University of Notre Dame
Reparations Design and Compliance Lab
NDRL

Inter-American Court of Human Rights Reparations Dataset, 1989 - 2023

Codebook - Version 20250116
January 2025

The dataset contains information on 355 cases decided by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights between 1989 and 2023. The units of analysis in the dataset are individual reparation measures ordered by the Court (N = 2,564). The file contains information on the case, the state, the type of reparation measure, and the date of compliance with the order. Researchers working on this dataset collected the information from the official website of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. This version covers all cases decided by the end of 2023, with the information posted by the Court through the end of 2024.

Please cite this dataset as:

Pérez-Liñán, Aníbal, Lía de Valenzuela, Emily Lugg, Ana Olavarrieta Trejo, and Shea Smith. 2025. "Inter-American Court of Human Rights Reparations Dataset." Version 20250116. University of Notre Dame: Reparations Design and Compliance Lab. Available at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/GQ1CAG

Collaborated in this project:

Nicolás Buitrago Rey, Karla Burgos-Morón, Mary Clare Enright, Kathryn Erhardt, Ella Fennelly, Angie García Atehortúa, Sonia Gloege, Elizabeth Jiménez Mora, Emily Lugg, Kimia Moeinvaziri, Kelly Morrison, Paloma Nuñez, Meghan O'Leary, Ana Olavarrieta Trejo, Mayra Ortiz Ocaña, Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, Bernardo Pulido Márquez, Natalie Reysa, Luis L. Schenoni, Fabiola Shipley, Shea Smith, Angelica Suárez Torres, Michael Talbot, Lauren Watts, Faisal Yamil Meneses, Natalia Yepez-Frías.

1. Case Identification

ccode: Three-letter country code (ISO Alpha-3).

cowcode: Numeric country code (Correlates of War).

casecode: Nine-digit code assigned to cases (NDRL).

> Coding rules: This nine-digit number is structured as cccyyyyxx, where: ccc is cowcode; yyyy is four digits for the year of the ruling, and xx is two digits for the case. The last two digits are assigned based on the sequence of rulings for the given country in a given year. Earlier decisions separated the main ruling (*Fondo*) from a later ruling about reparation measures (*Reparaciones y Costas*). In those cases, we use the date of the reparations ruling.

repcode: Eleven-digit code assigned to each reparation.

> Coding rules:
>
> 1) This eleven-digit number is formed by the casecode and two digits to identify the specific reparation within the case. Reparations should be numbered following the order in the *ruling*.
>
> 2) An important exception are reparation measures that appear as a single reparation in rulings but are then monitored separately in resolutions. This tends to happen with indemnifications, judicial costs, and contributions to the Court's victims assistance funds, but it can happen with other types of reparations as well. These are coded as independent reparations in the order they appear in the *resolutions*. (For clarification, see the definitions of **reparation** and **type** below).

2. Characteristics of the Legal Case

case: Name of the case

> Coding rules: The name of the case reflects the title in the IACtHR website. Often this consists of: [the name of the victim] vs. [perpetrator state].

violation: Year of the human rights violation.

> Coding rules: The date of the violation is identified in the *main ruling*. In some cases multiple or single violations take place in multiple years. In those cases the year of the violation should be coded as the year of the *last* violation for which the state is considered responsible. In cases where the violation occurred in an indeterminate year before the country's independence, the year of independence should be recorded.

decision: Year of the Court's decision imposing reparations to the state.

> Coding rules: For contemporary decisions, the date of the main ruling is unambiguous. Earlier decisions separated the main ruling (*Fondo*) from a later ruling about reparation measures (*Reparaciones y Costas*). In those cases, we use the date of the reparations ruling.

forstate: Adopts a value of 1 when the Court rules that the state was not guilty of the violation.

Coding rules: If the case adopts a value of 1, we also provide the values for the case code, year of violation, and the year of decision.

art65: Adopts a value of 1 if a case was reported to the General Assembly of the Organization of American States as an instance of non-compliance, invoking the procedure established in article 65 of the Inter-American Convention of Human Rights. (Value of 0 for all other cases.)

art65in: Year when article 65 was applied.

