

Database on Constitution-Building Processes in Fragile Settings

Methodology

International IDEA has worked on the role of constitution building processes in conflict management and state building since 2003, developing knowledge resources and providing advisory services. International IDEA understands constitution building as part of a broader process in which key stakeholders decide on the way in which power is to be institutionalized and exercised, and therefore as a critical element in any political settlement after conflict. While the importance of constitution-building processes is increasingly recognized among the development and the peace-building community, there is no tool that provides users with data about constitution-building processes within broader political-settlement processes.

In 2008, Professor Jennifer Widner from Princeton University published a foundational article on “Constitution Writing in Post-Conflict Settings: An Overview”, using data collected as part of an original dataset on constitution writing and conflict resolution from 1975 to 2003. This dataset used 130 distinct variables (or “items of information”) to describe the constitution-building process in fragile settings.

International IDEA has now updated and expanded Prof. Widner’s codebook (see Annex 1), including over 200 distinct variables, and started collecting data on constitution-building processes in fragile, conflict-affected or post-conflict settings from 2001 to today. This database will be regularly updated as constitution-building process conclude with the adoption of a new constitution or constitutional amendment.

Case Study Selection

This database draws its cases from constitution-building processes that have, since 2001, concluded with the adoption of a new constitution, the amendment of a preexisting constitution, or the restoration of a previously suspended constitution (see Elkins, Ginsburg and Melton 2009).

The database, however, specifically focuses only on countries that (1) after 2001 engaged in a constitution-building process following or during the occurrence of, armed conflict (as defined by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP)¹), or (2) after 2001 *significantly* amended an existing constitution

¹ UCDP distinguishes between three types of armed conflict: (1) interstate armed conflict between two or more states or extra-systemic armed conflict between a state and a non-state group outside its own territory; (2) internal armed conflict between the government of a state and one or more internal opposition group(s) without intervention from other states; and (3) internationalized internal armed conflict between the government of a state and one or more internal opposition group(s) with intervention from another state (a secondary party) on one or both sides. The UCDP database also distinguishes between low intensity conflict – between 25 and 999 battle-related deaths in a given year; and high intensity conflict – at least 1000 battle-related deaths in a given year.

during or following armed conflict (as defined by UCDP) (see criteria for significant amendments in Annex 1).

- Where countries have adopted a new constitution (or restored an old one), we include any instance of armed conflict that took place after UCDP started recording up until the constitution was adopted.
- Where countries have amended an existing constitution, we include any instance of armed conflict that either (a) started before and continued after the adoption of the constitution; or (b), started after the adoption of the constitution and was addressed by the amendment(s) (criteria to distinguish relevant amendments are listed below).

Constitution-Building Processes

Fragile and conflict-affected states increasingly engage in constitution-building, often with the aim of preventing the resurgence of conflict and sustaining peace. In fragile and conflict-affected settings, constitution-building is an exceedingly difficult undertaking. Building a constitution requires more than drafting a text; it is necessary to design a process that will lead stakeholders to a successful transition from war to peace, creating a new social contract between citizens and the state. The constitution-building process is part of a broader political-settlement process in which, over an extended period of time, key stakeholders decide new ways in which power should be held and exercised (see Bell and Zulueta-Fülscher 2016).

In accordance with Prof. Widner's categorisation, International IDEA has adopted the division of the constitution-building process into eight distinct stages. These extend from initial negotiations or "talks about talks" – which might sometimes take place before or during peace negotiations – to ratification, and sometimes also subsequent amendment of the constitutional text. The stages are an attempt to structure constitution-building processes in a way that allows for comparison between cases. At the same time, the user should bear in mind that while some processes can be neatly divided into the eight stages, the majority cannot. For instance, there are cases in which no interim constitution was adopted, and there are cases in which there were no amendments to the constitution after its entry into force. More importantly, perhaps, there are cases that did not have an initial drafting stage clearly distinguishable from the final drafting stage, and there are cases that had several (i.e. a number of distinct bodies took sequential turns in preparing the initial draft). The sequencing of the stages can also vary, with public participation, for instance, happening before, during or after the finalization of the draft constitution. Such idiosyncrasies can hamper informed comparison between constitution-building processes. As far as possible, this database aims to promote comparability by including all process related information, structured around the eight stages.

Below the reader can find the eight stages enumerated and briefly explained:

1. **Talks about talks.** Most constitution-building processes, especially after conflict or in times of profound crises, begin with deliberations on the types of constitution-making body, rules and timetables. Oftentimes these talks about talks are not formalized (in law or any other type of

agreement), but happen “ad hoc.” The format of these deliberations, and the degree of participation/inclusion, varies from case to case.

2. **Interim constitution drafting process.** Oftentimes, especially in constitution-building processes after/during conflict, the negotiating parties agree on some form of interim political arrangement or interim constitution meant to serve as a bridge between the former and the future constitutional regimes. An interim constitution is “a constituent instrument that asserts its legal supremacy for a certain period of time pending the enactment of a contemplated final constitution” (Zulueta-Fülscher 2015: 9).
3. **Initial drafting stage.** While the legislature or a constituent assembly (or convention) might be ultimately responsible for drafting the constitution or constitutional amendment, oftentimes there is an appointed (sometimes elected) commission or committee (or groups of experts) responsible for preparing the initial draft. This initial draft is then subsequently debated (amended and/or adopted) by the legislature/assembly/convention. Usually this commission/committee is generated by the body with ultimate responsibility for the draft, i.e. the legislature, constituent assembly or constitutional convention, and/or appointed by the executive. It is furthermore possible that several different bodies work sequentially on the initial draft. The database accounts for this eventuality in that every body sequentially responsible for the initial draft is dealt with separately (i.e. multiple initial drafting stages are identified).
4. **Final constitution-making stage.** This stage mainly refers to the body ultimately responsible for deciding when the draft is ready to be adopted. This body is oftentimes also charged with sending the draft to be ratified by referendum, and/or to be promulgated by the head of state. This body will usually take the text produced by the aforementioned committee or commission, review it, and amend it before submitting the draft for ratification, though there might be other bodies involved in reviewing/amending the draft, e.g. a constitutional court, or the executive.
5. **Civic education and public consultation stage.** Throughout the constitution-building process, and even before, outside actors or stakeholders directly involved in the process, might want to involve the public in either of two ways: civic education and/or public consultation campaigns. Civic education refers to any process or activities undertaken to increase public knowledge and/or awareness of constitutional values and principles. Public participation elicits peoples’ reflections on either proposed or desired constitutional changes.
6. **Review and ratification of the draft.** Sometimes constitutions need to be reviewed before they are ratified. Oftentimes the body with the ultimate responsibility for drafting conducts these reviews, advised or instructed by a Constitutional or Supreme Court in charge of certifying the constitutional draft. Ratification, on the other hand, can vary quite significantly. Some ratification processes involve the legislature/constituent assembly only, while others require a referendum; still others might require the vote of sub-state legislatures or the endorsement of the executive.
7. **Entry into force.** This stage refers to the time or the moment after which the constitution starts being implemented, and might coincide with the final adoption and/or ratification of the constitutional draft.
8. **Amendments after adoption.** Constitutional processes rarely produce perfect constitutions. Sometimes constitutions need to be amended shortly after being adopted, and sometimes these amendments are quite significant in nature (see Annex 1 below).

