Coding instructions and codebooks

For the case studies in the PhD thesis *After Reform: Procedural Justice and the Legitimacy of International institutions*

By Vegard Tørstad

General coding instructions

1. The first step in the coding procedure is identifying which parts of the documents that should be coded or not. In the UNFCCC documents, all sections in which states discuss the Paris Agreement or Copenhagen Accord are coded. In the GATT General Council and WTO Dispute Settlement Body verbatim records, states' discussions of the adoption of panel reports are coded. That is, the agenda items that are about a specific panel report. In the UNGA debates, only text under the agenda items "Report of the Security Council" or "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters" are coded. Under these agenda items all sections are coded, except statements by Presidents of the General Assembly (who chairs the debates) and the President of the Security Council (who introduces SC report to GA).
2. After locating the relevant sections that are to be coded, the next step is to look for legitimacy statements within that section. A legitimacy statement is characterized by an institutional member state or country group expressing a sentiment toward the given institution. A coding unit is therefore generally characterized by three components at minimum: a country, a sentiment and a reference to the Council. For example: "Cuba values the Security Council." (constructed example). Note that sometimes, there will be no legitimacy statements in the designated sections of a document. If so, no coding is undertaken.
3. Sentiment is generally characterized by a verb or adjective that expresses either support or dissatisfaction. The codebook below contains lists of sentiment verbs and adjectives that the coder should look for. However, it should be noted that occasionally a country may express sentiment without using verbs or adjectives. Legitimacy statements are coded in such cases also, as long as it is possible to identify a sentiment in the statement.
4. Sentiments are divided into two categories: positive or negative. Since all coding units have to contain a sentiment, all coding units are classified as either positive or negative.
5. After deciding on whether the coding unit expresses positive or negative sentiment, the coder should assess whether the coding unit contains a justification. A justification is any information that the country expresses as a reason for its sentiment.
6. A coding unit either contains:

   a. Only an actor's sentiment toward the institution, or
   b. An actor's sentiment + a justification for (or elaboration of) that sentiment.
7. If there is no clear justification for the sentiment, the coding unit should be given the code "diffuse." This is the case for the "Cuba" example described in bullet point 2 above.
8. If the actor expresses a justification for the sentiment, the coding unit is coded as a "specific" legitimacy statement. Specific legitimacy statements are either coded as "procedural" or "outcome"; see codebook for details.

Quasi-sentences and natural sentences

The coding unit is a quasi-sentence, which is defined as one identifiable message or argument. In the documents coded for this analysis, states often express one unique message or argument per sentence. In these cases, one quasi-sentence equals one natural sentence. The general rule for the coder is therefore that one legitimacy statement equals the length of a natural sentence. This is the case for the vast majority of the legitimacy statements coded for this analysis. However, there are exceptions to that rule. One natural sentence may comprise several legitimacy statements, and occasionally several sentences jointly comprise one legitimacy statement. The paragraphs below describe when to split natural sentences into two or more coding units and when to combine two or more natural sentences into a coding unit.

When to split a natural sentence into two or more coding units

A natural sentence is divided into two or more coding units if it contains more than one unique argument. Unique arguments are most often separated by either punctuation (e.g. commas or semicolons) or conjunctions (e.g. "and"). A general rule is that if it makes sense to split up the sentence into a meaningful bullet point list, the sentence likely contains several legitimacy statements (Werner, Lacewell, and Volkens 2015). Note, however, that even though punctuation or conjunctions *can* indicate that a sentence should be split up to several legitimacy statements, there is no automaticity. The rules for dividing up natural sentences are as follows. A natural sentence is divided into two or more legitimacy statements if:

- The sentence contains two or more unique sentiments, or
- The sentiment refers to two or more unique sources of legitimacy.

This rule means, for example, that one sentiment and two sources of legitimacy are coded as two legitimacy statements, and that one source of legitimacy and two sentiments are coded as two legitimacy statements.

When to code two or more natural sentences as one coding unit

Sometimes, a coding unit consists of more than a single sentence. The important thing to look for is a sentiment and the justification or source for that sentiment. Consider the following quote:

> "We appreciate the assessments that have been prepared by the successive Presidents of the Council in recent months. These documents are useful instruments in helping us to understand better what is happening." (Mexico, A/52/PV.38)

The first sentence in the coding unit above contains a positive sentiment ("appreciate"). However, it is not possible to understand simply from that sentence what causes the positive sentiment, since the sentence does not contain any justification. The second sentence elaborates on the first: the documents are important for "helping us to understand better what is happening". Hence the coding unit becomes a specific instead of a diffuse legitimacy statement. It is given the codes: positive, specific, procedural.

