Peacemakers at Risk: Understanding Violence against Third Party Interveners

UCDP Peacemakers at Risk (PAR)

Codebook and User Guide

PAR Codebook and User Guide version 1.1-2016

Covers the: PAR Dataset (v. 1.0-2016) and PAR Dataset supplement (v. 1.0-2016)

This version authored by: Sara Lindberg Bromley (sara.lindberg_bromley@pcr.uu.se) & Maria Greek

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), <www.ucdp.uu.se>.

Any future and updated versions of this dataset may be retrieved from the following site <http://ucdp.uu.se/downloads/>.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This codebook describes the Peacemakers at Risk (PAR) Dataset, the main output of a data collection project attached to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), based at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University. The UCDP collects and makes available comprehensive data on organised violence, widely used by the broader research community. Funding for the UCDP Peacemakers at Risk project has been provided by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet, VR) and the Folke Bernadotte Academy (FBA). The Codebook and User Guide provides an overview of the PAR Dataset, by specifying included variables, as well as discussing key definitions and delimitations guiding the coding procedures.[1]

Violence against third party actors intervening in contexts of conflict is often noted as becoming increasingly common. Scholars have however only recently begun to directly address this important dimension of conflict and interventions; a shortage of systematically collected and comprehensive data may explain the limited academic attention to date. The PAR Dataset contributes to addressing this gap by charting incidences of violence directly involving peacekeeping actors, a key type of intervening third party actor in contexts of conflict.[2]

By providing event-data on incidences where third party actors are targeted and become the victims of violence, the PAR Dataset allows for closer examination of *where*, *when* and *how* violence against third party actors takes place. In order to gain a fuller picture of third party risk, the project also charts a set of incidences where third party actors with an armed capacity initiate or reciprocate violence, against local armed actors or civilians. The PAR Dataset makes possible the focused study of this feature of armed conflicts, enabling inquiries into for instance variations in third party violence over time, between different third party actor categories or across intervention contexts, but also its relation to other conflict dynamics. In order to enable this added value, the PAR Dataset has been made compatible with extant UCDP event-data (state-based, non-state and one-sided categories) on organised,

---

[1] Full lists of variables included in the two main project outputs—the PAR Dataset and the PAR Dataset supplement—are provided in Section 4 and Section 5, respectively.

[2] More progress has been made in the field of aid worker security, in terms of data collection and both academic and more policy-oriented analysis (e.g. Larissa Fast, *Aid in Danger: The Perils and Promise of Humanitarianism* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014); Kristian Hoelscher, Jason Miklian, and Haavard Nygaard, "Understanding Violent Attacks Against Humanitarian Aid Workers," *Available at SSRN 2700772*, 2015, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2700772>. For more policy-oriented outputs, see also for instance the ICRC project "Health Care in Danger" <https://www.icrc.org/eng/what-we-do/safeguarding-health-care/index.jsp> and the MSF project "Medical Care Under Fire" <http://www.msf.org/en/humanitarian-issues/medical-care-under-fire>). Humanitarian Outcomes provides publicly available, global data on violence against aid workers from 1997 to present (Humanitarian Outcomes, *Aid Worker Security Database*, n.d., <https://aidworkersecurity.org/>). The PAR Dataset focuses at this stage (v. 1.0-2016) on peacekeeping actors, but is structured to accommodate incorporating data also on other third party actor types in the future. Therefore, while the PAR project conceives of intervening third party actors widely, as subsuming personnel attached to different types of peace operations, mediators as well as aid workers – or peacemakers, as per the title – the current version of the dataset focuses only on peacekeepers.

armed conflict violence. Comprehensive and systematically collected data is expected to allow for better analysing and understanding this important dimension of conflict and interventions, which by extension will be crucial for proposing methods for prevention.

2. Defining violence involving third party actors

The Peacemakers at Risk (PAR) Dataset provides detailed information at the event-level, on the timing, location, actors and outcomes of violence involving third party actors deployed to conflict-affected countries. The dataset (v. 1.0-2016) includes information on a range of peacekeeping actors – including traditional peacekeepers, peace enforcers and the staff that make up all-civilian (and non-police) peace operations – deployed from 1989 to 2009 to sub-Saharan African intra-state conflict contexts.[3] The PAR Dataset charts violent incidents directly involving peacekeepers and resulting in fatalities, as well as direct violent incidents resulting in other, serious but non-fatal, outcomes to peacekeepers. This section develops how the incidence of violence involving third party actors is conceived and defined for the PAR project.[4]

Defining an "event"
The basic unit of analysis in UCDP coding is the "event". In general terms, in accordance with UCDP terminology, this implies a phenomenon (individual incident) of lethal violence occurring at a given time and place. More specifically, a UCDP event is defined as:

"The incidence of the use of armed force by an organised actor against another organised actor, or against civilians, resulting in at least 1 direct death in either the best, low or high estimate categories at a specific location and for a specific temporal duration."[5]

The basic unit of analysis for PAR is also the "event". A number of components of the operational definition depart from UCDP definitions, and are specified below. A PAR-event is defined as:

*"The incidence of the **use of force** by an organised actor[6] against an **intervening third party actor** – or the use of armed force by an intervening third party actor against an organised actor or civilians, if the*

---

outcome is fatal – resulting in at least 1 direct death in either the best, low or high estimate categories, or 1 other, **non-fatal, serious outcome** *in the best estimate category, at a specific location and for a specific temporal duration.*"

The separate, new, components of the definitions are:

1) *Use of force*: violence by material means (e.g. armed with manufactured weapons but also sticks, stones, fire, water etc.) or physical force, resulting in direct death or other direct, non-fatal, serious outcome.

> (a) *Non-fatal serious outcome*: Injuries or kidnappings. For attacks short of fatal outcomes to be included, they must be levelled with the presumed intent of causing major bodily harm to the third party actor and result in physical injury, or be of a particularly severe nature, namely kidnapping. For kidnappings specifically, the use of force also subsumes the *threat* of use of force, when used to effectuate forcible detainments (i.e. kidnappings do not require force by material or physical means to be included in the dataset).

2) *Intervening third party actor*: a primarily external actor, organised and professional, intervening in a setting to provide sustained support related to the political, security, humanitarian and development aspects in a country.

> (a) *Primarily external*: A third party actor is externally organised and/or headed. While a third party can include local (national) staff, it also includes individuals external to the conflict setting (foreign nationals).
> (b) *Organised, professional*: Individuals acting outside of an organisation, for instance on a volunteer-basis, are not coded as third party actors.
> (c) *Intervening*: Third party actors must be present in the target country and provide sustained support, in order to be included in the coding (as opposed to being mainly based or present in for instance a neighbouring country).[7]

3) Intervening third party actors can be broadly divided into two major sub-categories:

> (a) *Those with a mandated capacity to use force*: peace operations armed and mandated to use force for any expressed purpose and composed of any combination of military troops, military observers, police and civilians in a target state, and:
> (b) *Those without a capacity to use force*: subsumed herein are peace operations composed only of civilian (and non-police) staff, as well as those peace operations where non-civilian personnel are deployed but without the capacity to use force (e.g. advisory or strictly monitoring functions), as per their mandates.[8]

---

[6] The organisation-criterion serves to make PAR compatible with other UCDP datasets on organised violence. PAR, however, also records and makes public data on incidents *not* meeting the organisation-criterion, and makes this data available to interested users as an add-on. For further information, see later sections.