Structure of the codebook

The codebook is structured around three basic issues:

1. Identifying the case
2. Specifying the context
3. Detailing the (constitution-building) process

Identifying the case: Here the questions consider the country we are dealing with, the region it is part of, whether it had any type of colonial heritage, the date of the adoption of the new constitution or amendment, as well as the type of the event/process we are describing.

For questions related to the colonial heritage, the researchers have drawn primarily on Paul R. Hensel's (2014) data.

Specifying the context: the dataset provides details on a set of issues related to the context in which the process took place, such as the intensity of the conflict before and after the adoption of the new constitutional dispensation, the type of transition the constitution-building process was a part of, the nature of the political settlement process the constitution-building process is a part of, the peace process the constitution-building process was (or might have been) a part of, transitional justice issues, as well as the role of the international community throughout the political settlement process.

- ➔ Regarding the intensity of the conflict before/after adoption, as well as the level of violence during the constitution-building process, the database uses data from the Uppsala Conflict Data Program.
- ➔ Regarding the type of political settlement process the constitution-building process is a part of the database initially uses Bell and Zulueta-Fülscher (2016), as a guide.
- ➔ Regarding the peace process the constitution-building process is (or might have been) a part of, the database uses the University of Edinburgh PAX Database (<https://peaceagreements.org>).

Detailing the (constitution-building) process: This refers to the eight stages summarized above, or any combination of the stages specific to a particular constitution-building process.

Qualitative research

For each stage of the process, researchers are asked to answer a series of specific questions. Each question corresponds to a single variable in the dataset. For the majority of questions, researchers must choose between two or more prescribed answers (numerically coded according to an ordinal or nominal scale). Their response is complemented with a comment if necessary or appropriate. The comment adds relevant information to the answer chosen, and is backed by key references. For some questions, researchers are to provide a date or number (e.g. the turnout at a referendum in percentage) or are asked to write their own short answer.

Research for the database relies primarily on **qualitative** sources, drawing on information from both primary materials and secondary literature, including newspaper articles, public statements, laws and formal agreements, and academic articles and books.

To increase the rigor of the research, the database uses **double coding**, in that each case study is assigned to two separate researchers. The project manager reviews, consolidates and finalizes each case study. Occasionally, when doubts persist, case studies are sent for review to country experts. Still sometimes the data is not readily available, in which case the researchers have been asked to err on the side of caution and fill out the “no data” answer option.

Furthermore, we invite researchers and practitioners working in the area of peace- and constitution-building to contribute to updating this database. Like all International IDEA databases, there is a feature in the interface—‘Submit feedback’—that allows users to provide updates and/or corrections regarding the information found in specific processes. When a user suggests updates or provides information on missing or incorrect data, the input is sent automatically to the relevant staff member within the Constitution Building Programme who then verifies this information and makes the relevant updates.

Key References

Bell, C. and Zulueta-Fülscher, K., ‘Sequencing Peace Agreements and Constitutions in the Political Settlement Process’, International IDEA Policy Paper No. 13, November 2016

Elgie, R., *Semi-presidentialism: Sub-types and democratic performance*, Oxford University Press: 2011

Elkins, Z., Ginsburg, T., and Melton, J., *The Endurance of National Constitutions*, New York: Cambridge University Press: 2009

Hensel, P. R., "ICOW Colonial History Data Set, version 1.0", 2014, available at <http://www.paulhensel.org/icowcol.html>

Reynolds, A., Reilly, B., and Ellis, A., *Electoral system design: the new International IDEA handbook*, International IDEA: 2008

Sartori, G., *Comparative constitutional engineering: an inquiry into structures, incentives, and outcome*, NYU Press: 1994

Shugart, M. S., and Carey, J. M., *Presidents and assemblies: Constitutional design and electoral dynamics*, Cambridge University Press: 1992

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia, Uppsala University www.ucdp.uu.se, accessed 21 May 2018

Widner, J., ‘Constitution Writing in Post-Conflict Settings: An Overview’, William and Mary Law Review 49: 4, 2009, pp. 1513-1541

Zulueta-Fülscher, K., ‘Interim Constitutions. Peacekeeping and Democracy Building Tools’, International IDEA Policy Paper, October 2015

Annex 1: Codebook

STAGE/TYPE OF QUESTION	QUESTIONS	ANSWER OPTIONS
Context		
	Coder's last name	
	Country name	
	Case ID	
	Region	1. Northern Africa 2. Sub-Saharan Africa 3. Latin America and the Caribbean 4. Northern America 5. Central Asia 6. Eastern Asia 7. Southeastern Asia 8. Southern Asia 9. Western Asia 10. Eastern Europe 11. Northern Europe 12. Southern Europe 13. Western Europe 14. Australia and New Zealand 15. Melanesia 16. Micronesia 17. Polynesia
	Colonial Heritage	1. British 2. French 3. Spanish 4. Portuguese 5. Other 6. Communist 7. None
	Date of ratification/promulgation of the constitution (or interim constitution if no final constitution has been adopted) / restoration date of suspended constitution / year of significant amendment(s) (as defined by set International IDEA criteria, c.f. methodology)	

