

## Security Council

Distr.  
GENERAL

S/1994/674/Add.2 (Vol. I)  
28 December 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

FINAL REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION OF EXPERTS  
ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO  
SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 780 (1992)

---

ANNEX I.A  
THE DATABASE AND DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

---

Under the Direction of:

M. Cherif Bassiouni  
Chairman and Rapporteur on the Gathering  
and Analysis of the Facts, Commission of Experts  
Established Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 780 (1992)

Principal Analyst:

Carson A. Wetzel, IHRLI Staff Attorney

Contributors:

Sébastien Mancel, IHRLI Volunteer Analyst  
Monica Witczak, IHRLI Volunteer Analyst

and

The Staff of the International Human Rights  
Law Institute, DePaul University

## CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1 - 5	4
II. SOURCES OF DOCUMENTS . . . . .	6 - 18	4
A. Submissions by governments . . . . .	8 - 11	4
B. Submissions by the "warring parties" not recognized as states . . . . .	12	5
C. Information received from United Nations bodies . . . . .	13	5
D. Submissions by IGOs . . . . .	14 - 15	5
E. Submissions by NGOs . . . . .	16 - 17	6
F. Other sources . . . . .	18	6
III. ASSESSMENT OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY THE IHRLI DOCUMENTATION CENTRE . . . . .	19 - 22	6
IV. THE IHRLI/LINDEN PRODUCTIONS VIDEOTAPE ARCHIVE PROJECT . . . . .	23 - 29	7
V. THE IHRLI MAP COLLECTION . . . . .	30 - 33	8
VI. THE IHRLI DOCUMENTATION SYSTEM . . . . .	34 - 44	9
A. The administrative file . . . . .	38	9
B. The master file . . . . .	39 - 41	9
C. The submitter/source file . . . . .	42	10
D. Security and data protection . . . . .	43 - 44	10
VII. DOCUMENTARIAN DATABASE . . . . .	45 - 55	10
A. Document short title . . . . .	46	10
B. Submitter category . . . . .	47	11
C. Submitter name . . . . .	48	11
D. Primary source . . . . .	49	11
E. Secondary source . . . . .	50	11
F. Citation . . . . .	51 - 52	11
G. Document number . . . . .	53	11
H. Date . . . . .	54	12

## CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Notes . . . . .	55	12
VIII. THE IHRLI DATABASE . . . . .	56 - 75	12
A. Database categories . . . . .	60 - 70	12
1. Date and time . . . . .	61	13
2. Summary description . . . . .	62	13
3. Location information . . . . .	63 - 64	13
4. Source information . . . . .	65	13
5. Property damage . . . . .	66	13
6. Violations/victim counts . . . . .	67	13
7. Victims/witnesses/perpetrators . . . . .	68 - 69	14
8. Evidence . . . . .	70	14
B. Data entry . . . . .	71 - 74	14
C. Quality control . . . . .	75	15

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report describes the document handling, database entry and security procedures implemented by the Commission's Rapporteur on the Gathering and Analysis of the Facts at the DePaul University International Human Rights Law Institute (IHRLI). In December 1992, the Rapporteur on the Gathering and Analysis of the Facts established the database and documentation centre at IHRLI. As of 30 April 1994, over 65,000 pages of documents were received from governments, United Nations bodies, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and other sources, as detailed below. Over 5,600 cases have been logged into the database. In addition to the above materials, the documentation centre has a collection of videotapes, maps, and photographs.

2. In March 1993, the Commission and IHRLI agreed that data gathering, the creation of a database, and data analysis would be done by IHRLI under the direction of Rapporteur Professor M. Cherif Bassiouni. IHRLI did not receive remuneration or reimbursement from the United Nations or the Commission for this work. All costs, including personnel costs, were met by grants and in-kind contributions to IHRLI.

3. The costs of the database operations from December 1992 to April 1994 exceeded \$1,100,000. IHRLI received over \$850,000 in grants from the Soros Foundation and the Open Society Fund, and a \$300,000 grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Through April 1994, IHRLI received approximately \$250,000 of in-kind contributions from DePaul University for space and indirect costs.

4. IHRLI also benefited from the contributions of volunteer attorneys and students. Attorneys from Chicago, New York, Minnesota, and Washington, D.C. contributed pro bono services to IHRLI over the life of the database project. As part of their efforts, a number of attorneys relocated to Chicago to work on the project. A large number of law students, graduate students and post-graduate students also served as volunteers.

5. IHRLI transmitted all original documents and complete copies of the database software and the information contained therein to the Prosecutor's Office of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTFY).