[7] While this definition of intervening third party actors is sufficiently open to allow for incorporating other types of third party actors in the future, this version of the PAR Dataset contains only one sub-set of third party actors, namely peacekeepers, deployed in peace operations. Section 3.a. details how peace operations are defined for the PAR project. It is important to note that the wider PAR definition of a third party described in this section differs from that ordinarily used in the UCDP. The PAR definition is on the one hand *broader* and includes a wider range of actors. On the other hand, the PAR definition of a third party is *narrower*, by imposing a criterion of physical intervention in a host-state. (See <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/>).

[8] Aid workers (humanitarian, development) and mediators would also fall into this latter category.

3. Coding rules for new PAR variables

The PAR Dataset brings together extant UCDP variables with a set of unique variables created specifically for the PAR project, to capture violence involving intervening third party actors. The data structure – alongside efforts taken to ensure this feature – makes the new PAR Dataset compatible with other UCDP categories of violence.[9] This section discusses definitions of key concepts and lists coding rules for new PAR variables.[10]

a. Intervening third party actors: Discussion of new variables

As presented above, the PAR project defines intervening third party actors broadly, grouping together different and varied types of actors that share as a key characteristic their position as external to the main conflict parties and issues. Coding for the PAR project to date has, however, focused on one category of third party actors: peace operations.[11] Peace operations are considered to be particularly interesting for this type of inquiry. Notably, many of these operations can themselves use force, creating interesting tensions between the roles and functions they serve in contexts of conflict. Another reason for prioritising peacekeepers in the coding is that more progress has already been made in the field of aid worker security, with regards to the systematic collection of data on violence.

Peacekeepers
Peace operations are defined broadly for the PAR project, to include traditional and multidimensional peacekeeping missions, peace enforcement missions and all-civilian peace operations, deployed by UN and non-UN actors. The PAR project casts the net purposefully wide to include a broad cross-section of operations – with differing personnel compositions, mandates, deploying bodies, and so on – in order to present a rich dataset likely to provide for interesting sources of variation within this third party actor category.

Included in the dataset are peace operations meeting the general description set by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operation (UN DPKO) definition, adapted and employed by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), describing "peacekeeping as a mechanism to assist conflict-ridden countries to create conditions for sustainable peace" that may include tasks such as "monitoring and observing ceasefire agreements; serving as confidence-building measures; protecting the delivery of humanitarian assistance; assisting with the demobilisation and reintegration process; strengthening institutional capacities in the areas of judiciary and the rule of law (including penal

---

[9] See later sub-section on PAR-UCDP compatibility (pp. 16-17), describing how the data has been treated in order to be made compatible with other UCDP categories of violence.

[10] For information on coding rules for extant UCDP categories of violence, please consult the UCDP Codebooks for State-based Armed Conflicts, Non-State Conflicts and One-Sided Violence, access via URL <http://ucdp.uu.se/downloads/>.

[11] The terms "peacekeepers" and "peace operation staff" – as well as "peacekeeping" and "peace operations" – are used interchangeably. "Peacekeepers" denote all staff types.

institutions), policing, and human rights; electoral support; and economic and social development."[12]

In order to qualify for inclusion in the PAR Dataset, peace operations must have a *mandate*, provided for by the UN or a regional organisation, or by other multilateral agreement (notably, by peace agreement).[13] Interventions based on bilateral military/defence agreements between two countries, or host country invitation alone, are not included in the data. While the data includes UN peacebuilding missions that follow on directly to peacekeeping operations, purely political missions (such as those tasked with fact-finding or providing good offices) and pure electoral observation missions are excluded. The data excludes also Joint Commissions that combine international observers with representatives of local conflict parties into a single structure. Included peace operations are usually but not always, and not by requirement, multilateral.

Peacekeepers are understood as all staff – military or civilian, international or locally contracted – attached to a peace operation. Where such information is provided in the event-reports recorded in a first coding stage, the PAR Dataset parses out and displays nationalities of violence-affected peacekeepers ("nationality_pko", see below); it also provides users with the option of disaggregating those incidents where national peacekeeping staff are affected by violence ("deaths_nationals" and "nationals_non_lethal" variables). Peace operations can, in line with the PAR definition of an intervening third party actor more broadly, be conceived as having the *mandated capacity to use force* or not. This characteristic is reflected in the variable "pko_force" (below).

In order to meet the broader project criteria of a third party actor, the peacekeeping presence must also be <u>intervening</u>, meaning that there must be a *sustained, in-country presence* and it must be *deployed*, which makes sense, considering the focus of the data collection project on violence involving third party actors intervening in contexts characterised by intra-state conflict.[14] These criteria serve to exclude certain operations, such as (a) peace operations that are authorised but never deployed and (b) interventions based in a third country, from where the personnel, for instance, provides training or stages only brief interventions into the target country (such as the airlifting of humanitarian assistance). A peace operation is by definition

---

[12] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Multilateral Peace Operations Database, Definitions and Methodology, URL <http://www.sipri.org/databases/pko/methods> (accessed 2013-11-15).

[13] While not a prerequisite for inclusion, a vast majority of the peace operations included in the dataset are "welcomed, authorized, endorsed, commended or approved by UN Security Council Resolutions", in line with the categorisation by Heldt & Wallensteen (Birger Heldt and Peter Wallensteen, *Peacekeeping Operations: Global Patterns of Intervention and Success, 1948-2004,* Sandöverken: Folke Bernadotte Academy, 2006, p. 44).

[14] Given that there has been one or several intrastate conflicts recorded by the UCDP for the 1989-2009 time-period, peace operations meeting the established criteria are included in the dataset. Peace operations deployed to South Africa and Namibia in the time-period are for instance excluded on the basis of this delimitation. Additionally, two operations deployed to address the border conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia—with the chief aim of monitoring a demilitarised zone of confidence (or supporting this effort) and explicitly deployed to manage an inter-state conflict—have not been recorded for this version of the dataset (v. 1.0-2016). Moreover, UNOMUR to Rwanda is excluded on account of being based on the Ugandan side of the border.

<u>external</u>: it is externally organised, headed and includes foreign nationals as staff, meeting the criteria of a third party actor.

While we consider this inclusive approach to be a strength of the dataset, we recognise that this broad definition fits a considerable number of peace operations with rather different characteristics and functions in a conflict setting. For this reason, and in order to begin to differentiate between different types of peace operations, we also include a stricter classification of operations, using a more stringent definition of peacekeeping. This differentiation of peace operations is reflected in the variable "pko_def". Distinguishing between operations in this way will enable data users to select all or only a sub-set of operations for analysis, as appropriate for the theoretical argument they are seeking to test.