Indicate what specifically happened on the previously-mentioned date	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ratification of new constitution 2. Ratification of a significant amendment(s) 3. Ratification of an interim constitution that functions as the country's constitutional framework 4. Restoration of suspended constitution 5. Restoration of suspended constitution with amendments that altered a critical element of the constitution 6. Other
PAX Database	
Change in the territorial arrangement / structure of state	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From unitary state toward federal state 2. Emergence of special autonomy status in a unitary state 3. From federal toward unitary 4. Other 5. No change
Levels of conflict 1 year after adoption of the new constitution or significant amendment(s) to previous constitution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. Low (Uppsala database: 25 - 999 battle-related deaths per year) 1. High (Uppsala database: +1000 battle-related deaths per year) 2. Not applicable (No conflict; Uppsala database 0 - 24 battle-related deaths per year) 3. No data (Uppsala database: no data)
Levels of conflict 5 years after adoption of the new constitution or significant amendment(s) to previous constitution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. Low (Uppsala database: 25 - 999 battle-related deaths per year) 1. High (Uppsala database: +1000 battle-related deaths per year) 2. Not applicable (No conflict; Uppsala database 0 - 24 battle-related deaths per year) 3. No data (Uppsala database: no data)
Levels of conflict 10 years after adoption of the new constitution or significant amendment(s) to previous constitution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. Low (Uppsala database: 25 - 999 battle-related deaths per year) 1. High (Uppsala database: +1000 battle-related deaths per year) 2. Not applicable (No conflict; Uppsala database 0 - 24 battle-related deaths per year) 3. No data (Uppsala database: no data)
If the outcome of the process at stake was the ratification of a significant amendment, was this amendment part of a series of amendments (related or unrelated), which occurred within 10 years before or after the current change?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes, it was part of a series of at least several significant amendments 2. Yes, it was part of a series of amendments but only one was significant 3. Not applicable 4. No data

Date on which constitution or amended constitution went into force. (Date: MM/DD/YEAR)	
Were elections held prior to the final adoption of constitutional amendments or the new constitution (as part of the broader political settlement process)?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Date on which first elections were held after the new constitution (or significant constitutional amendment) was adopted. (Date: MM/DD/YEAR)	
If restoration of a suspended constitution, indicate the reasons for the earlier suspension	1. State of emergency 2. Military coup against democratically elected government 3. Intervention by mercenaries to replace a democratically elected government 4. Replacement of democratically elected government by armed dissident groups and rebel movements 5. The refusal by an incumbent government to relinquish power to the winning party after free, fair and regular elections 6. Other 7. Not applicable 8. No data
How many times were significant constitutional amendments adopted regarding the previous constitutional framework during the 10 years before the deliberations for the new constitution or constitutional amendment start?	
What were the causes of the conflict taking place prior to the constitution-building process?	1. Civil War 2. Secession 3. Post-electoral violence 4. Popular revolution 5. Military coup 6. Foreign intervention 7. Not applicable
Was the adoption of the constitutional change specified in or linked to a peace or political settlement process (as set out in, e.g. peace agreement, transitional political arrangement, ceasefire or interim constitution)?	1. No, there was such an agreement (or agreements), but the constitutional change was either not specified in the document(s) or not linked to the agreement(s) 2. Yes, the constitutional change was linked to but not specified in such agreement(s) 3. Yes, the constitutional change was specified in one or more such agreement(s) 4. Not applicable, there was no such agreement 5. No data

If the new constitution or amendment is the result of a previous peace or political settlement process: what was the exact document where the constitutional reform was first mentioned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ceasefire agreement 2. Peace agreement (including transitional political arrangements) 3. Transitional political arrangements (not part of a peace agreement) 4. Interim constitution 5. Not applicable 6. No data
If the new constitution or amendment is the result of a previous peace or political settlement process: Was there more than one transitional political arrangement or interim constitution throughout the process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No, there was no change in transitional or interim arrangements 1. Yes, there was more than one interim constitution 2. Yes, there was more than one transitional agreement 3. Yes, there was more than one transitional agreement and more than one interim constitution 4. Not applicable. There was no transitional arrangement or interim constitution 5. No data
If the new constitution or amendment is the result of a previous peace or political settlement process and a related transitional political arrangement (tpa) or interim constitution (ic) had been adopted, was there a ceasefire or peace agreement signed after the tpc/ic and before the final constitution was adopted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If the new constitution or amendment is the result of a previous peace or political settlement process: what was the sequencing pattern chosen for this political settlement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A ceasefire/peace agreement (without transitional political arrangements) followed by a new constitution or significant constitutional amendments 2. A transitional political arrangement (part or not of a peace agreement) followed by a new constitution 3. An interim constitution - preceded or not by a ceasefire/partial peace agreement - followed by a new constitution 4. A transitional political arrangement followed by an interim constitution then followed by a new constitution 5. Other 6. Not applicable 7. No data
Was the new constitution or amendment framed after a secession, a declaration of independence, or the dissolution of a previously-existing state (thus, not as part of a constitutional negotiation process in the parent state)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes, it was framed after a secession 2. Yes, it was framed after an independence process 3. Yes, it was framed after the dissolution of a previously existing state 4. Other 5. No data

Was the new constitution or amendment framed following popular demand for institutional change as expressed in significant street demonstrations or protests?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Was the new constitution or amendment written after a military coup?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Was eligibility for or membership in a regional organization (such as the EU, NATO, Mercosur, the Commonwealth, etc.) at stake for the country either immediately before or during the constitutional change process?	0. No 1. Yes, the State had publicly expressed interest in joining such regional organization 2. Yes, the State had applied, was in the process of applying, or had started formal negotiations for membership in a regional organization 3. Yes, the constitutional change intended to fulfil specific conditions to become member in a regional organization 4. Yes, the status of current membership was at stake 5. Not applicable 6. No data
Were any key actors or groups formally or informally excluded from the constitution writing process, including being banned through a vetting or lustration process, due to their role in the conflict?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did vetting/lustration take place <i>prior</i> to the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did criminal prosecutions for crimes against humanity, war crimes, genocide, or other crimes sanctioned in domestic law related to armed conflict or an authoritarian regime, take place prior to the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did transitional justice institutions (e.g. truth commissions, international, hybrid or national tribunals/special chambers, investigative panels, etc.) operate (including initiation of hearings, reports, investigations, etc.) prior to the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If a transitional justice institution report was released, when was it released?	1. Before the constitution-making process 2. During the constitution-making process 3. After the Constitution was adopted 4. Not applicable 5. No data

Was an amnesty granted <i>prior</i> to the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did vetting/lustration take place <i>during</i> the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did criminal prosecutions for crimes against humanity, war crimes, genocide, or other crimes sanctioned in domestic law related to armed conflict or an authoritarian regime, take place during the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did transitional justice institutions (e.g. truth commissions, international, hybrid or national tribunals/special chambers, investigative panels, etc.) operate (including initiation of hearings, reports, investigations, etc.) during the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Was an amnesty granted <i>during</i> the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did violence continue during the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes, minor armed conflict occurred in at least one but not all years in which the process took place (Uppsala database: 25-999 battle-related deaths per year) 2. Yes, minor armed conflict occurred in all years in which the process took place (Uppsala database: 25-999 battle-related deaths per year) 3. Yes, major armed conflict occurred in at least one but not all years in which the process took place (Uppsala database: +1000 battle-related deaths per year) 4. Yes, major armed conflict occurred in all years in which the process took place (Uppsala database: +1000 battle-related deaths per year)
Were there any spoilers to the constitution-making process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