When to not code separate legitimacy statements

There are two main rules for when separate legitimacy statements should not be coded:

1. Repeated messages are not coded as separate legitimacy statements. Repeated messages are defined as legitimacy statements that comprise the same sentiment *and* the same legitimacy source repeated two or more times without any intervening text. For example: "We commend the continuing trend towards greater transparency in the Council's work and note with appreciation the increasing openness of the Council." (Romania, 2004, A/59/PV.29)). That legitimacy statement is repeated because "transparency" and "openness" are synonyms.
2. Examples are not coded as separate legitimacy statements. If an actor lists examples to illustrate an argument, these examples are not coded.

What counts as a "sentiment"?

Sentiment is here defined as an evaluative statement. Since this study is about states' perceptions of the legitimacy of international institutions, only states' evaluative statements of the given institutions are coded. Evaluative statements comprise various types of words and formulations. They can be adjectives, adverbs, verbs, or nouns, in both simple and compound form. The essential point is that there is some sort of evaluation of the institution in question. There are four rules for when to code sentiment or not:

1. Only sentiment that expresses a clear and direct evaluation of the given institution is coded. In general, neutral words such as "we note that…" or "we observe that…" are not sentiments by themselves. Hence sentences beginning with such neutral expressions are not coded. However, expressions of this kind can be coded if they are combined with adjectives or adverbs. For example: "we regrettably observe that…", or "we note that the repugnant practice of the veto is still in place."
2. Counterfactual conditional sentiment, e.g. "it would be good if the Security Council could be more transparent", is not coded.
3. Repeated sentiments within the same coding unit are not coded separately. Two or more synonymous or quasi-synonymous sentiments that refer to the same source of legitimacy are only coded as one legitimacy statement. Take the following sentence: "Senegal shares the view of the majority of States that the right to veto is inequitable, discriminatory and anachronistic." (Senegal 2004, A/59/PV.26). That

sentence is only coded as one legitimacy statement, although it contains three negatively laden adjectives. The reason is that the adjectives all describe a similar negative sentiment toward the right to veto. This is an example of repeated sentiment.

4. If there is any doubt on whether a statement contains a sentiment or not, the statement is not coded.

Table S1. Codebook for UNFCCC case

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
Part A: Positive legitimacy statements		"Adequate"; "appreciate/appreciation"; "appropriate"; "commend"; "content"; "encouraging/encouraged"; "historic"; "important"; "impressive"; "improved/improvement"; "pleased"; "positive"; "progress"; "relevant/relevance"; "remarkable"; "respect"; "satisfaction/satisfied"; "significant"; "strong"; "succeed/success/successfully"; "support"; "useful"; "welcome"
A.1. Diffuse support	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement without specifying any reason or source for the support.	
A.1.1. Acceptance or importance	Evaluative statements in which member states express acceptance or signal importance of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	"Accept"; "best chance/best hope/best we can get"; "conditional support"; "first step"; "important/importance"; "step forward"; "support"
A.1.2. Commitment	Evaluative statements in which member states express commitment toward COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	"Committed"; "dedicated"; "determined"; "loyal"; "trust";
A.1.3. Compliance intention or urging	Evaluative statements in which member states express an intention to implement or comply with the Copenhagen Accord or Paris Agreement, present evidence of compliance, or urge other states to comply.	"Associate"; "comply"; "entry into force"; "fulfil/fulfilment"; "honor"; "implement"; "into effect"; "operationalize"; "put into action/practice" "ratify/ratification";

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
A.2 Specific support: outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the outcome performance of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement, including the substance and consequences of the two climate agreements and states' compliance with these.	
A.2.1 Ambition level	Evaluative statements in which states express that the outcome of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement is ambitious.	"Action", "action plan", "ambitious", "dynamic", "effective", "empowering", "gives hope", "necessary step", "monumental", "outcome", "potential", "prevents climate change/global warming", "signal/signals", "solid ground", "step forward", "temperature goal (1.5C/2C)"
A.2.2 Compliance	Evaluative statements in which states express positive evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement with reference to parties' compliance with the agreements.	
A.2.3 Fair or balanced (differentiation)	Evaluative statements in which states express positive evaluations of the outcomes of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement because the agreements are fair or balanced.	"Balance/balanced", "common but differentiated responsibilities", "equitable/equity", "fair/fairness", "just/justice", "principles of the Convention", "progressive"
A.2.4 Issue coverage	Evaluative statements in which states express positive evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement with reference to the inclusion of certain issues.	"Adaptation", "carbon pricing", "climate finance", "comprehensive", "Green Climate Fund", "human rights", "loss and damage", "REDD+", "sustainable development", "technology mechanism", "transparency mechanism"
A.2.5 Legal nature	Evaluative statements in which states express positive evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement with reference to the legal nature of the climate agreement in question.	"Legal", "legal instrument", "legally binding"