For its stricter definition of peacekeeping, PAR relies on the theoretical definitions of an extant data compilation by Heldt and Wallensteen (2006). Heldt and Wallensteen (at times henceforth referred to as H/W) define "peacekeeping operations" as:

A third-party state intervention that:
  a) Involves the deployment of military troops and/or military observers and/or civilian police in a target state;
  b) is, according to the mandate (as specified in multilateral agreements, peace agreements, or resolutions of the UN or regional organisations), established for the purpose of separating conflict parties, monitoring ceasefires, maintaining buffer zones, and taking responsibility for the security situation (among other things) between formerly, potentially, or presently warring parties;
  c) is neutral towards the conflict parties, but not necessarily impartial towards their behaviour.[15]

Included in this definition are, then, internationally or regionally deployed interventions made up of military troops, military personnel and civilian police. In those cases where an operation consists of only civilian (non-police) personnel, they will be coded in the aforementioned, broader category of peace operations. Similarly, those operations tasked with anything but what Heldt and Wallensteen refer to as "traditional peacekeeping tasks", as well as those deployed forces that are *not* serving as neutral interposition forces, fall outside of this stricter theoretical definition of peacekeeping.[16]

---

[15] Heldt and Wallensteen, *Peacekeeping Operations*. Since the PAR Dataset spans through 2009, and the Heldt and Wallensteen data only covers the time-period until the end of 2004, operations deployed 2005 and onwards have been preliminarily coded on the basis of the given criteria. Users interested in this variable should thus be aware that such coding was not conducted by or in consultation with the original authors.
[16] While we draw on Heldt and Wallensteen as our point of departure, other data gathering efforts focusing on peacekeeping interventions may certainly also be of interest for users, in terms of theoretical approach and/or content. Scholars may further be interested in using the PAR Dataset alongside other data on more detailed characteristics related to peacekeeping interventions. Data from Mullenbach (2013), for instance, provides information on a number of key features related to peacekeeping interventions, such as contributing states, authorising documents and force strength. Focusing on an overlapping sub-set (in terms of time-frame and geographical parameters set), the PAR and Mullenbach datasets are mostly but not wholly consistent with regards to particular coverage or inclusion. Both datasets draw on similar approaches, notably in terms of widening the conception of peacekeeping to include also non-UN interventions. Yet, the datasets build on

The PAR Peacekeeper variables are devised to provide information on each individual peace operation that has been coded for the PAR Dataset. These variables are supplied separately, and by peace operation, in the "PAR Dataset supplement" [parsupp].[17]

pko_name: Name (acronym) of the PKO.

pko_id: The unique ID of the PKO.

pko_country: Country of PKO deployment.

pko_type: What type of peacekeeping actor (deploying body or deploying arrangement)?

By type we mean deploying body (listing here acronyms, e.g. UN, AU, ECOWAS), or other deploying arrangement. Other deploying arrangements are ad hoc coalitions ("ad hoc"), unilateral interventions (but still meeting the PAR criteria of a PKO) "[country-code]", or hybrid operations ("hybrid").[18]

pko_def: Does the peace operation fit the stricter definition of a peace operation (Heldt Wallensteen, 2006)?
        0 = no
        1 = yes
This dummy variable is introduced to highlight whether the operation in question adheres to the stricter definition of peace operations, enabling users who may wish to select and study only such cases.

pko_force: Does the peace operation have the mandated capacity to use force?
        0 = no
        1 = yes
In order to further differentiate between peace operations in the sample, PAR introduces a variable denoting whether the operation in question is conceived as having the mandated capacity to use force. The aim here is to distinguish those operations that are armed and operate under a mandate that includes provisions for various forms of security-functions. Peace operations are coded as having the mandated capacity to use force if they are authorised and tasked with responsibilities related to the provision of security. Such security functions include, but are not limited to, provisions for the (military) protection of civilians,

---

somewhat differing definitions of what constitutes a peacekeeping operation. To exemplify, Mullenbach restricts his operations deployed to conduct "security-related functions", whereas PAR includes additional interventions meeting the criteria set forth (notably a number of all-civilian operations deployed to serve advisory or training functions). In addition, Mullenbach's data on occasion differentiates interventions into "phases" denoting e.g. mandate expansions, where we record one, sustained intervention. See, Mark J. Mullenbach, "Third-Party Peacekeeping in Intrastate Disputes, 1946-2012: A New Data Set," *The Midsouth Political Science Review* 14 (December 2013): 103–33 and associated data.

[17] See also the full list of variables starting on p. 18.

[18] Denoting a mission jointly deployed by more than one organisation and under a joint command structure.

providing security for key installations (e.g. government installations), or provisions for defence of the mission. The purpose and aim with this variable is to capture peacekeeping presences that are armed and have the mandate to use force. Note that this is not the same as enforcement missions.[19] Peace operations *without* the mandated capacity to use force include those peace operations composed only of civilian (and non-police) staff, as well as those peace operations where non-civilian staff deploy but without the capacity to use force (e.g. with advisory or strictly monitoring functions), as per their mandates. It is important to note that it is the authority and tasks given to a peace operation, rather than their behaviour or ability to meet those tasks, which determine whether a peace operation has a mandated capacity to use force. Furthermore, as this variable is coded at the mission-level, a peace operation may be coded as having the mandated capacity to use force also in cases where this does not apply to its full duration.[20] In other words, this variable would not reflect instances where mandated have changed over time to subsume (or remove) such mandated tasks.

pko_start: Estimated start-date of PKO (month and year), requiring a combination of a mandate and "boots-on-the-ground".

pko_end: Estimated end-date of PKO (month and year), denoting official mission close.

b. Violence: Discussion of new variables

In line with UCDP methodology, the PAR project records and measures violence that is lethal. For the PAR project, this subsumes attacks by local actors against members of an intervening third party actor (peacekeepers) that cause at least one fatality, or attacks by third party actors (peacekeepers) against a local actor, including against civilians, resulting in at least one fatality.

In the PAR Dataset, violence also subsumes incidences of uses of force that lead to other, non-fatal, serious outcomes to intervening third party actors (peacekeepers). This expansion of the concept of violence is a strength of the PAR Dataset. Indeed, targeted attacks with non-fatal outcomes can indicate the same level of hostile intent and be carried out on the

---

[19] Enforcement missions, by definition, will always have the mandated capacity to use force, but this categorisation subsumes a broader subset of operations. Note that for interventions limited to tasks such as observation and with no apparent and explicit mandate-provisions for the use of force, we impose a size-criterion, and code only observation missions of substantial size (here, clearly surpassing 1,500 deployed peacekeepers) as having the mandated capacity to use force. We do so to seek to limit the impact of changes in how peace operations are conceived and authorised over time – with notably UN interventions deploying later in the studied time-period receiving more forceful mandates – and as it seems likely such large missions contain formed units (rather than only individual observers or experts).

[20] In other words, peace operations meeting the criteria set forth for all or parts of their deployment are coded as having the mandated capacity to use force. This thus need not apply to all operation personnel, i.e. a peace operation with a formed military component will typically be coded as having an armed capacity.

same (or different but of similarly high relevance) operational and strategic considerations as those resulting in fatalities (on this theme, see also Stoddard et al, in footnote 23).

PAR codes two non-fatal outcome categories of violence: injuries and kidnappings, or forcible detainments (see injury_non_lethal and kidnap_non_lethal variables below). Note that both types of non-fatal outcomes are coded for the intervening third party actor only, and not for other, local, actor categories. This means that if a rebel group, for instance, is involved in a clash with a peacekeeping actor that kills two rebels and injures an additional two rebels, only the two fatalities are coded for the rebel group. The inclusion of non-fatal outcomes seeks to better capture levels of, and variations in, risk facing intervening third party actors.

Data on non-fatal outcomes is, however, likely to be more difficult to retrieve on a systematic scale, and we expect non-fatal incidents of violence to be more likely to go unreported than instances of fatal violence. For this reason, this sub-set of events should be considered a modest assessment of what violence with non-fatal outcomes to third party actors has actually taken place, particularly for some less closely monitored third party interventions. While it is important to be aware of this possibility of a reporting bias, it should also be noted that incidences involving members of external third party interventions are, generally speaking, expected to be likely to be more closely monitored and reported on than other forms of conflict-related violence, for instance violence affecting warring parties and local populations in areas of conflict.