This variable reflects the *year* when article 65 was invoked, which can be identified usually in the last monitoring resolution. This column is missing (blank) for cases that were not under article 65 at any point in their history.

art65out: Year when case under article 65 returned to the supervision stage (if ever). Those cases will be listed as currently under supervision, even if they have a value for art65 = 1.

closedcase: Dichotomous indicator marking whether the case has been archived (which usually means that all reparations received full compliance).

0. Case is open.
1. Case is closed (archived).

3. Characteristics of the Reparation Measure

paragraph: String indicating the reparation's location in the ruling (paragraph number)

reparation: Full text of the reparation.

Coding rules:

1) The text of the reparation is copied in Spanish from the original text in the ruling.

2) Important exceptions regard indemnifications, judicial costs, and contributions to the Court's victims assistance fund. Sometimes these appear as single paragraph in the main rulings. However, these are usually separated for the purpose of monitoring, and listed separately in monitoring resolutions. In such cases, we identify these categories in the main ruling and parse the text into separate reparations.

   Example: Consider the case *Furlan y Familiares Vs. Argentina* (2012). Reparation #6 in the main ruling establishes that:

   El Estado debe pagar las cantidades fijadas en los párrafos 316, 321 y 325 de la Sentencia de Excepciones Preliminares, Fondo, Reparaciones y Costas, por concepto de indemnizaciones por daños materiales e inmateriales, y por el reintegro de costas y gastos, en los términos de los referidos párrafos, así como reintegrar al Fondo de Asistencia Legal de Víctimas la cantidad establecida en el párrafo 328 de la Sentencia de Excepciones Preliminares, Fondo, Reparaciones y Costas.

This paragraph contains three distinct orders, reflecting unambiguous reparations that should be listed in three separate rows (with unique repcodes):

- "Pagar las cantidades fijadas en los párrafos 316, 321 y 325 de la presente Sentencia, por concepto de indemnizaciones por daños materiales e inmateriales (type = 61)
- Pagar las cantidades fijadas en los párrafos 316, 321 y 325 de la presente Sentencia (…) por el reintegro de costas y gastos (type = 62)
- (…) reintegrar al Fondo de Asistencia Legal de Víctimas la cantidad establecida en el párrafo 328 de la Sentencia de Excepciones Preliminares, Fondo, Reparaciones y Costas (type = 70)

rtype: Type of reparation according to eight categories employed by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights:

10. Restitution
20. Rehabilitation
30. Satisfaction
40. Guarantees of non-repetition
50. Investigation and sanction
61. Indemnification
62. Legal costs
70. Contribution to the Court's assistance fund

Coding rules: These categories are the ones used by the IACtHR. The court provides the following descriptions (Spanish labels): (10) *Restitución*: restore the situation as it was before the human rights abuse. Actions may include, but are not limited to, release of those illegally detained, return of confiscated items, return of the victim to their home, restoration of a victim's job, or restoration of indigenous lands. (20) *Rehabilitación*: provide medical and/or psychological attention to victims. (30) *Satisfacción*: publicly recognize the damage done and the dignity of the victims. Actions may include, but are not limited to, a public act in memory of the victim; production and/or distribution of the Court's sentence; commemoration of the victims through monuments, street namings, or scholarships; housing for victims that have survived a massacre, or socioeconomic reparations to a group of victims through health or education programs. Orders to find the remains of disappeared people and return them to the families, and orders to stop death row executions, also fall in this category. (40) *Garantías de no repetición*: public policy meant to prevent the abuse from recurring. Actions may include, but are not limited to, strengthening institutional capacity of relevant actors (i.e. police forces, armed forces, the judiciary, health workers, etc.), societal education, adoption of new domestic laws, or measures related to the protection of specific victims. (50) *Obligación de investigar y sancionar*: removal of all *de facto* and *de jure* barriers to effective investigation of the case and prosecution of culprits. (61) *Indemnizaciones*: compensation for damages done to the victims. (62) *Reintegro de costas y gastos*: compensation for the legal costs paid by victims for representation and action. (70) *Fondos de asistencia*: the state is asked to contribute to the Court's fund to support victims.