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
A.3. Specific support: procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the decision-making procedures or working methods of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	
A.3.1 Inclusiveness or participation	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of inclusiveness or participation of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	"All countries/parties/states", "applicable to all", "collective", "common effort", "consensus"; "inclusive/inclusiveness", "interact/interaction"; "major economies/emitters"; "multilateral"; "participate/participation"; "play/played a role"; "large number of countries", "voluntary"; "[x] number of countries/parties/states"; "widespread", "universal"
A.3.1 Presidency	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the COP presidencies at COP15 or COP21.	"Danish/Denmark", "France/French", "leadership", "presidency/president"
Part B: Negative legitimacy statements		"Concern/concerned"; "deficient/deficit"; "disappoint/disappointed/disappointment"; "[x] does not meet expectations"; "fail/failure"; "inability"; "ineffective"; "inequitable"; "injustice"; "lack of"; "outdated"; "paralysis/paralyzed"; "prejudice"; "regret/regrettably"; "unacceptable"; "undesirable" "unfortunate/unfortunately"; "unjust"; "unsatisfactory"
B.1. Diffuse critique	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement without specifying any reason or source for the support.	
B.1.3. Compliance refusal	Evaluative statements in which member states express a refusal to implement or comply with the Copenhagen Accord or Paris Agreement, or urge other states to not comply.	"Associate"; "comply"; "entry into force"; "fulfil/fulfilment"; "honor"; "implement"; "into effect"; "operationalize"; "put into action/practice" "ratify/ratification";
B.1.1. Unacceptance or unimportance	Evaluative statements in which member states express non-acceptance or	"Failed/failure"; "insignificant"; "not accept/acceptable"; "unimportant";

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
	unimportance of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	
B.1.2. Uncommitted	Evaluative statements in which member states express that they are not committed toward COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	"Not committed"; "uncommitted";
B.2. Specific critique: outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the outcome performance of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement, including the substance and consequences of the two climate agreements and states' compliance with these.	
A.2.1 Ambition level	Evaluative statements in which states express that the outcome of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement is unambitious.	"Action", "action plan", "ineffective", "outcome", "potential", "climate change/global warming", "signal/signals", "temperature goal (1.5C/2C)", "unambitious",
A.2.2 Issue coverage	Evaluative statements in which states express negative evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement with reference to the (lack of) inclusion of certain issues.	"Adaptation", "carbon pricing", "climate finance", "Green Climate Fund", "human rights", "loss and damage", "REDD+", "sustainable development", "technology mechanism", "transparency mechanism"
A.2.2 Compliance (lack of)	Evaluative statements in which states express negative evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement with reference to parties' lack of compliance with the agreements.	"Lack of compliance"; "not honored"; "not fulfilled"; "unkept promises"
A.2.4 Legal nature	Evaluative statements in which states express negative evaluations of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement with reference to the legal nature of the climate agreement in question.	"Legal", "legal instrument", "legally binding"

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
A.2.5 Unfair or unbalanced (differentiation)	Evaluative statements in which states express negative evaluations of the outcomes of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement because the agreements are unfair or unbalanced.	"Balance/balanced", "common but differentiated responsibilities", "equitable/equity", "fair/fairness", "just/justice", "principles of the Convention", "progressive"
B.3. Specific critique: procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the decision-making procedures or working methods of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	
B.3.1 Inclusiveness or participation	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of inclusiveness or participation of COP15/the Copenhagen accord or COP21/the Paris Agreement.	"All countries/parties/states", "applicable to all", "collective", "common effort", "consensus"; "inclusive/inclusiveness", "interact/interaction"; "major economies/emitters"; "multilateral"; "participate/participation"; "play/played a role"; "large number of countries", "voluntary"; "[x] number of countries/parties/states"; "widespread", "universal"
B.3.1 Presidency	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the COP presidencies at COP15 or COP21.	"Danish/Denmark", "France/French", "leadership", "presidency/president"

Table S2. Codebook for GATT/WTO case

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
Part A: Positive legitimacy statements		"Adequate"; "appreciate/appreciation"; "appropriate"; "commend"; "content"; "encouraging/encouraged"; "important"; "impressive"; "improved/improvement"; "pleased"; "positive"; "progress"; "relevant/relevance"; "remarkable"; "respect"; "satisfaction/satisfied"; "significant"; "strong"; "succeed/success/successfully"; "support"; "useful"; "welcome"