It is also important to note that in line with UCDP criteria, violence must *directly involve* intervening third party actors (peacekeepers) to be included in the dataset. This applies to all PAR events. Consequently, in order to be included in the dataset, attacks must be *direct and non-accidental*; the third party must be directly involved in the violence (as victim, perpetrator or opponent) and appear in an event as part of a dyad, rather than simply being at the wrong place at the wrong time.[21] PAR should thus be understood as a dataset aiming to capture those incidences where intervening third party actors are reported as being directly involved in violence in interaction with local actors, rather than as a comprehensive account of all third party casualties in areas of conflict.

Finally, in order to try to reflect how violence may affect different subsets of third party actors differently, variables have been included to show the extent to which local members of staff attached to intervening third party actors (peacekeepers) are directly affected by violence (through the variables death_nationals and nationals_non_lethal).

---

[21] Recall also that peacekeeper casualties stemming from causes such as accidents or illnesses related to their deployment in the host country are not included in the PAR Dataset. Rather, the focus is on outcomes from direct and "hostile" (or "malicious") action.

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:4px; display:inline-block">**PAR Violence variables**</div>

The PAR Dataset follows UCDP coding policies for estimating fatalities (providing best, high, and low estimates on an event-basis), which always represent modest assessments.[22] This section lists and discusses only violence variables that are new and unique, developed specifically for the PAR Dataset.

deaths_nationals: Does the total number of fatalities recorded in this event include any national members of staff attached to a third party actor (local staff members)?

     0 = no
     1 = yes

non_lethal_violence: In this event, were there *only* non-fatal outcomes to third party actors, and no deaths (in the best estimate)?

     0 = no
     1 = yes

This variable allows those users who are only interested in attacks with at least 1 fatality (in any category and in the best estimate) to easily filter out events with only non-fatal outcomes to third party actors.

injury_non_lethal: Attack using force leading to physical injury in a member of a third party (number of individuals injured, best estimate). In order to meet the criteria of an injury attacks against members of intervening third party actors must have been direct and the intent is to capture incidences of violence levelled with a presumed intent of causing major bodily harm.

kidnap_non_lethal: Kidnapping or forcible detainment (abduction, hostage-taking) of members of a third party, for a duration of at least 24 hours, regardless of hostage demands or the like (number of individuals kidnapped/detained, best estimate).[23] If the member of a third party is held for less than 24 hours and killed, the incident is coded only as a third party fatality. If the member of a third party actor is held for 24 hours or more, and subsequently killed, the incident is coded both as a kidnapping and as a third party fatality. Forcible detainments can be effectuated with the use of force, or the threat thereof. Individuals are

---

[22] For information on UCDP policies on assessing fatalities, and information on these and other variables related to violence in UCDP data, please see UCDP Codebooks for State-based Armed Conflicts, Non-State Conflicts and One-Sided Violence, see URL (http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/codebooks/). Note that best, high and low estimates are only provided for fatalities. Non-fatal outcomes record only best estimates.

[23] Non-fatal outcomes have been operationalized in line with Stoddard et al.'s (2009) existing data collection guidelines on aid worker security (Abby Stoddard, Adele Harmer, and Victoria DiDomenico, "Providing Aid in Insecure Environments: 2009 Update," *Trends in Violence against Aid Workers and the Operational Response. Policy Brief* 34, Apr. 2009). Drawing on established definitions in this way support the accumulation of knowledge (Christian Davenport and Will H. Moore, "Conflict Consortium Standards and Best Practices for Observational Data," April 7, 2015, 5, http://conflictconsortium.weebly.com/standards--best-practices.html.). Specifically it facilitates the process of merging datasets that would be potentially interesting to link.

usually but need not be physically detained in a specific location to be recorded in the dataset – in a small number of cases peacekeepers were clearly prevented from leaving and in a manner that meets other established criteria. However, simply being denied access does not constitute a forcible detainment, as long as third party actors are free to backtrack or leave. Note that incarceration by a state actor does not qualify for coding in this variable, in line with regular UCDP definitions (concerning extrajudicial killings).

Note also that a kidnapping is coded as a "one-day-event", meaning that we do not use event start- and end-dates to mark the total duration of captivity/forcible detainment, even in cases where such information is provided in reporting. The start- and end-date are rather both listed as the date that the individual was taken hostage, reflecting our focus on the *act* of abduction.

nationals_non_lethal: Does the total number of non-fatal outcomes coded in this event include any national members of staff attached to a third party actor?
>   0 = no
>   1 = yes

nationality_pko: This variable reflects the reported nationalities (countries of origin, i.e. peacekeeping personnel contributing countries) of those individual members of a peace operation that are reported to suffer the violence outcome(s) recorded, at the event-level. This entry is therefore applicable only for events with recorded violence-outcomes to peacekeeping personnel, and only in cases where such outcomes are recorded in the best estimate.[24]

The variable is coded as a string in a standardised format:
-    First, the nationality of the violence-affected peacekeeper (country of origin),[25] followed by the number of cases and type of outcome. As an example: "India: 5 injury".
-    If peacekeepers of the same nationality (countries of origin) suffer different kinds of violence-outcomes in the same incident, these outcomes are listed separately and separated by commas and spaces according to a standardised format. The types of outcomes are listed in singular and ordered alphabetically (i.e. death, injury, kidnap). As an example: "India: 5 injury, 1 kidnap".
-    If peacekeepers of several different nationalities (countries of origin) are violence-affected in the same event, separate strings for each country are coded following the above-listed format. These smaller strings are then combined into one, ordered

---

[24] Note also that information related to nationalities of violence-affected peacekeepers was parsed out from extant incident reporting at a second stage of coding. Resultantly, information on nationalities may be available in sources other than those forming part of the original coding, and should be understood as partial. In the current dataset version (v.1.0-2016), full or partial information on nationalities is available for approximately 74% of recorded incidents in which peacekeepers were recorded as suffering violence-outcomes.
[25] By country-name at time of the incident, in the case that this has later changed.

alphabetically by country-name, with country-strings separated by semicolons. As and example: "Chad: 1 injury; India: 5 injury, 2 kidnap; Philippines: 2 death, 3 injury".

- In cases of missing information and to account for violence-outcomes recorded in the incident, the country-name can be substituted for a generic "No info" entry. As an example: "No info: 1 death; South Africa: 2 injury".[26]

For information of relevance also for the coding of nationalities, see also Appendix 3.

c. Local actors

The PAR Dataset seeks to capture reported incidences of *direct* violence involving intervening third party actors (peacekeepers, as one party to a dyad) in contexts of intra-state conflict. The local actors (i.e. actors other than intervening third party actors, non-intervening third party actors) featured in the dataset can take the following forms:

- A local actor (organised, less organised or unknown) levelling a direct attack against a peacekeeping actor, leading to fatalities (to any category of victim), or to non-fatal outcomes to the peacekeeping actor, or
- A local actor (organised, less organised or unknown) involved in reciprocal violence with a peacekeeping actor, leading to fatalities (to any category of victim), or to non-fatal outcomes to the peacekeeping actor, or
- A local actor (organised, less organised or unknown) attacked by a peacekeeping actor, leading to fatalities (to any category of victim), or to non-fatal outcomes to the peacekeeping actor,[27] or
- Civilians, if members of a peacekeeping actor level direct force against a civilian leading to fatal outcome. This latter example would then, in UCDP terminology, be the type of incident captured in the one-sided violence category.[28]
- Finally, collateral victims, to a direct attack meeting all required criteria and coded as an event resulting in fatalities in which one of the parties in the dyad is a peacekeeping actor, and the other actor is a local actor (organised, less organised or unknown), including civilians.