Note: *This classification follows the label assigned in the* Reparations *section of the ruling.*

partial: Year of reported partial compliance.

Coding rules: This is the date of the *resolution* that reported partial compliance with the specific reparation. Partial compliance is coded as "missing" (blank) if (a) if the state never complied or (b) the state fully complied, without any previous report of partial compliance.

full: Year of reported full compliance.

Coding rules: This is the date of the *resolution* that reported full compliance with the specific reparation. The categories of partial and full compliance are not exclusive. A state may comply partially with a reparation and comply fully at a later date, or it may comply in full at once, without mediating partial compliance.

Possible combinations of the two variables would depict four different situations:

partial	full	Status of the reparation measure:
		No compliance whatsoever
2014		Partial compliance declared in 2014, no full compliance yet
	2016	Full compliance declared in 2016, skipping partial compliance
2014	2016	Partial compliance declared in 2014, and full in 2016

censored: Variable reflecting if (and when) monitoring of compliance has been suspended indefinitely. "Censoring" indicates that the reparation has not received full compliance, but the Court explicitly closed the supervision process. For example, the Court may establish that compliance with the reparation measure is henceforth impossible or that victims have rejected the measure, and thus explicitly closes the supervision of a particular reparation even if there is no full compliance.

Blank: Supervision of compliance was not suspended (censored).
Year: Year of the resolution when the Court ends supervision. (This is rare.)

Coding rules: If supervision is suspended due to application of Article 65, do not code it as censored, because the supervision stage may be reopened.

yepc: Year of effective partial compliance.

Coding rules: to code the yepc we look into the resolution that declares partial compliance with the reparation, as coded in "partial." Within the text of that resolution the Court usually determines a date of a particular event that is interpreted as creating a situation of partial compliance.

Five situations might arise:
1) The year of an event is easily identifiable and it corresponds to a particular reparation, in which case the yepc is recorded for that particular reparation.
2) The year of an event is readily identifiable but it is not clear to which reparation it corresponds, in which case the yepc is attributed to all reparations declared partially complied with in that resolution.
3) Many events and years are mentioned in a narrative as proof of partial compliance, in which case the year of the **first event** is recorded as yepc.
4) The year of the event is not explicitly mentioned, but the date in which the state reported

the event to the IACtHR is reported. We infer the year of the event from the timing of the report if possible.
5) No year is mentioned at all, in which case the yepc is coded as "missing" (blank).
The yepc is also coded as "missing" (blank) if (a) if the state never complied with a reparation or (b) the state fully complied, without any mention to partial compliance.

yefc: Year of effective full compliance.

Coding rules: to code the yefc we look into the resolution that declares full compliance with a reparation, as coded in "full." Within the text of that resolution the Court usually determines a date of a particular event that is interpreted as creating a situation of full compliance.

Five situations might arise:
1) The year of an event is easily identifiable and it corresponds to a particular reparation, in which case the yefc is recorded for that particular reparation.
2) The year of an event is readily identifiable but it is not clear to which reparation it corresponds, in which case the yefc is attributed to all reparations declared fully complied with in that resolution.
3) Many events and years are mentioned in a narrative as proof of full compliance, in which case the year of the **last event** is recorded as yefc.

Note: If the narrative leading to full compliance refers to partial compliance in earlier years, the first year in the sequence may be recorded in the **yepc** column (assuming no resolution explicitly declared partial compliance before).

4) The year of the event is not explicitly mentioned, but the date in which the state reported the event to the IACtHR is reported. We infer the year of the event from the timing of the report if possible.
5) No year is mentioned at all, in which case the yefc is coded as "missing" (blank).
The yepc is also coded as "missing" (blank) if (a) if the state never complied with a reparation or (b) the state fully complied, without any previous report of partial compliance.

Note: When the Court suspends the supervision of reparations without declaring partial or full compliance, we identify the date of this resolution using the **censored** column, and do not enter dates of **yepc** or **yefc** even when the narrative suggests that the state complied to the extent possible (e.g., in Castillo Petruzzi v. Peru).