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
A.1. Diffuse support	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the WTO DSS or its Appellate Body without specifying any reason or source for the support.	
A.1.1. AB Commitment	Evaluative statements in which member states express commitment toward the WTO DSS Appellate Body.	"Committed"; "dedicated"; "determined"; "loyal"; "trust"; "support"
A.1.2. AB Compliance intention or urging	Evaluative statements in which member states express an intention to comply with WTO DSS Appellate Body decisions or urge other member states to do so.	"Comply"; "implement"
A.1.3. AB Institutional importance	Evaluative statements in which member states express that the AB is an important or relevant institution.	"Authority"; "central role"; "credible"; "corrected Panel report [x]"; "cornerstone"; "legitimate"; "importance"; "irreplaceable"; "reversed Panel report [x]"; "unique"; "vital"
A.1.4. WTO DSS Commitment	Evaluative statements in which member states express commitment toward the WTO DSS.	"Committed"; "dedicated"; "determined"; "loyal"; "trust"; "support"
A.1.5. WTO DSS Compliance intention or urging	Evaluative statements in which member states express an intention to comply with WTO DSS Panel reports or urge other member states to do so.	"Comply"; "implement"
A.1.6. WTO DSS Institutional importance	Evaluative statements in which member states express that the WTO DSS is an important or relevant institution.	"Authority"; "central role"; "credibility/credible"; "cornerstone"; "legitimate"; "importance"; "irreplaceable"; unique"; "vital"
A.2 Specific support: outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the WTO DSS' or WTO AB's outcome performance, including the substance and consequences of Panel reports and states' compliance with these.	
A.2.1 AB Confer outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the WTO AB's reports, including the reports' findings,	"Compliance"; "findings"; "obligations"; "measures"; "report"; "results";

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
	consequences, and states' compliance with the reports.	
A.2.2 WTO DSS Confer outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the WTO DSS' Panel reports, including the reports' findings, consequences, and states' compliance with the reports.	"Compliance"; "findings"; "obligations"; "measures"; "report"; "results";
A.3. Specific support: procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the WTO DSS' or WTO AB's procedural performance, including the application of WTO rules and law in Panel reports.	
A.3.1. AB Confer procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the WTO AB's decision-making procedures and working methods, including the legal basis and reasoning of AB reports.	"Analysis"; "article [x]"; "judicial"; "jurisprudence"; "law/legal/legality"; "interpret/interpretation"; "investigate/investigation"; "legal interpretation"; "reasoned/reasoning"; "review"; "standard of review"; "weighing of evidence"; "work/worked"
A.3.2 WTO DSS Confer procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the WTO DSS' decision-making procedures and working methods, including the legal basis and reasoning of DSS Panel reports.	"Analysis"; "article [x]"; "judicial"; "jurisprudence"; "law/legal/legality"; "interpret/interpretation"; "investigate/investigation"; "legal interpretation"; ""reasoned/reasoning"; "review"; "standard of review"; "weighing of evidence"; "work/worked"
Part B: Negative legitimacy statements		"Concern/concerned"; "deficient/deficit"; "disappoint/disappointed/disappointment"; "[x] does not meet expectations"; "fail/failure"; "inability"; "ineffective"; "inequitable"; "injustice"; "lack of"; "outdated"; "paralysis/paralyzed"; "prejudice"; "regret/regrettably"; "unacceptable"; "undesirable" "unfortunate/unfortunately"; "unjust"; "unsatisfactory"
B.1. Diffuse critique	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the WTO DSS or its Appellate Body without specifying any reason or source for the support.	

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
B.1.1. AB Commitment	Evaluative statements in which member states express that they are uncommitted to the WTO DSS Appellate Body.	"[un]commitment/[un]committed"; "obligated/obligation";
B.1.2. AB Compliance	Evaluative statements in which member states express a refusal to comply with WTO DSS Appellate Body Panel reports or urge other member states to refuse to comply.	"Comply"; "implement"
B.1.3. AB Institutional importance	Evaluative statements in which member states express that the AB is an unimportant or irrelevant institution.	"Authority"; "credible/credibility"; "[un]important/importance"
B.1.4. WTO DSS Commitment	Evaluative statements in which member states express that they are uncommitted to the WTO DSS.	"[un]commitment/[un]committed"; "obligated/obligation";
B.1.5. WTO DSS Compliance	Evaluative statements in which member states express a refusal to comply with WTO DSS Panel reports or urge other member states to refuse to comply.	"Comply"; "implement"
B.1.6. WTO DSS Institutional importance	Evaluative statements in which member states express that the AB is an unimportant or irrelevant institution.	"Authority"; "credible/credibility"; "[un]important/importance"
B.2. Specific critique: outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the WTO DSS' or WTO AB's outcome performance, including the substance and consequences of Panel reports and states' compliance with these.	
B.2.1. AB Withhold outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the WTO AB's reports, including the reports' findings, consequences, and states' compliance with the reports.	"Compliance"; "findings"; "obligations"; "measures"; "report"; "results";