Local *organised* actors include both government and non-state actors, and may as per UCDP definitions be formally or informally organised. These actors are given the same identifiers as

---

[26] To make user-friendlier, a file breaking out nationalities specifically will be compiled and released in a separate format. Please check back for updates <http://ucdp.uu.se/downloads/>.

[27] Note that the "directionality" of violence (i.e. who initiates or responds to violence) is not recorded for events. This description is rather to illustrate the different ways, or roles in which, actors can feature in the data.

[28] Put in other words, and depending on the circumstances surrounding each incident, a peacekeeper can thus feature in the dataset as a "victim" or "perpetrator" of violence, or as an "opponent" in violent interactions.

in other UCDP datasets, where such exist.[29] This allows for establishing connections with already known conflict actors and dyads, as well as tracing organised actors across datasets. Local organised actors may also appear in the dataset on the side of the peacekeeping actor to denote events where they collaborate with intervening third party actors (peacekeepers), and where events and outcomes are not possible to further distinguish by actor on the basis of the accounts accessed.

In addition to the organised actor categories, specified in the UCDP definition of an event (see Appendix 1), PAR opts to include also categories of less organised or unknown local actors. The decision to expand the conception of groups recorded in the dataset is a pragmatic one; by doing so we are able to capture more of the violence involving intervening third party actors (peacekeepers). PAR includes three additional categories of third party "opponents", under generic names, requiring less in terms of (or no) level of organisation:

(1) *mobs*: unorganised gatherings of people, often in the form of demonstrations, as well as spontaneous protests, which include persons who use force (any material means);
   a.   Given the identifier "6058" in the "side_a_dset_id" entry of the event.
(2) *organisation unknown*: subsumes actors described in source-materials as organised groups but not specified by name (e.g. "armed group", "militia", "clan group").[30]
   a.   Given the identifier "6059" in the "side_a_dset_id" entry of the event.
(3) *unknown*: other local actors, non-specified.[31]
   a.   Given the identifier "6060" in the "side_a_dset_id" entry of the event.

Events attributed to these additional actor categories (less organised or unknown) are identified in the dataset, by being marked as "Organisation" in the "code_status" entry. Users wishing to adhere to UCDP coding rules in strict terms, and use only events involving more clearly organised or identifiable actors, may therefore consider excluding this sub-set (in full or part) of events prior to analysis.

---

[29] We have sought to reflect notable exceptions to this general policy in the PAR Dataset supplement, noted at the mission-level. Note that unless a precedent exists in UCDP data, we have typically not inferred actors on the basis of contextual understanding other than in certain individual incidences. The coding has rather sought to record events for the actor- or actor-category provided in reported, accessed accounts. We have sought to reflect more major exceptions to this policy in the coding notes.

[30] While we know less about these actors, we expect here to be capturing essentially the same types of groups as those meeting the stricter criteria of organisation, even though events are not pinned to a particular group in event-reporting used as the basis of the coding. Note that such groups may also feature in the unknown actor category. Comment-entries allow coders to record information relevant to the actors implicated on an event-basis. These notes are available upon request.

[31] Note well that we focus on actors other than third party actors in this regard, and exclude from this dataset version a number of instances of "blue-on-blue" violence (or equivalent for other mission types); cases of e.g. "friendly-fire" or within-mission staffing disputes that have led to otherwise recordable violence-outcomes.

d. PAR-UCDP compatibility

The set of violence-phenomena captured in PAR does not make up a mutually exclusive category of violence, such as the UCDP's non-state or one-sided violence categories. It is a complement to UCDP data, making it possible to capture some of the organised violence not previously included in UCDP data. In some instances, however, the violence categories overlap: a PAR event can simultaneously be a state-based, one-sided, or a non-state event.[32] The PAR project opts to shift the focus, or perspective, on the events, to capture violence as it implicates intervening third party actors.

While PAR will serve as a stand-alone category of violence, we also want to provide users with the option of combining the new PAR data with extant UCDP data categories (UCDP's state-based, non-state, and one-sided categories of data). In order to do so, the PAR data is made compatible with other UCDP data and formats.

Central to making the datasets compatible is to ensure that users can exclude instances of double-coded events, with the aim to avoid that the same fatalities are counted twice. For that reason, the PAR Dataset introduces a variable (ged50_corresp_id) to establish a connection with events already included in other, extant categories of UCDP data.[33]

The PAR and UCDP GED Datasets have been manually checked and streamlined and, where the PAR event in question has an "equivalent" event included in the UCDP GED data, the ID of the "original" UCDP GED event is entered into the "ged50_corresp_id" variable cell of the PAR Dataset code-sheet. Streamlined duplicate events will therefore have two event-IDs: one PAR ID (id) and one, copy of an already existing, UCDP GED ID (ged50_corresp_id). By doing so events that are identified as included in both UCDP GED and PAR Datasets, will be marked in the PAR Dataset, so users may opt to exclude one set of these events from their analysis.

- Users wishing to make the PAR Dataset compatible with the UCDP GED Dataset should therefore *exclude* one set of the events denoted with an entry in the "ged50_corresp_id" cell of the PAR Dataset code-sheet.
- Users wishing to ensure *theoretical* consistency with definitions and operationalisations underpinning UCDP coding procedures may, additionally, (a) exclude all PAR events

---

[32] In other words, the same violence-incident may feature in PAR as well as in one of the UCDP's existing categories of violence. This could be the case for instance when a third party actor with the mandated capacity to use force (peacekeepers) is understood as fighting alongside a local conflict actor (which could feature in UCDP state-based/non-state violence), or when an altogether civilian third party actor is killed in a deliberate attack by a local and organised armed actor (which could feature in UCDP one-sided violence). Note that definitions and operationalisations underpinning the coding procedures for PAR have sought consistency with UCDP GED; i.e. the same incidents should typically – albeit not always – be similarly coded along key dimensions (date, location, conflict parties and estimated fatalities).

[33] The PAR Dataset version denoted here has been streamlined against, and thus made compatible with, UCDP GED Version (5.0-2016).

involving less organised or known local actors, and, (b) exclude all PAR events with only non-fatal outcomes.

> For further instructions on how to ensure compatibility with UCDP coding and UCDP coding rules, please see the user manual in Appendix 2.

Users closely familiar with UCDP methodology should also note that the PAR forgoes the 25-fatalities criterion imposed in other UCDP data, i.e. the threshold for the scale of violence required for a dyad's events to feature in the public data.[34] The PAR Dataset includes each event meeting the criteria set forth, from the first event recorded, irrespective of the number of casualties reported. Further on, the PAR Dataset does not require any stated incompatibility on behalf of conflict parties, which is a pre-requisite for UCDP state-based conflicts.

e. Data collection procedures[35]

Data collection for the PAR Dataset largely follows standard UCDP coding procedures and guidelines. This procedure draws on human coders mining primarily news articles retrieved from key-word searches in the news archive database Factiva,[36] but also other open-source material such as IGO- and NGO-reports, case studies, mission-specific reports, as well as outputs from other data collection projects. Information on reported violence-incidences meeting the definitional criteria set forth is manually extracted, and information on the dimensions of interest is recorded in the variable-format listed below, to create the event-data format.