Was there a form of unconstitutional transfer of power during the constitution-making process?	0. No, any transfer of power was constitutional 1. Yes, there was an unconstitutional transfer of power 2. Yes, there was an unconstitutional transfer of power but addressed under another legal mechanism (e.g. UNSCR) 3. Not applicable, no transfer of power took place 4. No data
Did the international community provide direct support to the political settlement process of which the constitution-building process was a part?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If the international community provided direct support to the political settlement process, was there a formal international mandate?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If there was a formal international mandate, what kind of legal mandate justified international involvement in the political settlement process?	1. UN Security Council Resolution 2. Bi- or multi-lateral state-led agreement with the host country 3. Resolution by the UN General Assembly 4. Regional mandate 5. Other 6. Not applicable 7. No data
If there was a formal international mandate, did this legal mandate justify the establishment of an international administration within the country in question?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
What role did these international actors play in the political settlement process?	1. (Formal) Mediator 2. Certification/formal guarantor 3. Advisor/facilitator 4. Funder 5. Other 6. None 7. Not applicable 8. No data
Did the international community's presence throughout the political settlement process include neighbouring countries (sharing a border)?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
What role did these neighbouring (bordering) countries play?	1. (Formal) Mediator 2. Certification/formal guarantor 3. Advisor/facilitator 4. Funder 5. Other 6. None 7. Not applicable 8. No data

	Did the international community's presence throughout the political settlement process include other (non-neighbouring) countries?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	What role did these other (non-neighbouring) countries adopt throughout the political settlement process?	1. (Formal) Mediator 2. Certification/formal guarantor 3. Advisor/facilitator 4. Funder 5. Other 6. None 7. Not applicable 8. No data
	If there was one or several ceasefire agreements in advance of, or during, the constitution-making process that involved the international community, what role did the international community adopt?	1. (Formal) Mediator 2. Certification/formal guarantor 3. Advisor/facilitator 4. Funder 5. Other 6. None 7. Not applicable 8. No data
	If there were negotiations for a peace agreement or political transitional arrangement before or during the constitution-building process, what role did the international community adopt?	1. (Formal) Mediator 2. Certification/formal guarantor 3. Advisor/facilitator 4. Funder 5. Other 6. None 7. Not applicable 8. No data
	If there were negotiations for one or several interim constitutions throughout the political settlement process, what role did the international community adopt?	1. (Formal) Mediator 2. Certification/formal guarantor 3. Advisor/facilitator 4. Funder 5. Other 6. None 7. Not applicable 8. No data
	Was there a foreign occupation/military intervention (i.e. not a UN peacekeeping operation) in the country in question?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	Was there a UN peacekeeping operation (PKO) in the country in question throughout the political settlement process?	0. No 1. Yes, there was a first generation PKO (based on consent and neutrality, only observers to watch over implementation of a ceasefire) 2. Yes, there was a second generation PKO (based on consent, involving military contingent with no use of force or only for self-defense, and civil contingents) 3. Yes, there was a third generation PKO (peace enforcement, involving military

		contingent allowed to use force, with or without the consent of host-state, and civil contingents) 4. No data
STAGE 1: Talks about talks		
	If preliminary discussions/negotiations took place to establish the type of forum in which constitutional drafting and deliberation would take place, in what kind of forum did these discussions/this process take place?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Part of peace negotiations among warring parties or other international negotiation that ended up in a peace agreement (with or without transitional political arrangements) 2. Part of negotiations that ended up in an interim constitution (including round table discussions between incumbent political leaders and the organized political opposition) 3. A National Conference with representatives of different economic and social groups 4. The legislature 5. A special commission within the legislature 6. Executive branch or ruling party central committee 7. Other 8. Not applicable, no such negotiations 9. No data
	If preliminary discussions/negotiations on the type of forum for constitutional drafting and deliberation took place, did these discussions yield any of the following?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rules for the selection of delegates 2. Rules of procedure to govern subsequent deliberations 3. Ratification procedures 4. Principles that the final constitution must respect 5. Interim constitution and/or political agreement 6. Clear process and timetable 7. Dispute resolution mechanisms for the delegates engaged in the negotiations 8. None 9. Not applicable 10. No data

What groups took part in these discussions/negotiations to establish the forum for drafting/deliberating the constitutional text?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parties to the armed conflict 2. All relevant political parties (even if not represented in the legislature) 3. All political parties represented in the legislature 4. Prominent business groups 5. Civil society groups 6. Traditional leaders (and other identity groups) 7. Religious leaders 8. Ethno-religious or indigenous minorities 9. Women and/or women groups 10. Armed forces representatives 11. Local authorities 12. Diaspora groups 13. International actors 14. It was an executive-led process 15. Other 16. Not applicable 17. No data
Did any political parties publicly self-exclude themselves from, or boycott, this part of the process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
How many people participated in these discussions/negotiations?	
Did external third parties, such as representatives of an international organization, diplomats from another country, or an international religious organization assist throughout the discussions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, they constituted an intrinsic part of the discussion and/or connected different stakeholders in these discussions 2. Yes, they, facilitated meetings and/or advised stakeholders 3. Yes, they formally mediated 4. No 5. Not applicable, no such negotiations 6. No data
Where did these negotiations take place?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capital city 2. Important secondary city 3. At a remote location within the country 4. At one or more locations outside the country 5. At multiple locations in and outside the country 6. Not applicable, no such negotiation 7. No data

