (2015) “Conflict management capabilities of peace-brokering international organizations, 1945-2010: A new dataset”, *Conflict Management and Peace Science*.

Selection, data coverage, and sources are described in the article.

List of Variables

Year	The year of observation.
IO name	The name of the international organization (IO). Organizations with predecessor organizations (e.g., African Union has a predecessor organization in the Organization of African Unity) have been given the most recent name for all years.
IO number	Each IO has an individual identity number, as per the International Governmental Organizations Data Set (version 2.1) (Pevehouse & Nordstrom 2003). IOs not listed in Pevehouse & Nordstrom and have been given new numbers: African Union (3761), Andean Community (345) and the Nordic Council (865).
Members	Number of member states in IO in the year of observation.
Membership power	The aggregate material capability of IO members in year of observation, ranging from 0 to 1. Calculated using COW National Materical Capabilities (version 4.0) (Singer et al. 1972) and COW IGO data (version 2.3) (Pevehouse et al. 2004).
Membership polarity	The polarity of the IO as a system of member states, ranging from 0 to 1. The score is calculated by the formula $\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_t}(S_{it})^2-\frac{1}{N_t}}{1-\frac{1}{N_t}}}$, where N_t is the number of members in a given IO in year *t*; S_{it} the proportion of global material capabilities possessed by state *i* in year *t*; and $\sum_{i=1}^{N_t}(S_{it})^2$ the sum of the proportion of global material capabilities possessed by all members of the IO in the year *t*. Further details can be found in Ray and Singer (1973). See also Bueno de Mesquita (1975) and Mansfield (1993). Calculated using COW National Material Ca- pabilities (v4.0) (Singer et al. 1972); COW IGO

	data (v.2.3) (Pevehouse et al. 2004).
Diplomatic interventions capability	A measure of the degree of specialization and institutional support that an IO can mobilize to plan, coordinate and exercise diplomatic instruments. Ordered categorical; 0-4; aggregate of measure of “bureaucratic support”, the scope of bureaucratic support, and “practice”, relevant experience. The ”bureaucratic support” dimension is coded in the following manner: 0: IO lacks a mandate to engage in this area of conflict management; 1: Mandate in treaty or protocol, no specialized institutional support (function is supported via general IO secretariat); 2: Mandate in treaty or protocol, specialized institutional support (specialized department or agency with at least 50 staff members). The ”practice” dimension is coded in the following manner: 0: IO lacks mandate / never exercised capability; 1: Exercised at least once in the last 10 years; 2: Exercised at least five times in different countries in the last 10 years. The scores for ” bureaucratic support” and “practice” are added up to yield a 0-4 point score for the variable.
Diplomatic interventions authorization	Measures the locus of authority on the intergovernmental-supranational dimension, for decisions relating to the use of diplomatic and other non-military non-coercive instruments available to the IO, including mediation, good offices, fact-finding, light observation missions, etc. Categorical; 0-4; 0: No rules for authorizing the use of the relevant capability exist or are formalized. 1: Unanimity or consensus required for authorization (“Consensus”); 2: Majority (simple, qualified, or other) required for authorization (“Majority”); 3: Authorization of the capability delegated to a subset of member states (”Council”); 4: Authorization of the capability delegated to a supranational entity (”Supranational”).
Economic sanctions capability	A measure of the degree of specialization and institutional support that an IO can mobilize to plan, coordinate and exercise economic instruments. Ordered categorical; 0-4; aggregate of measure of “bureaucratic support”, the scope of bureaucratic support, and “practice”, relevant experience. The ”bureaucratic support” dimension is coded in the following manner: 0: IO lacks a mandate to engage in this area of conflict management; 1: Mandate in treaty or protocol, no specialized institutional support (function is supported via general IO secretariat); 2: Mandate in treaty or protocol, specialized institutional

	support (specialized department or agency with at least 50 staff members). The ”practice” dimension is coded in the following manner: 0: IO lacks mandate / never exercised capability; 1: Exercised at least once in the last 10 years; 2: Exercised at least five times in different countries in the last 10 years. The scores for ” bureaucratic support” and “practice” are added up to yield a 0-4 point score for the variable.
Economic sanctions authorization	Measures the locus of authority on the intergovernmental-supranational dimension, for decisions relating to the use of economic and other non-military coercive instruments available to the IO, including economic sanctions and suspension from IO.Categorical; 0-4; 0: No rules for authorizing the use of the relevant capability exist or are formalized. 1: Unanimity or consensus required for authorization (“Consensus”); 2: Majority (simple, qualified, or other) required for authorization (“Majority”); 3: Authorization of the capability delegated to a subset of member states (”Council”);
Field mission capability	A measure of the degree of specialization and institutional support that an IO can mobilize to plan, coordinate and exercise military instruments, primarily peacekeeping and military monitoring missions. Ordered categorical; 0-4; aggregate of measure of “bureaucratic support”, the scope of bureaucratic support, and “practice”, relevant experience. The ”bureaucratic support” dimension is coded in the following manner: 0: IO lacks a mandate to engage in this area of conflict management; 1: Mandate in treaty or protocol, no specialized institutional support (function is supported via general IO secretariat); 2: Mandate in treaty or protocol, specialized institutional support (specialized department or agency with at least 50 staff members). The ”practice” dimension is coded in the following manner: 0: IO lacks mandate / never exercised capability; 1: Exercised at least once in the last 10 years; 2: Exercised at least five times in different countries in the last 10 years. The scores for ” bureaucratic support” and “practice” are added up to yield a 0-4 point score for the variable.
Field mission authorization	Categorical; 0-4; 0: No rules for authorizing the use of the relevant capability exist or are formalized. 1: Unanimity or consensus required for authorization (“Consensus”); 2: Majority (simple, qualified, or other) required for

	authorization (“Majority”); 3: Authorization of the capability delegated to a subset of member states (”Council”); 4: Authorization of the capability delegated to a supranational entity (”Supranational”).
Budget	The total budget of the IO, in US dollars, in year of observation. For years where data was not available, data have been interpolated from available data. Missing for some IOs.
Collective security	A variable indicating if the IO has adopted the principle of collective security or other arrangements amounting to collective security. 0: No collective security. 1: Collective security arrangement in place.
Confidence-building measures (CBMs)	A variable indicating if the IO has established confidence-building measures. 0: None 1: Treaty or protocol specifies that exchange of views, military information exchange, transparency dialogues or other CBMs should take place with regularity.
Early warning	A variable indicating if the IO has established an early warning system. 0: No early warning system has been established. 1: Early warning system has been established, including bureaucratic support for the provision of analysis and policy guidance of risk factors and emerging crises.