Consulting additional sources beyond the news media has been particularly important for cases where reporting has been found to be sparse. While not seeking to capture or reflecting precisely overlapping phenomena, other sources of data on peacekeeping fatalities have also been consulted. While only available for some operations, some outcomes and generally presented in aggregated formats, such data sources have added important quality checks, particularly at the early stages of the data collection process, in terms of refinement of definitions, data categories and for developing article-search efforts.

---

[34] For more information on this criterion, see <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/#Battle-related_deaths>. By extension and in practical terms, some events in PAR have no match in UCDP GED owing to the fact that the dyad in question has not reached the 25-fatalities criterion.

[35] This section draws and builds on discussions that feature also in Sara Lindberg Bromley, "Introducing the UCDP Peacemakers at Risk dataset, sub-Saharan Africa 1989–2009", *Journal of Peace Research* (2017) (DOI: 10.1177/0022343317735882), and associated Online appendix.

[36] In total, more than 35,000 news articles have been consulted for the v.1.0-2016 dataset version. Materials are saved in an internal archive.

4. List of variables in the UCDP Peacemakers at Risk Dataset [par]

The UCDP PAR Dataset [par] has a structure that includes classic and extant UCDP variables, a number of additional and more recent variables relevant for creating UCDP Geo-Referenced Event Data (GED), as well as newly created variables relevant for coding violence involving third party intervening actors (underlined variable names in the column "Variable name" denotes these new PAR variables). Below follows an overview of all variables included in the PAR Dataset v. 1.0-2016.[37]

Variable Name	Content	Type
id	A unique numeric ID identifying each event.	Integer
ged50_corresp_id	Is event included in the UCDP GED Dataset version 5.0-2016? [UCDP GED ID] = yes, the event is already included in the UCDP GED Dataset.[38] 0 = no, the PAR event is unique.	Integer
year	Shows the calendar year in which the event took place.	Integer (date)
code_status	Clear: event fulfils all UCDP/PAR criteria for inclusion Organisation: event fulfils all criteria for inclusion apart from the organisational criteria on Side A (Local actors).[39]	String
source_article	The name and date of the source material from which information on the event is gathered.	String
source_original	The type of person, organisation, or other unit from which the information in the source stems.	String
dyad_dset_id	Dyad ID code for each unique PAR dyad.	Integer
dyad_name	Name of the dyad creating the event (for example Government of Somalia-AMISOM or CNDD-OMIB or civilians-Operation Licorne).[40]	String
side_a	The name(s) of Side A in the dyad. For PAR it will be the name of the government in the country of deployment or non-state actor(s)	Formatted string

---

[37] Some information collected and coded is not published in the dataset. For instance, text extracts from the source article on which the coding is based is not provided due to copyright issues. To learn about extant UCDP variables, see UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset and UCDP Geo-referenced Event Dataset (GED) codebooks.

[38] Users wishing to use both PAR and UCDP GED Datasets should exclude this event in order to avoid double-counting.

[39] Events listed as code-status "Organisation" can thus implicate less organised or known actor categories ("mobs"; "organisation unknown"), as well as altogether unknown actors ("unknown"), on the basis of how they are describe in the source-materials. Users wishing to make PAR compatible with UCDP data and coding rules may opt to exclude events listed here as "Organisation".

[40] Dyad names can in PAR be composed of more than one group on either "side".

	involved in a dyad with a third party actor. It may also be one of the generic names for actors that are not known or do not meet the organisation criterion (see codes below): "civilians"; "mobs"; "organisation unknown"; "unknown".[41]	
side_a_dset_id	The unique ID of actor(s) in Side A. From the UCDP Actor Dataset.[42] It may also be one of the following generic IDs, including for less organised or known actors: "9999": code for civilians in Side A, i.e. cases in which a third party actor uses direct force against an unarmed civilian ("civilians"); "6058": code for demonstrators, protestors, mobs that use any form of material force ("mobs"); "6059": code for seemingly organised but unknown/unidentified actors ("organisation unknown"); "6060": code for unknown/unidentified actors ("unknown") <u>NOTE</u>: Local actors or alliances not previously included in UCDP data are displayed separately in the file "par_actors_a", included in dataset supporting materials.	Integer
side_b	The name(s) of Side B in the dyad. For PAR the name of the third party actor (peace operation acronym). Notes also any additional actors, including local armed actors, where implicated as acting in cooperation with a third party actor in the same event.	String
side_b_dset_id	The unique ID(s) of Side B, created for the PAR Dataset.[43] <u>NOTE</u>: For further information on actors and alliances on side b, see among the dataset supporting materials, "par_peacekeepers".	Integer
side_b_pko_id	The PKO actor(s) involved in the specific event, created for the PAR Dataset.	Integer
country	Name of the country in which the event takes place.[44]	String

---

[41] "Clear" entries in the Code_status variable denote known/identified and organised actors or civilians. "Organisation" entries in the "code_status" variable denotes "mobs", "organisation unknown" or "unknown" local actor categories.

[42] Where more than one actor is reported as cooperating in the same event, a unique actor code is used. See file "par_actors_a" among the dataset supporting materials.

[43] Each particular form of actor collaboration receives a unique ID; these are available in the separate file "par_peacekeepers", included in dataset supporting materials. Multiple actors are coded for the same side in events where several actors are reported to be directly involved and where the incident in question cannot – on the basis of the information provided – be further disaggregated.

[44] Filtering by country thus garners events taking place on that territory, rather than where the conflict or peacekeeping intervention is necessarily based. While generally the same, violence occasionally takes place across a border and in another country.

country_id	Gleditsch and Ward code of the country in which the event takes place.	Integer
where_prec	The geo-precision code for the location reflecting the preciseness of the coordinates and eventual estimation.	Integer (1-7)
where_coordinates	Name of the location to which the event is assigned (name of place described by lat and lon)	String
adm_1	The name of the first order administrative division (province etc.) in which the event took place.	String
adm_2	The name of the second order administrative division (district etc.) in which the event took place.	String
latitude	The latitude coordinates of the location.	Numeric (float)
longitude	The longitude coordinates of the location.	Numeric (float)
geom_wkt	Geometry (lat/lon) information in OGC WKT format	WKT
priogrid_gid	The PRIO-GRID cell in which this specific event took place. Compatibility with PRIO-grid[45] for PRIO-grid 1 and 2.	Integer
event_clarity	1 (high) for events where the reporting allows the coder to identify the event in full. 2 (lower) for events where an aggregation of information was already made by the source material that is impossible to undo in the coding process.	Integer
date_prec	How precise the information about the exact time (day) of the occurrence of the event is.	Integer (0 – 5)
date_start	Start date of the event (earliest possible)	Date (YYYY-MM-DD)
date_end	End date of the event (latest possible)	Date (YYYY-MM-DD)
deaths_a	The estimated number of deaths for Side A. For PAR, deaths on Side A entail any fatalities accrued among government or non-state actors, less organised or known local actors, or civilians (when direct party to dyad).	Integer
deaths_b	The estimated number of deaths for Side B. For PAR, deaths on Side B entail *only* third party deaths, all categories, including civilian third parties.	Integer

---

[45] See Andreas Forø Tollefsen, Håvard Strand, and Halvard Buhaug, "PRIO-GRID: A Unified Spatial Data Structure," *Journal of Peace Research* 49, no. 2 (March 1, 2012): 363–74.