	<p>What constraints were placed on the parties' interactions with the media in the talks about talks?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The negotiations took place in secret, without publicity. 2. There was an agreed press embargo with enforcement mechanisms negotiated among the parties. 3. The negotiators met in closed sessions, with occasional or regular progress reports to the outside world, agreed by all parties. 4. The parties agreed that only the chairperson or mediator, individually or working through a press secretariat, should communicate with the press or with the outside world about the content of agreements. 5. Relationships with the media and the outside world were at each party's discretion. 6. Media or the public could observe some significant portion of the deliberation. 7. The negotiating parties actively reached out to the media and engaged them as a partner in publicising their work 8. Not applicable, no such negotiations 9. No data
Stage 2: Interim Constitution Drafting Process		
	<p>Was there an interim constitution adopted in advance of the final constitution-building process?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	<p>If there was an interim constitution in advance of the final constitution, did negotiations to develop an interim constitution take place more than once?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	<p>What was the nature of the interim constitution(s)?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new text that superseded the constitutional regime previously in place 2. Amendments to an existing constitution 3. An old constitution that was temporarily reinstated 4. Not applicable 5. No data
	<p>Did one or more interim constitution(s) alter the original agreement on procedures for amending or adopting the Constitution?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	<p>Did the body endowed with responsibility for preparing the interim constitution develop its own rules of procedure or did it operate with rules determined in earlier negotiations?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developed its own rules of procedure 2. Abided by rules developed in an earlier stage 3. Other 4. Not applicable 5. No data

Was there a timetable announced at the beginning of the interim constitution building process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If there was a timetable, was it followed?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
How long did the preparation of the interim constitution take? (in months)	
Were there any other rules (e.g. rules of procedure, rules of selections, etc.) announced at the beginning of the interim constitution-building process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
How were delegates to the body that prepared the interim constitution selected?	1. By the executive 2. By the leaders of the warring parties 3. By the political parties not represented in parliament 4. Existing legislature 5. Elected from within the ranks of the legislature 6. By corporate bodies, such as peak associations or religious leadership 7. Popularly elected 8. Other 9. Not applicable 10. No data
What was the size of the body with a formal role in the negotiation for the interim constitution?	
Did any important party or stakeholder boycott this phase of the process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

	What constraints were placed on the parties' interactions with the media during the deliberations regarding the interim constitution?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The negotiations took place in secret, without publicity. 2. There was an agreed press embargo with enforcement mechanisms negotiated among the parties. 3. The negotiators met in closed sessions, with occasional or regular progress reports to the outside world, agreed by all parties. 4. The parties agreed that only the chairperson or mediator, individually or working through a press secretariat, should communicate with the press or with the outside world about the content of agreements. 5. Relationships with the media and the outside world were at each party's discretion. 6. Significant portions of the proceedings were broadcast 7. The negotiating parties actively reached out to the media and engaged them as a partner in publicising their work 8. Not applicable 9. No data
	How was compliance to be ensured with fundamental principles or rules and procedures included in the Interim Constitution regarding the newly-adopted constitution or constitutional amendment?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Judicial review of the draft 2. Executive review of the draft 3. Other 4. Not applicable (no compliance procedures specified) 5. Not applicable 6. No data
	What decision rule was used to produce the interim constitution?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus 2. 3/4 majority 3. 2/3 majority 4. 3/5 majority 5. Simple majority 6. Other 7. Not applicable 8. No data
Stage 3: Initial drafting stage		
	At the beginning of the constitution-making process, was there a specific timetable set?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	If there was a clear timetable, was it followed?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

Were there any other substantive principles or procedural rules announced at the beginning of the constitution-making process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
How many bodies were sequentially involved in preparing the initial draft?	
How long did the preparation of the initial draft take (in months)?	
What was the name of the body assigned the responsibility for preparing the initial draft?	
What type of body was assigned responsibility for preparing the initial draft?	1. A committee or committees (nominated out of the Constituent Assembly/Constitutional Convention/National Conference/Roundtable/Legislature) 2. A separately constituted body, not a sub-committee (e.g. an expert commission appointed by a body with the ultimate responsibility for drafting the constitution) 3. Preparing the initial draft was the responsibility of body with the ultimate responsibility for drafting the constitution as a whole 4. Other 5. Not applicable 6. No data
How many members did the body with the responsibility for preparing the initial draft have?	
If a committee (or constitutional commission) was responsible for preparing the initial draft, how were its members selected?	1. By the dominant party in the drafting body 2. With the approval of a majority of delegates to an elected drafting body and/or regular legislature 3. With the approval of a super-majority of the delegates to an elected drafting body and/or regular legislature 4. By the executive branch 5. By leaders of warring parties 6. By leaders of contending political or social groups 7. By leaders of corporate groups 8. Other or a mix between different procedures 9. Popularly elected 10. By external actors 11. Members appointed by a dominant political power 12. Not applicable 13. No data

Which parties were included on the drafting committee or commission if a political (rather than technical) body was responsible for preparing the initial draft?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parties to the armed conflict or political parties resulting from them 2. Key political parties (even if not represented in the legislature) 3. Political parties represented in the legislature 4. Business groups 5. Civil society groups 6. Traditional and/or religious leaders 7. Ethno-religious or indigenous minority groups 8. Women and/or women groups 9. Armed forces 10. Local authorities 11. Diaspora groups 12. Foreign government officials / international organizations 13. Other 14. None/not applicable 15. No data
Did all major political parties have representatives on the initial drafting committee or commission (if body was political rather than technical in nature)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did any actors or groups of actors have an observer status in the body preparing the initial draft?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Which decision-making rules for adopting the initial draft did the committee responsible for preparing the initial draft employ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus 2. Super-majority of the entire committee 3. Super-majority of those present the day of voting 4. Majority within the committee 5. Majority within those present the day of voting 6. Other 7. Not applicable 8. No data
Is there evidence to suggest that significant segments of popular or elite opinion considered the body in charge of preparing the initial draft to be insufficiently representative?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did any major party or group that was invited to participate in the development of the initial draft choose to boycott this part of the process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

Where did the preparation of the initial draft take place?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capital city 2. Important secondary city 3. At a remote location within the country 4. At multiple locations within the country 5. At a location outside the country 6. At multiple locations in and outside the country 7. Not applicable 8. No data
What constraints were placed on the parties' interactions with the media during the negotiations to develop the initial draft?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The negotiations took place in secret, without publicity 2. There was an agreed press embargo with enforcement mechanisms negotiated among the parties 3. The negotiators met in closed sessions, with occasional or regular progress reports to the outside world, agreed by all parties 4. The parties agreed that only the chairperson or mediator, individually or working through a press secretariat, should communicate with the press or with the outside world about the content of agreements 5. Relationships with the media and the outside world were at each party's discretion 6. Significant portions of proceedings were broadcast 7. The negotiations were open to the public 8. The negotiating parties actively reached out to the media and engaged them as a partner in publicising their work 9. Not applicable, no such negotiations 10. No data
Did the body in charge of preparing the initial draft have a website or a facebook page?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did this body have an explicit, pre-determined time limit for the preparation of the initial draft?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If there was a pre-determined time limit for the preparation of the initial draft, was this time limit kept?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
How long did this body work on the preparation of the initial draft (in months)?	