Name	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
B.2.2. WTO DSS Withhold outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the WTO DSS' Panel reports, including the reports' findings, consequences, and states' compliance with the reports.	"Compliance"; "findings"; "obligations"; "measures"; "report"; "results";
B.3. Specific critique: procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the WTO DSS' or WTO AB's procedural performance, including the application of WTO rules and law in Panel reports.	
B.3.1. AB Withhold procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the WTO AB's decision-making procedures and working methods, including the legal basis and reasoning of AB reports.	"Analysis"; "article [x]"; "judicial"; "jurisprudence"; "law/legal/legality"; "interpret/interpretation"; "investigate/investigation"; "legal interpretation"; "reasoned/reasoning"; "review"; "standard of review"; "weighing of evidence"; "work/worked"
B.3.2. WTO DSS Withhold procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the WTO DSS' decision-making procedures and working methods, including the legal basis and reasoning of DSS Panel reports	"Analysis"; "article [x]"; "judicial"; "jurisprudence"; "law/legal/legality"; "interpret/interpretation"; "investigate/investigation"; "legal interpretation"; ""reasoned/reasoning"; "review"; "standard of review"; "weighing of evidence"; "work/worked"

Table S3. Codebook for UNSC case

Coding categories and indicators	Description	Dictionary (non-exhaustive)
Part A: Positive statements	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council.	"Adequate"; "appreciate/appreciation"; "appropriate"; "commend"; "content"; "encouraging/encouraged"; "important"; "impressive"; "improved/improvement"; "pleased"; "positive"; "progress"; "relevant/relevance"; "remarkable"; "respect"; "satisfaction/satisfied"; "significant"; "strong"; "succeed/success/successfully"; "support"; "useful"; "welcome"
A.1. Diffuse support	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UNSC without specifying any specific reason for the support.	
a. Commitment	Evaluative statements in which member states express commitment toward the UNSC.	"Committed"; "dedicated"; "determined"; "loyal"; "trust"; "support"
b. Compliance	Evaluative statements in which member states express an intention to comply with UNSC resolutions or urge other member states to do so.	"Comply"; "implement"
c. Institutional importance	Evaluative statements in which member states express that the UNSC is an important institution.	"Authority"; "central role"; "cornerstone"; "legitimate"; "credibility"; "importance"; "irreplaceable"; "unique"; "vital"
A.2. Specific support: outcome legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's outcome performance and the outputs produced.	
a. Actions or resolutions	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN	"Action; "activity"; "decision"; "issue"; "measure"; "resolution [number x]"; "respond/response"

	Security Council's actions or resolutions produced.	
b. African conflicts	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, African conflicts.	"Africa", "[African country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Africa]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in Africa]"
c. Asian conflicts	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, Asian conflicts.	"Asia", "[Asian country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Asia]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in Asia]"
d. Broad scope of issues	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, issues that are "broader" than traditional security concerns.	"Expansion of the concept of security"; "broad set of issues"; "non-military threats"
e. Compliance	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to induce compliance with its decisions or resolutions.	"Compliance"; "implementation"
f. Conflict prevention	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's engagement in conflict prevention.	"Conflict prevention"; "prevention"; "prevention of conflict"
g. Conflict resolution	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's engagement in conflict resolution.	"Addressing conflict [x]"; "conflict resolution"; "regional conflicts"; "resolution of conflict [x]"; "contain conflict [x]"
h. Counterterrorism	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's counterterrorism efforts.	"11 September 2001"; "combat terrorism"; "counterterrorism"; "counterterrorism committee"; "fight terrorism"; "terrorism"

i. Effectiveness	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's effectiveness.	"Effective"
j. European conflicts	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, European conflicts.	"Europe", "[European country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Europe]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in the Europe]"
k. Humanitarian issues	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's engagement with humanitarian issues.	"Humanitarian"
l. Latin American conflicts	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, Latin American conflicts.	"Latin America", "South America"; "Central America"; "Caribbean" "[Latin American country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Latin America]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in Latin America]"
m. Maintenance of peace and security	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to "maintain peace and security", which is the Council's defined mandate in the UN Charter.	"Mandate"; "maintenance"; "peace and security"; "provisions of the Charter"; "peace"; "security"
n. Middle East conflicts	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, conflicts in the Middle East.	"Middle East"; "[African country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in the Middle East]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in the Middle East]"
o. Non-proliferation and arms control	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's efforts in non-proliferation and arms control.	"Arms control"; "missile"; "non-proliferation"; "nuclear"; "proliferation"; "weapons"
p. Peacebuilding	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN	"Peacebuilding"; "peace-building"; "Peacebuilding Commission"

	Security Council's peacebuilding efforts.	
q. Peacekeeping	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's peacekeeping efforts.	"Peacekeeping"; "peacekeeping operation"; "peacekeeping mandate"; "peace-keeping"; "peace operation"
r. Protection of civilians	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's efforts to protect civilians in conflict.	"Children"; "civilians"; "women"; "children and women"; "women and peace"
s. Sanctions	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's use of sanctions.	"Sanctions"; "Sanctions Committee"
A.3. Specific support: procedural legitimacy	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's decision-making procedures and working methods.	
a. Accountability	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to act on behalf of, and report its activities to, the General Assembly, as defined in Articles 15 and 24 of the UN Charter.	"Accountability/accountable"; "annual report"; "Article 15"; "Article 24"; "on behalf of";
b. Arria-formula meetings	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's use of Arria-formula meetings.	"Arria-formula meetings"; "Arriaformula meetings"; "Arria meetings"
c. Cooperation with regional organizations	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's cooperation with regional organizations.	"African Union/AU"; "Economic Community of West African States/ECOWAS"; "European Union/EU"; "regional institutions"; "regional organizations"