deaths_unknown	The estimated number of deaths of unknown persons.[46]	Integer
collateral_civilians[47]	The estimated number of deaths of civilians (civilian bystanders not associated with the third party, nor involved in a direct dyad with the third party in question).	Integer
best_est	The best estimate of fatalities resulting from the event.	Integer
high_est	The high estimate of fatalities resulting from the event. When there is no high estimate for an event, the high estimate cell registers the best estimate fatalities.	Integer
low_est	The low estimate of fatalities resulting from the event. When there is no low estimate for an event, the low estimate cell registers the best estimate fatalities.	Integer
deaths_nationals	Does the total number of fatalities coded in this event include any national members of staff attached to a third party actor? 0 = no (or not known) 1 = yes	Integer (0-1)
non_lethal_violence	In this event, were there *only* non-fatal outcomes to third party actors, and no deaths (in the best estimate)? 0 = no 1 = yes	Integer (0-1)
injury_non_lethal	The estimated number (best estimate) of direct injuries to members of a third party actor; number of casualties.	Integer
kidnap_non_lethal	The estimated number (best estimate) of kidnappings of members of a third party actor; number of affected individuals.	Integer
nationals_non_lethal	Does the total number of non-fatal casualties coded in this event include any national members of staff attached to a third party actor? 0 = no (or not known) 1 = yes	Integer (0-1)
nationality_pko	Variable denoting the reported nationality of individual, violence-affected peacekeepers and the respective outcomes suffered (best estimate only).	String
split	Variable denoting whether or not the violence-outcome estimates	Integer

[46] Included here are also any fatalities attributable to a government or a non-state group, in those cases where they are collaborating militarily with a third party actor (peacekeepers), in an event that cannot be disaggregated between them. This procedure differs from standard practice in UCDP coding, where such deaths would be reported for the relevant fighting "side". This is carried out in order to ensure that all fatalities entered in "deaths_B" are, indeed, those reported as members of a third party (peace operation).

[47] The variable name "collateral_civilians" is used to indicate that civilian fatalities can in the PAR Dataset feature also as "deaths_a", in instances where they form a direct party to a dyad with a third party (peace operation).

	provided in the event have been artificially split between events (assigned based on event-location). 0 = no 1 = yes	(0-1)

5. List of variables in the PAR Dataset supplement [parsupp]

The "PAR Dataset supplement" is a separate dataset [parsupp], which provides supplemental information at the level of the individual third party intervention (peace operation).

Variable name	Content	Type
pko_name	Name (acronym) of PKO.[48]	String
pko_id	The unique ID of the PKO, listed as Side B.[49]	Integer
pko_country	Country of PKO deployment.	String
pko_type	Type of peacekeeping actor (deploying body or deploying arrangement), listing deploying body acronym (e.g. UN, AU) - Ad hoc coalitions of states contributing a peace operation: "ad hoc" - Hybrid mission: "hybrid"	String
pko_def	Does the peace operation fit the stricter definition of a peace operation (Heldt & Wallensteen, 2006)? 0 = no 1 = yes	Integer (0-1)
pko_force	Does the peace operation have the mandated capacity to use force? 0 = no 1 = yes	Integer (0-1)
pko_start	Estimated start-date of PKO, year and month.	Date (YYYY-MM)
pko_end	Estimated end-date of PKO, year and month.	Date (YYYY-MM)
pko_codingnotes	Entry for coding notes and/or coding decisions at the level of the individual peace operation, if applicable.	String

---

[48] Corresponding to that listed in "side_b" in the PAR Dataset, where applicable.
[49] This identifier is the same as that used in the variable entry "side_b_pko_id", in the PAR Dataset.

Appendix 1: The UCDP "event"[50]

A UCDP event is defined as: *"The incidence of the use of armed force by an organised actor against another organised actor, or against civilians, resulting in at least 1 direct death in either the best, low or high estimate categories at a specific location and for a specific temporal duration."*

The separate elements of the definitions are:

1) *Armed force*: use of arms in order to promote the parties' general positions in the conflict, resulting in deaths.

   (a) *Arms*: any material means, e.g. manufactured weapons but also sticks, stones, fire, water etc.

2) *Organised actor*: a government of an independent state, a formally organised group or an informally organised group according to UCDP criteria.

   (a) *Government of an independent state*: the party controlling the capital of a state.

   (b) *Formally organised group*: any non-governmental group of people having announced a name for their group and using armed force against a government (state-based conflict), another similarly organised group (non-state conflict) or unorganised civilians (one-sided violence). The focus is on armed conflict involving consciously conducted and planned political campaigns rather than spontaneous violence.

   (c) *Informally organised groups*: any group without an announced name, but which uses armed force against another similarly organised group (non-state conflict), where there is a clear pattern of incidents being connected.

      i. there is a clear pattern of violent incidents that are connected and in which both groups use armed force against the other.

3) *1 direct death*: one death as

   (a) directly related to combat between the warring parties (state-based and non-state conflict), *or*

   (b) directly related to one-sided violence against civilians.

      i. *Civilians*: unarmed populations that are not part of the organised actors.

4) *Casualty estimate categories*: best, high and low casualty estimates defined by UCDP as

   (a) *Best estimate*: the aggregated most reliable numbers for all incidents of organised violence during one event. If different reports provide different estimates, an examination is made as to what source is most reliable. If no such distinction can be made, UCDP as a rule includes the lower figure given.

   (b) *Low estimate*: the aggregated low estimates for all incidents of organised violence during one event. If different reports provide different estimates and a higher estimate is considered more or equally reliable, the low estimate is also reported if deemed reasonable.

---

[50] This section is taken from Ralph Sundberg, Mathilda Lindgren and Ausra Padskocimaite, *UCDP Geo-referenced Event Dataset (GED) Codebook*, Version 1.5, Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), 2012. Note that while the specific formulation of the UCDP "event" has been revised in codebooks attached to later dataset versions, the definitions (as well as the UCDP GED dataset versions) remain entirely compatible. For the most recent dataset and codebook versions, please see URL <http://ucdp.uu.se/downloads>.

(c) *High estimate*: the aggregated high estimates for all incidents of organised violence during one event. If different reports provide different estimates and a lower estimate is considered more or equally reliable, the high estimate is also reported if deemed reasonable. If there are incidents when there is some uncertainty about which party has been involved, these may also be included in the high estimate.[51]

5) *Specific location*: a name and one pair of x and y coordinates that relate to the geographical information specified in the source material.

6) *Specific temporal duration*: a specified time period during which armed interactions cause at least 1 fatality. The smallest possible temporal unit to which an event can be related is a calendar day (24 hours) starting at midnight.

In UCDP data, each row constitutes an event of violence and is supplemented by additional information on the date, scale, perpetrator and other aspects of the event in question. There are three different types of events based on the above-definition: single-day events, summary events and continuous events. Different event-types differ in aspects of duration, temporal precision and continuity in armed violence. While all event-types are restricted to one specified spatial location, temporal aspects vary between different event types.[52]

---

[51] For a more detailed discussion on aspects concerning points 1-4 please refer to the UCDP Codebooks for State-based Armed Conflicts, Non-State Conflicts and One-Sided Violence, see URL <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/codebooks/>.

[52] Specification of these event-types are detailed in Ralph Sundberg, Mathilda Lindgren and Ausra Padskocimaite, *UCDP Geo-referenced Event Dataset (GED) Codebook*, Version 1.5, Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), 2012. See in particular pp. 5-7 and Appendix 1.