	Did the committee that prepared the initial draft have research staff or staff to provide drafting assistance?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	Did the executive have the right to amend the initial draft before it was presented to the body with ultimate authority?	0. No 1. Yes, the executive amended the initial draft, and the Head of State, Head of Government and/or cabinet also had the legal right to amend the initial draft 2. Yes, the Head of State, Head of Government and/or cabinet amended the initial draft with no right or without clear right to do so 3. Not applicable 4. No data
Stage 4: Final constitution-making stage		
	How was the body denominated that exercised ultimate responsibility for drafting the constitution (i.e. final deliberative body with authority to adopt the draft)?	1. Constitutional convention or specially elected constituent assembly (working in parallel to the legislature) 2. National conference 3. Roundtable / Peace negotiations 4. (Already elected) legislature sitting in special session as a constituent assembly 5. Normal legislature 6. A commission appointed by the legislature 7. Executive branch officials 8. Party central committee 9. A commission appointed by the executive 10. Appointed (or elected) transitional legislature 11. Decolonization conference 12. Other 13. Elected Constituent Assembly acting also as a regular legislature 14. Not applicable 15. No data
	How many members did the constitution-making body have?	
	How many members had voting authority in this body?	
	If the body with ultimate authority to draft the constitution was an assembly (regular, interim or dual function as a constituent assembly), was the body with the ultimate authority unicameral or bicameral?	1. Unicameral 2. Bicameral 3. Not applicable, ultimate body was not the legislature 4. No data

Did the constitution-making body establish its own rules of procedure?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it developed its own rules of procedure specific to the constitution making process 2. No, it abided by rules developed in an earlier stage of the process 3. No, rules were developed outside of the constitution-making process (pre-existing rules for the body) 4. Other 5. Not applicable 6. No data
How were delegates to the body with ultimate responsibility (i.e. not the committee/commission responsible for preparing the initial draft) for the draft selected?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By the head of state 2. By the leaders of the warring parties 3. By the major political parties 4. By the legislature 5. Elected from within the ranks of the legislature 6. By corporate bodies, such as peak associations or religious leadership 7. Popularly elected (Constituent Assembly) 8. Popularly elected (regular legislature) 9. Other 10. Not applicable 11. No data
If the body with ultimate responsibility for the draft was popularly elected, please explain the electoral system used?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SMP 2. Other single-member-district system (double-ballot, AV) 3. Mixed PR/Majoritarian 4. PR 5. Indirect election 6. Other 7. Not applicable 8. No data
If the body with ultimate responsibility for the draft was popularly elected, was the general context conducive to free and fair elections?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If the body with ultimate responsibility for the drafting was popularly elected, how long was the campaign period (in months)?	
Was there special representation (i.e. quotas) for individual groups based on gender ethnicity, religion, or any other differentiating factor?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Where all electoral districts based on population size?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

If there was an elected Constituent Assembly, was it elected using the same rules as the previous or current legislature?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Could delegates to the body with ultimate authority for the drafting sit concurrently in the regular legislature?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Could delegates to the body with ultimate authority for the drafting hold a concurrent appointment in the judiciary or in the executive branch?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Could delegates to the body with ultimate authority for the drafting run for legislative office or for the executive post in the first election after the new constitution went into effect?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Which parties were included in the body ultimately responsible for the draft?	1. Parties to the armed conflict or political parties resulting from them 2. Key political parties (even if not represented in the legislature) 3. Political parties represented in the legislature 4. Business groups 5. Civil society groups 6. Traditional and/or Religious leaders 7. Ethno-religious or indigenous minority groups 8. Women and/or women groups 9. Armed forces 10. Local authorities 11. Diaspora groups 12. Foreign government officials / international organizations 13. Other 14. None/not applicable 15. No data
Were some major parties (e.g. political parties, but also parties to the conflict, or key societal groups) not represented in the body ultimately responsible for the draft?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did any actors or groups of actors have an observer status in the body ultimately responsible for the draft?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Is there evidence to suggest that significant segments of popular or elite opinion considered the body with ultimate responsibility for the draft to be insufficiently representative?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

Did any major party or group that was invited to participate in the discussion and ultimate approval of the draft choose to boycott this part of the constitution-making process (distinct from ratification)?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Where did the body ultimately responsible for the draft meet?	1. Capital city 2. Important secondary city 3. At a remote location within the country 4. At multiple locations within the country 5. At a location outside the country 6. At multiple locations in and outside the country 7. Not applicable 8. No data
What constraints were placed on the parties' interactions with the media during the negotiations in the body with ultimate responsibility for the draft?	1. The negotiations took place in secret, without publicity 2. There was an agreed press embargo with enforcement mechanisms negotiated among the parties 3. The negotiators met in closed sessions, with occasional or regular progress reports to the outside world, agreed by all parties 4. The parties agreed that only the chairperson or mediator, individually or working through a press secretariat, should communicate with the press or with the outside world about the content of agreements 5. Relationships with the media and the outside world were at each party's discretion 6. Significant portions of proceedings were broadcast 7. Proceedings open to the general public 8. The negotiating parties actively reached out to the media and engaged them as a partner in publicising their work 9. Not applicable 10. No data
Did the constitution-making body (or the body ultimately responsible for the constitutional draft) have a website or facebook page?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Was there an explicit, pre-determined time limit for these deliberations (this refers to the final drafting stage, if different from the initial drafting stage)?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If there was a pre-determined time limit for the final drafting stage, was this time limit kept?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

Did delegates to the body with ultimate responsibility for the draft have the power to propose individual provisions, or could they propose whole drafts only?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delegates could propose individual provisions 2. Delegates could propose whole drafts only 3. Delegates could only vote a sub-committee or commission proposal up or down (i.e. delegates had no power to propose) 4. Delegates' initiative powers limited in some other way 5. Not applicable 6. No data
Did the rules of procedure permit delegates to vote on individual provisions or on whole drafts only?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vote by individual provision 2. Vote on whole drafts only 3. Other 4. Not applicable 5. No data
Which decision-making rules did the body ultimately responsible for the constitutional draft employ to adopt the draft?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus 2. Super-majority of members 3. Simple majority of members 4. Simple majority of members present the day of voting 5. Other 6. Super majority of members present the day of voting 7. Not applicable 8. No data
Were the rules of procedure ever amended throughout the constitution-making process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did members of the body with the ultimate responsibility for drafting the constitution form new political parties during the drafting process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did members of the body with the ultimate responsibility for drafting the constitution form political parties within a year of the ratification of the constitution (or constitutional amendment)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Were legislative or executive elections held during the constitution-building process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
How soon were legislative or executive elections held following the ratification of the constitution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0-1 years 2. 1-2 years 3. 2-3 years 4. 3-4 years 5. More than 4 years 6. Not applicable 7. No data