d. Deliberation	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's practices related to deliberations and dialogue.	"Deliberate/deliberation"; "dialogue"; "exchange of ideas"; "exchange of views"; "interactive/interactivity"
e. Expert briefings	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's practice of holding expert briefings.	"Briefings by [person x] or [institution x]"; "briefings from UN officials"; "envoys"; "expertise"; "expert briefing"; "special knowledge"
f. Field missions	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's practice of conducting field missions or field visits to investigate any dispute or situation which might threaten international peace and security.	"Ad-hoc mission"; "fact-finding"; "fact-finding mission"; "field mission"; "field visit"; "mission"; "special mission"; "visit"
g. GA/ECOSOS cooperation	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the cooperation, interaction, or relationship between the UN Security Council and the General Assembly (GA) or the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOS).	"Economic and Social Council/ECOSOS"; "general membership"; "General Assembly/GA"; "interaction"; "/larger/wider United Nations membership"; "relationship"
h. Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the Council's "Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters".	"Informal Working Group"; "Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Matters"
i. Note 507	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of UN Security Council's Presidential Note 507.	"507"; "S/2006/507"; "S/2010/507"; "S/2017/507"; "presidential note on working methods"; "working methods note"
j. Office of the Ombudsperson for the Sanctions Committee	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the Office	"Ombudsperson"

	of the Ombudsperson for the Sanctions Committee.	
k. Open-ended working group	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the relationship between the UN Security Council and the "Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters related to the Security Council", which is a group created by the General Assembly. Note: coding for this indicator should only occur when a state discusses the way that the Security Council has interacted with the group or the group's proposals. No coding should occur when a state discusses the internal affairs or progress of the group in itself, including the so-called "intergovernmental negotiations", since the Open-ended Working Group originates in the General Assembly and not the Council.	"Open-ended working group"; "Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters related to the Security Council"
l. Participation	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of UN member states' opportunities to participate in the UN Security Council's decision-making procedures. This indicator captures various practices related to inclusiveness and states' opportunity to express their views	"Consultations"; "engagement with the wider membership"; "include/inclusive/inclusiveness"; "input"; "friends of the Secretary-General"; "group of friends"; "interaction between members and non-members"; "involve/involving/involvement"; "open meeting"; "open session"; "opportunities for input"; "participate/participation"; "public meeting"; "public debate"; "resolution 1353"; "troop-contributing countries"; "views of member states"; "views of non-members"; "voice"

	in the decision-making of the Security Council. Note: one-way communication practices (communication from the Security Council to the general membership) are coded as "transparency", while two-way communication practices (communication between the Council and the general membership) are coded as "participation".	
m. Private meetings	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's practice of conducting private meetings.	"Private meeting"
n. Provisional rules of procedure	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's rules of procedure.	"Provisional rules of procedure"; "rules of procedure"
o. Sanctions committee	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the work of the UN Security Council's sanctions committee.	"Sanctions committee"
p. Structure or composition of the Council	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the structure or composition of the UN Security Council	"Composition"; "structure";
q. Subsidiary bodies	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the work of the UN Security Council's Subsidiary bodies.	"Subsidiary body"; "subsidiary organ"
r. Thematic debates or issues	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN	"Thematic debate"; "thematic issue"; "theme"

	Security Council's practice of conducting thematic debates.	
s. Transparency	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the degree of transparency and/or openness in the UN Security Council's work. This indicator captures various practices related to how informed the general membership is of the Security Council's work, including the reporting practices of the Security Council to the General Assembly. Note: one-way communication practices (communication from the Security Council to the general membership) are coded as "transparency", while two-way communication practices (communication between the Council and the general membership) are coded as "participation".	"Access/accessible"; "announce/announcement"; "briefings"; "communication"; "document/documentation"; "information"; "Journal of United Nations"; "monthly assessments"; "open/openness"; "orientation"; "programme of work"; "report/reporting"; "summary"; "transparent/transparency"; "wrap-up sessions"
t. Veto power	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the permanent members' right to veto.	"Prerogative or privilege of permanent member(s)"; "veto"; "veto power"
u. Working methods	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the working methods or procedures of the UN Security Council.	"Decision-making"; "method(s) of work"; "practice(s)"; "procedure(s)"; "work"; "working method [x]; "working methods"
v. Wrap-up sessions	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's practice of conducting wrap-up sessions.	"wrap-up meeting; "wrap-up session"