Appendix 2: User manual: Ensuring compatibility with UCDP data

Data collection for the PAR project has sought to make the PAR Dataset compatible with extant UCDP event-data and data formats, to facilitate merging for analysis different datasets on organised violence. The new PAR Dataset has been streamlined against, and thus made compatible with, UCDP GED Version (5.0-2016), at the event-level and along a few key dimensions.[53] While PAR does not represent an additional, mutually exclusive category of violence, definitions and operationalisations underpinning the coding procedures of violence-phenomena for PAR have sought consistency with UCDP GED. In other words, the same or equivalent incidents should typically – albeit not always – be similarly coded along key dimensions (date, location, conflict parties and estimated fatalities).[54] The basic idea here is to facilitate joint study of violence-phenomena.

As a general policy, events are disaggregated to the level possible, including in terms of actors. Thus, events may feature in PAR and other UCDP data that appear closely linked or related, but without overlap in terms of fatalities recorded. Such cases would be coded separately in the respective dataset, and thus not marked as overlapping incidents.

As elaborated on in the main body of the PAR Codebook and User Guide above, the PAR Dataset has expanded the conception of violence to include also non-fatal outcomes to third party actors, as well as how local actors are conceived to include also less organised or known local actors. It is therefore important to note that there are instances where the same events *should* be treated differently in PAR data than in extant UCDP data categories. For example, a third party actor reported to suffer non-fatal outcomes as part of an incident (meeting all other criteria) will be recorded in the PAR dataset; non-fatal outcomes will never be included in ordinary UCDP coding.

Users wishing to make the PAR Dataset theoretically compatible with the UCDP definition and operationalisations may:

(1) Exclude PAR events involving less organised or known local actors.
   o These are marked "Organisation" in the "code_status" variable entry, and denote events implicating the following local actor categories: "mobs"; "organisation unknown"; "unknown".

---

[53] This and other UCDP datasets is available for download at <http://ucdp.uu.se/downloads/>. UCDP GED contains three main types of organised violence tracked by the UCDP: state-based violence; non-state violence and one-sided violence.

[54] Note also that the layouts of the code-sheets differ in few regards. Notably, variable-columns are ordered somewhat differently and variable-names may be modified. Furthermore, each respective dataset records information on a set of unique features. In other words, the datasets do no include an identical set of variables. Notably here, newer versions of UCDP GED introduce additional, novel variables that do not feature in PAR v. 1.0-2016. See the full list of variables above, for further information (including on what information each variable contains). Key UCDP-PAR discrepancies in the treatment of incidents are noted, as relevant, in the PAR Dataset supplement. Coding notes or in PAR Dataset comment entries, available upon request. Note also that some discrepancies stem from forgoing in the PAR data the 25-fatalities criterion and threshold.

(2) Exclude all PAR events with only non-fatal outcomes
   o These are marked as "1" in the "non_lethal_violence" variable entry.[55]

Users wishing to draw on both PAR and other UCDP data on organised violence in the same analysis may, further on:

(1) Exclude incidents that are included in more than one dataset, to ensure that what are interpreted to be the same incidents/fatalities are not counted twice.
   o These incidents are marked in the PAR Dataset with an entry other than 0 in the "ged50_corresp_id", i.e. events specifying a GED ID in this variable entry have already been coded and included in another category of UCDP data.

---

[55] Users should subsequently also of course exclude non-fatal outcome variables from events with both fatal and non-fatal outcomes.

Appendix 3: PAR Geo-referencing: Special rules and procedures

For the PAR Dataset, geo-referencing follows extant UCDP GED guidelines and procedures. This includes, inter alia, the use of precision-scores to reflect levels of precision or certainty of the geographical coordinates extracted from the source-materials and provided in the dataset. Geo-referencing was carried out separately to the original coding process, in a second stage parsing out geographical information from extant incident reporting to produce v.1.0-2016. This segment focuses on rules and procedures related to geo-variables specific to the PAR Dataset.[56] Note also that where applicable, specific decisions or features related to geography are reflected in coding notes in the PAR Dataset supplement, displayed at the level of the operation.

Geo-rules specific for PAR
  ➢ Compounds, camps, guard-posts, posting locations and similar places which are described by the name of an identifiable town or village (e.g. "Bangui camp", "Lafoole guard-post"[57]) are geocoded using the coordinates for the location provided and a precision score of 1, unless information indicates a distance from the location (e.g. town or village) of more than 25 km.
    o It is sometimes possible to locate coordinates for large refugee/IDP camps, where these are identified as sites of attacks. When this is the case, the camps are coded as locations in their own right.
  ➢ When geo-referencing incidences of kidnapping or forcible detainments of peacekeepers, the location of the actual abduction is coded (along with the appropriate precision score), as opposed to any location or locations where peacekeepers later come to be held or released, if these differ. This is in line with the PAR focus on the *act* of abduction.

"Split" based on geography and implications for coding of nationalities
  ➢ In line with UCDP coding procedures, violence-outcome estimates (fatal or non-fatal) are sometimes split into separate events based on event-locations provided in reports. In other words, if event-reports mention multiple locations but only provide one aggregated casualty toll, separate events are created for each reported location, and casualties are artificially "split" and distributed as evenly as possible across the geographical locations provided in the source-material.[58] This was carried out also for

---

[56] Users interested in a full discussion of UCDP variables and coding rules for variables relating to geo-referencing should consult ee.g. Sundberg and Melander, "Introducing the UCDP Georeferenced Event Dataset" and UCDP Geo-referenced Event Dataset (GED) codebooks, available from <http://ucdp.uu.se/downloads>).
[57] Note that these examples are fictive.
[58] Some events are difficult to code based on the geographical information provided by the sources. In such incidents, information may describe fighting in a number of places during one or several days, and then offers a summary casualty toll. According to the strict definition of a split, these are done when the sum total of casualties is known as well as the places they occurred. However, there is not always clear indication that casualties occurred in all places mentioned, although there may be no indications to the contrary either. In these

the PAR Dataset, at a later stage and in connection with the geo-coding process. This procedure can have implications for the coding of nationalities of violence-affected peacekeepers.[59]

➢ In general nationalities are distributed as evenly as possible across the events in question, in line with coding procedures for "split". Thus, if there are several affected people from the same country of origin, they are distributed between the number of events to the extent possible.

  o If there are fewer people from each country than there are events (e.g. one person each from two countries, and two events), the nationalities are randomly assigned to events.[60]

  o If the incidence of a type of outcome is lower than the number of events (e.g. one PKO death, two events), the outcome and its corresponding nationality is randomly assigned.

➢ The even distribution of the number of outcomes (deaths and/or non-fatal incidents) is prioritised over the even distribution of nationalities.

Event-specific information on any such breakdown is available upon request, as is information on events in the dataset for which a "split" has been implemented.

---

instances, a split is generally made based on the reported locations, assuming deaths took place in all locations provided in the source-materials and in connection with the violence described. If the sources indicate that the places mentioned are not the only places where fighting happened/casualties were accrued, an additional event with a location on a higher level of aggregation is created.

[59] This concerns only a small number of events in the actual dataset (in the current dataset version less than a dozen).

[60] It follows that it is in theory and by way of this procedure possible that the dataset includes artificially assigned peacekeeper casualties to a geographical location where perhaps peacekeepers of that nationality were not deployed. Owing to the lack of readily available information sub-national peacekeeping deployments consistently across interventions in the dataset and over time, this is however difficult to account for. Conversely, were such data available, it could conceivably be used to triangulate locations of incidences of violence and perhaps improve the precision with which certain events are geo-coded.