	Did the elections for the first legislature after adoption of the new constitution (or constitutional amendment) follow the same rules as the ones used to elect the previous legislature?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	At the time of the deliberations, was the short-term electoral strength of all political parties uncertain, or was one party clearly dominant?	1. Future electoral strength of parties was uncertain 2. One party was clearly dominant 3. More than one party had a head start 4. Not applicable 5. No data
	Did external actors play a role in the constitution-building process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	Was the role of external actors minor (provided advice on request) or major (proposed and wrote terms)?	1. Major 2. Minor 3. Not applicable (no external mediators) 4. No data
	Was a ceasefire/peace agreement/transitional political arrangement signed during the constitution-building process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	Did it contribute to peace (i.e. reducing number of deaths) the year of the agreement?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	Was a ceasefire/peace agreement/transitional political arrangement signed within a year of the conclusion of the constitution-building process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	Did it contribute to peace (i.e. reducing number of deaths) the year of the agreement?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Stage 5: Civic education and public participation		
	Before a draft was released, was there a official/formal campaign to inform citizens about the constitution-writing process?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	If there was an official/formal civic education campaign, how long did this campaign last (in months)?	
	Was there a distinct civil society initiative to inform citizens about the design of the constitution-writing process (e.g. how delegates were selected, their mandate and functions, timelines, etc.)?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

Were any of the education campaigns (governmental or civil society) funded from international sources?	1. Funded by foreign governments 2. Funded by foreign NGOs 3. Funded by international organizations (UN, etc.) 4. Funded by multiple sources (explain in comments) 5. No 6. Not applicable 7. No data
Did either the government educational campaign or the civic education initiative encompass citizens living in remote rural areas or were these programs primarily urban?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did either the government educational campaign or the civic education initiative encompass diaspora groups (living outside the country)?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Was there an official/formal public consultation campaign?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If there was an official/formal public consultation campaign, how long did this campaign last (in months)?	
Were civil society organizations involved in the public consultation campaign?	0. No 1. Yes, such organizations participated as a constituency 2. Yes, such organizations assisted to implement the official/formal campaign 3. Yes, such organizations held an independent consultation process distinct from any official/formal consultation process 4. Not applicable 5. No data
Were public consultation campaigns funded from international sources?	1. Funded by foreign governments 2. Funded by foreign NGOs 3. Funded by international organizations (UN, etc.) 4. Funded by multiple sources 5. No 6. Not applicable 7. No data
When did the opportunity for public comment occur?	1. Before work began on the initial draft. 2. During development of the initial draft. 3. Between completion of the initial draft and approval of the ultimate draft by the constitution-making body. 4. Not applicable 5. No data

What did these public participation campaigns include?	1. Meetings between constitution-making officials and civic groups 2. Meetings between constitution-making officials and citizens in local communities 3. Meetings between constitution-making officials and corporate groups (e.g. unions, trade associations, etc) 4. Radio broadcasts 5. Additions into school curricula 6. Popular theater, songs, comics designed to explain the process/draft 7. Opinion surveys 8. Not applicable 9. No data 10. Other
Did the formal process for public comment include hearings before the drafting body?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Who participated in the formal process for public comment?	1. Members of the public and corporate bodies 2. Assemblies in regions, districts, or state 3. Citizens at the town/village level 4. Political parties 5. Other groups (e.g. diaspora, women, minorities, vulnerable groups) 6. Not applicable 7. No data
How much time (in months) did the public comment last after the draft was released?	
Is there any evidence that one or more provisions in the draft was changed or influenced by the process of public comment?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Is there evidence that the body with ultimate responsibility for the draft expressly over-rode a widely-shared popular view or is there suspicion that such may have occurred?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Was there vocal opinion criticizing that the opportunity for public participation was insufficient or biased?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did the official body responsible for receiving public comment release a report?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
What were the two or three most contentious design issues throughout the constitution-building process, to your knowledge?	
Stage 6: Review and ratification	

Was there judicial review of the final draft?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Did any officer or body, other than a constitutional court, have legal veto power or other procedural means to prevent the adoption of the draft or the completion of the constitution-making process (e.g. pocket veto)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
What was the body required to ratify the constitution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The constitutional convention or constituent assembly 2. A legislature sitting in special session such as a Constituent Assembly 3. A roundtable 4. Popular referendum 5. Legislatures of states or other constituent units 6. The regular legislature 7. Judicial approval 8. Executive endorsement 9. Parties in peace negotiations 10. A departing colonial authority or any other international actor 11. Others 12. Not applicable 13. No data
If the regular legislature, a convention, or a constituent assembly had the power to ratify the constitution, what kind of margin was required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus 2. 3/4 majority 3. 3/5 majority 4. 2/3 majority 5. Simple majority 6. Absolute majority 7. Other 8. Not applicable 9. No data
If legislatures of constituent states or units had the power to ratify the constitution, what kind of margin was required within each legislature and among the constituent units?	
If the regular legislature, a convention, or a constituent assembly had the power to ratify the constitution, what was the actual margin by which the constitution was approved?	
If the regular legislature was not able to reach the required margin, was there a deadlock-breaking mechanism devised (e.g. a referendum in case the regular legislature is not able to reach a set majority)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

If a popular referendum was part of the ratification process, did voters have the opportunity to cast votes for specific items/provisions or could they only vote the whole constitution up or down?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could cast votes for specific provisions or items 2. Could only vote the document up or down 3. Not applicable 4. No data
If a popular referendum was part of the ratification process, what margin was required for approval?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus 2. 3/4 majority 3. 3/5 majority 4. 2/3 majority 5. (Simple/absolute) majority 6. Other 7. Not applicable 8. No data
If a popular referendum was part of the ratification process, were there requirements about the distribution of approval across regions or groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If a popular referendum was required/allowed to ratify the constitution, was a specific turnout required? (And if yes, what was the turnout?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
Was it obligatory for registered voters to vote at the referendum?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If a popular referendum occurred, was this procedure spelled out in the prior constitution/existing law or was it part of the design of the process and therefore included as part of a peace agreement, transitional political arrangement or interim constitution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authorized under existing law 2. Other mechanism (peace agreement, transitional political arrangement or interim constitution) 3. Not applicable 4. No data
If a popular referendum occurred, what was the reported margin?	
If a popular referendum occurred, what was the actual turnout?	
If a popular referendum occurred, were there clear pockets of disapproval in regions or among ethnic or religious groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If a popular referendum occurred, were members of the diaspora allowed to vote?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data