Part B: Negative statements		"Anachronistic"; "concern/concerned"; "deficient/deficit"; "disappoint/disappointed/disappointment"; "[x] does not meet expectations"; "fail/failure"; "inability"; "ineffective"; "inequitable"; "injustice"; "lack of"; "outdated"; "paralysis/paralyzed"; "regret/regrettably"; "secrecy"; "unacceptable"; "unfortunate/unfortunately"; "unjust"; "unsatisfactory"
B.1. Diffuse critique	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UNSC without specifying any specific reason for the support.	
a. Commitment	Evaluative statements in which member states express that they are uncommitted to the UNSC.	
b. Compliance	Evaluative statements in which member states express an intention to not comply with UNSC resolutions or urge other member states to not comply.	
c. Institutional importance, legitimacy or credibility	Evaluative statements in which member states express that the UNSC is not an important or relevant institution.	
B.2. Specific critique: outcomes	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's performance and the outcomes produced.	
a. Actions or resolutions	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's (lack of) actions or resolutions.	"Action; "activity"; "decision"; "inaction" "issue"; "measure"; "resolution [number x]"; "respond/response"
b. African conflicts	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or	"Africa", "[African country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Africa]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in Asia]"

	(lack of) involvement in, African conflicts.	
c. Asian conflicts	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or (lack of) involvement in, Asian conflicts.	"Asia", "[Asian country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Asia]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in the Asia]"
d. Broad scope of issues	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, issues that are "broader" than traditional security concerns.	"Expansion of the concept of security"; "broad set of issues"; "non-military threats"
e. Compliance	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to induce compliance with its decisions or resolutions.	"Compliance"; "implementation"
f. Conflict prevention	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's (lack of) engagement in conflict prevention.	"Conflict prevention"; "prevention"; "prevention of conflict"
g. Conflict resolution	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's (lack of) engagement in conflict resolution.	"Addressing conflict [x]"; "conflict resolution"; "regional conflicts"; "resolution of conflict [x]"; "contain conflict [x]"
h. Counterterrorism	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's (lack of) engagement in counterterrorism efforts.	"11 September 2001"; "combat terrorism"; "counterterrorism"; "counterterrorism committee"; "fight terrorism"; "terrorism"
i. Effectiveness	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's effectiveness.	"Effective"

j. European conflicts	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or (lack of) involvement in, European conflicts.	"Europe", "[European country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Europe]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in the Europe]"
k. Humanitarian issues	Evaluative statements that express positive evaluations of the UN Security Council's (lack of) engagement with humanitarian issues.	"Humanitarian"
l. Latin American and Central American conflicts	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, Latin American conflicts.	"Latin America", "South America"; "Central America"; "Caribbean" "[Latin American country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in Latin America]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in Latin America]"
m. Maintenance of peace and security	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to "maintain peace and security", which is the Council's defined mandate in the UN Charter.	"Mandate"; "maintenance"; "peace and security"; "provisions of the Charter"; "peace"; "security"
n. Middle East conflicts	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's handling of, or involvement in, conflicts in the Middle East.	"Middle East"; "[African country x]"; "[UNSC mission to country x in the Middle East]"; "[UNSC action regarding country x in the Middle East]"
o. Non-proliferation and arms control	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's efforts in non-proliferation and arms control.	"Arms control"; "missile"; "non-proliferation"; "nuclear"; "proliferation"; "weapons"
p. Peacebuilding	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's peacebuilding efforts.	"Peacebuilding"; "peace-building"; "Peacebuilding Commission"

q. Peacekeeping	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's peacekeeping efforts.	"Peacekeeping"; "peacekeeping operation"; "peacekeeping mandate"; "peace-keeping"; "peace operation"
r. Protection of civilians	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's efforts to protect civilians in conflict.	"Children"; "civilians"; "women"; "children and women"; "women and peace"
s. Sanctions	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's use of sanctions.	"Sanctions"; "Sanctions Committee"
B.3. Specific critique: procedures		
a. Chapter VII	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's adoption of chapter VII resolutions.	"Article 41; "article 42; "Chapter VII"
b. Closed meetings	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's practice of holding closed meetings.	"Closed doors"; "closed meeting"
c. Cooperation with regional organizations	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's (lack of) cooperation with regional organizations.	"African Union/AU"; "Economic Community of West African States/ECOWAS"; "European Union/EU"; "regional institutions"; "regional organizations"
d. Implementation of working methods reform	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's (lack of) implementation of working methods reform.	"implementation of Presidential Note 507 or S/507"; "implementation of working methods practice [x]"
e. Lack of accountability	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to act on	"Accountability/accountable"; "annual report"; "Article 15"; "Article 24"; "obligation to report"; "on behalf of"