	If a popular referendum occurred, did voters have to establish residency and citizenship?	1. Yes, they had to establish residency only 2. Yes, they had to establish residency and citizenship 3. Yes, they had to establish citizenship only 4. No 5. Not applicable 6. No data
	If a referendum was required for ratification, how long was the period from publication to voting? (in months)	
Stage 7: Entry into force		
	Was there a gap between adoption of the new constitution (or amendment) and the date on which the new constitution (or amendment) entered into force?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
	Was the constitution or amendment(s) at stake suspended or superseded in the first five years after its entry into force?	1. Yes, suspended 2. Yes, superseded 3. Never entered into force 4. Still in force after five years 5. Not applicable; five years have not elapsed 6. No data
Stage 8: Amendments		
	Was this constitution (or cluster of amendments) significantly amended within the first ten years after its entry into force?	1. No 2. Yes, first year 3. Yes, second year 4. Yes, third year 5. Yes, fourth year 6. Yes, fifth year 7. Yes, sixth year 8. Yes, seventh year 9. Yes, eighth year 10. Yes, ninth year 11. Yes, tenth year 12. Not yet in force 13. One year not elapsed 14. Suspended during this year 15. Not applicable 16. No data
	If this constitution was amended within ten years of its entry into force, did any of the amendments change the political party system?	1. Yes, from single-party to multi-party system 2. Yes, from multi-party to single-party system 3. Other 4. No 5. Not applicable 6. No data

If this constitution was amended within ten years of its entry into force, did any of the amendments change the system of government?	1. Yes, from parliamentary to semi-presidential 2. Yes, from parliamentary to presidential 3. Yes, from semi-presidential to parliamentary 4. Yes, from semi-presidential to presidential 5. Yes, from presidential to semi-presidential 6. Yes, from presidential to parliamentary 7. Other 8. No 9. Not applicable 10. No data
If this constitution was amended within ten years of its adoption, did any of the amendments change the structure of the legislative?	1. Yes, from unicameral to bicameral 2. Yes, from bicameral to unicameral 3. No 4. Not applicable 5. No data
If this constitution was amended within ten years of its adoption, did any of the amendments change the powers of the executive vis-a-vis the legislature?	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not applicable 3. No data
If this constitution was amended within ten years of its adoption, did any of the amendments change the structure of the state?	1. Yes, from unitary to federal 2. Yes, from unitary to special autonomy arrangements (where specific regions might be mentioned by name) 3. Yes, from unitary to significant decentralization 4. Yes, from federal to unitary 5. No 6. Other 7. Not applicable 8. No data
If this constitution was amended within ten years of its adoption, did any of the amendments change the electoral system?	1. Yes, there was a change of the electoral system re the legislature 2. Yes, there was a change of the electoral system re the president/head of state 3. Yes, there was a change of the electoral system re both the legislature and the head of state 4. No 5. Other 6. Not applicable 7. No data

	How often did significant amendments happen in the first 5 years after adoption?	1. Zero 2. Once or twice 3. Three to five times 4. More than five times 5. Suspended during the first five years 6. Not applicable; five years have not elapsed 7. No data
--	--	--

Annex 2: Criteria for deciding on the significance of amendments

To decide on the significance of constitutional amendments, the database follows the criteria noted below, which refer to a number of substantive changes that might change the nature of the constitutional text and its implementation:

1. Change from a single-party system into a multi-party system, or vice versa.
2. Change in the system of government, in any direction, from parliamentary to semi-presidential (premier-presidentialism or president-parliamentarism) to presidential system (definitions below):
 - **Presidentialism:** there is a directly elected (or popularly elected) fixed-term president, (*no prime minister*), cabinet members are not collectively responsible to the legislature (*but to the president*), and the legislature serves for a fixed term (and cannot be dissolved by the president).
 - **Semi-presidentialism:** there is a directly elected (or popularly elected) fixed-term president, and a prime minister and cabinet, which are collectively responsible to the legislature (*perhaps, though not necessarily, to the president as well*) (Elgie 2011: 22). The president can dissolve the legislature, often given a number of criteria.
 - In case that the prime minister and cabinet are only responsible to the legislature this form of semi-presidentialism is called **Premier-presidentialism**.
 - In case that the PM and cabinet are responsible to both the legislature and the president this form of semi-presidentialism is called **President-parliamentarism** (see Shugart and Carey 1992).
 - **Parliamentarism** – where there is either a monarch or an indirectly elected president (*via parliamentary vote*) and where the prime minister and cabinet are collectively responsible to the legislature
3. Change from a unicameral to a bicameral system, or vice-versa
4. Significant changes to the powers of the executive, for instance:
 - ✓ Power to dismiss the legislature;
 - ✓ Term limits (presidential and semi-presidential system);
 - ✓ Power to dismiss the executive/government (semi-presidential system);

5. Changes in the structure of the state:

- ✓ from **unitary to federal** (explicitly mentioning federalism as the structure of the state; lists of legislative (concurrent) competences for sub-state entities)
- ✓ from **unitary to special autonomy arrangements** (where specific regions might be mentioned by name);
- ✓ from **unitary to significant decentralization** (where amendments might include the expansion of the list of powers at regional and/or local level);
- ✓ from **federal to unitary**

6. Changes to the electoral system (see Sartori 1994: 4; and Reynolds, Reilly and Ellis 2008)

- Regarding the legislature (only the lower house in a bicameral system)
 - ✓ Changes from proportional to majoritarian, or vice-versa
 - ✓ Changes from proportional to mixed system, or vice-versa
 - ✓ Changes from majoritarian to mixed system, or vice-versa
 - ✓ Changes in the thresholds for party representation in parliament
- Regarding the president or head of state, changes from:
 - ✓ Indirectly elected to directly elected, or vice versa
 - ✓ Plurality vote (candidate wins most seats)
 - ✓ Two-round system (absolute majority required in the first round – if that does not happen, second round of voting is held between two leading candidates for plurality)
 - ✓ Instant run-off (alternative vote) system (voters rank candidates in order of preference – if not candidate received an absolute majority of first-preference votes, the lowest-polling candidate is removed and their votes are redistributed to subsequent preferences)