	behalf of, and report its activities to, the General Assembly, as defined in Articles 15 and 24 of the UN Charter.	
f. Lack of consensus	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to reach consensus in decision-making procedures.	"Consensus"
g. Lack of deliberation or interactivity	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's practices related to deliberations and dialogue.	"Deliberate/deliberation"; "dialogue"; "exchange of ideas"; "exchange of views"; "[meting x is a] formality"; "interactive/interactivity"; "pro forma"; "quality of discussions"; "ritual/ritualistic"
h. Lack of democracy	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's degree of democracy in decision-making procedures	"Democratic"; "democratization"; "non-democratic"; "undemocratic"
i. Lack of GA/ECOSOS cooperation	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the cooperation, interaction, or relationship between the UN Security Council and the General Assembly (GA) or the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOS).	"Autonomy of the Security Council"; "autonomous entity"; "competence"; "encroach on GA/ECOSOS"; "issue [x] falls within the purview of the GA/ECOSOS; "jurisdiction of GA/ECOSOS"; "GA/ECOSOS is disadvantaged/ignored/marginalized"; "relations or relationship between GA/ECOSOS and Security Council";
j. Lack of impartiality	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to act impartially in maintaining international peace and security.	"Bias"; "discriminate/discrimination"; "double standards"; "lack of impartiality"; "lack of independent review"; "lack of uniform standard"; "one-sided"; "selectivity"
k. Lack of participation	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of UN member states' opportunities to participate in the UN Security	"Consultations"; "contribute"; "engagement with the wider membership"; "exclude/exclusive/exclusiveness"; "include/inclusive/inclusiveness"; "input"; "friends of the Secretary-General"; "group of friends"; "interaction between members and non-members"; "involve/involving/involvement";

	Council's decision-making procedures. This indicator captures various practices related to inclusiveness and states' opportunity to express their views in the decision-making of the Security Council. Note: one-way communication practices (communication from the Security Council to the general membership) are coded as "transparency", while two-way communication practices (communication between the Council and the general membership) are coded as "participation".	"non-inclusive"; "open meeting"; "open session"; "opportunities for input"; "participate/participation"; "preclude"; "public meeting"; "public debate"; "resolution 1353"; "troop-contributing countries"; "views of member states"; "views of non-members"; "voice"
l. Lack of reform	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to adapt or reform. Note: this category is reserved for statements that refer to "lack of reform" in general. Specific types of reform have separate coding categories: Lack of *structural* or *compositional* reform is coded in the category "Lack of structural reform", while lack of *working methods* reform is coded as "Lack of working methods reform".	"Progress"; "real change"; "reform"; "substantive change";
m. Lack of representation	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's representativeness.	"Country [x] or continent [x] is not represented in the Council"; "historic injustice"; "not represented/representative"; "underrepresented"; "unrepresented/unrepresentative"

n. Lack of structural reform	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to reform its composition or membership structure.	"Compositional reform"; "increase in membership"; "membership reform"; "reform of the composition/structure of the Council; "structural reform";
o. Lack of transparency	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the degree of transparency and/or openness in the UN Security Council's work. This indicator captures various practices related to how informed the general membership is of the Security Council's work, including the reporting practices of the Security Council to the General Assembly. Note: one-way communication practices (communication from the Security Council to the general membership) are coded as "transparency", while two-way communication practices (communication between the Council and the general membership) are coded as "participation".	"Access/accessible/inaccessible"; "analytical/analysis"; "announce/announcement"; "briefings"; "communication"; "document/documentation"; "lack of information"; "in the dark"; "Journal of United Nations"; "lack of openness"; "lack of transparency"; "orientation"; "monthly assessments"; "no explanation"; "opaque"; "programme of work"; "report/reporting"; "summary"; "transparent/transparency"; "uninformed"
p. Lack of working methods reform	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's ability to adapt or reform its working methods or procedures.	"change in working methods"; "improvement in working methods"; "procedural reform"; "working methods reform"
q. Non-compliance with Charter	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's compliance with the UN Charter.	"Abuse of power"; "Charter"; "contravene/contravention + Charter"; "constitutional mandate"; "exceed mandate"; "ignore/ignored Charter"; "interference"; "non-compliance with Charter"; "not in keeping with the

		Charter"; "outside mandate"; "privileges that are found nowhere in the Charter"; "sovereignty"
r. Provisional rules of procedure	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's provisional rules of procedure.	"Provisional rules of procedure"; "rules of procedure"
s. Structure or composition of the Council	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the structure or composition of the UN Security Council.	"Composition"; "membership"; "membership structure"; "oligarchy"; "permanent member(s)"; "the Council is controlled by [permanent member state(s) x]"; "structure"
t. Thematic debates	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the UN Security Council's practice of holding thematic debates, or lack thereof.	"Thematic debate"; "thematic issue"; "theme"
u. Veto power	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the permanent members' right to veto.	"Prerogative or privilege of permanent member(s)"; "veto"; "veto power"
v. Working methods	Evaluative statements that express negative evaluations of the working methods or procedures of the UN Security Council.	"Decision-making"; "method(s) of work"; "practice(s)"; "procedure(s)"; "work"; "working method [x]; "working methods";