## II. SOURCES OF DOCUMENTS

6. The documentation centre received documents from governments, United Nations bodies, IGOs, NGOs, and other sources. Many of these documents were obtained through the Commission, but over half were obtained independently by IHRLI. A large number of the documents obtained by the Commission and IHRLI are now in the public domain. Some Commission documents were not forwarded to IHRLI for confidentiality reasons.

7. IHRLI received many documents in languages other than English, particularly in Serbo-Croatian. IHRLI relied on volunteer translators to translate these documents into English for entry into the database and for analysis by IHRLI attorney-analysts.

### A. Submissions by governments

8. The following Governments submitted reports and materials to the Commission pertaining to the large-scale victimization that has occurred in

the former Yugoslavia: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, France, Germany, Iran, Italy, Kenya, the Netherlands, Norway, Russia, Republic of Serbia, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, and Venezuela.

9. A number of reports received from governments provided data relating to specific occurrences which, if supported by evidence, would constitute "grave breaches" of the Geneva Conventions and other violations of international humanitarian law. The Governments of Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America were among the Governments which provided information that proved useful to the work of the Commission and ultimately will prove useful to the Prosecutor of the ICTFY. Several of the afore-mentioned Governments made multiple submissions.

10. Other submissions by governments ranged from general letters expressing support for initiatives taken by the United Nations, to re-publications of media reports, and to investigative studies and reports alleging or documenting "grave breaches" of the Geneva Conventions and other violations of international humanitarian law. Some of this documentation consisted of general background information.

11. Of the submissions described above, some were incorporated into formally submitted UN documents and are therefore in the public domain; other documents were submitted directly to the Commission only, and are therefore not in the public domain.

#### B. Submissions by the "warring parties" not recognized as states

12. The following parties also submitted relevant information through multiple submissions: Hrvatska Zajednica Herceg-Bosne (Croatian Community of Herceg-Bosnia), Republika Srpske Krajine (Republic of Serbian Krajina), and Republika Srpska (Serbian Republic).

#### C. Information received from United Nations bodies

13. The following UN bodies were a source of information to the Commission: United Nations Centre for Human Rights; Committee on the Rights of the Child; Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions; Special Rapporteur on Arbitrary Arrest and Detention; Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia; United Nations Commission on Human Rights; United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); United Nations Human Rights Committee; United Nations Program for Development; United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR); United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination; United Nations Department of Public Information; and World Health Organization (WHO).

#### D. Submissions by IGOs

14. The following IGOs have submitted reports or provided information to the Commission, or published material which the Commission consulted: Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), Council of Europe, European Community Monitoring Mission (ECMM), European Parliament, International

Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY), North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC).

15. Some IGOs, because of their limited mandates and missions, did not provide all of the information to which they had access. The International Committee of the Red Cross, for instance, did a great deal of work in the prison camps, but only provided information which it published and which is in the public domain.

#### E. Submissions by NGOs

16. The reports received from a number of non-governmental and humanitarian organizations proved to be very useful in enabling the Commission to gather pertinent, substantiated data. The extent of the investigations giving rise to these reports, and the level of their analysis, demonstrated an effort and commitment on the part of many NGOs to produce verifiable facts. The accounts published in the reports of some NGOs, particularly those received from Human Rights Watch Helsinki, were detailed and most closely resembled the type of data the Commission needed to assess responsibility for "grave breaches" of the Geneva Conventions and other violations of international humanitarian law. NGOs from which the Commission or IHRLI received information are listed in Annex I.C below.

17. NGOs did not, however, provide the Commission with their supporting documentation, usually for fear of breaching confidentiality agreements or endangering the lives of their sources of information.

#### F. Other sources

18. While governments, UN bodies, IGOs, and NGOs provided most of the documentation to the Commission, other sources yielded some useful information. Private individuals submitted personal accounts of victimization, videotapes, photographs, and other relevant information. IHRLI also gathered valuable information from print and electronic media, including reports based on searches of the LEXIS/NEXIS and Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) databases. 1/

### III. ASSESSMENT OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY THE IHRLI DOCUMENTATION CENTRE

19. The Commission and the Rapporteur experienced mixed results in their efforts to gather data and evidence of alleged violations of international humanitarian law. Many of the reports prepared by governments, UN bodies, IGOs, and NGOs consisted of general allegations which did not contain evidence. However, these sources were complemented by information provided by the warring parties' state war crimes commissions, other national organizations, media sources, and private individuals.

20. The reports received establish the large scale victimization that has taken place in the former Yugoslavia, but frequently did not contain the legal "evidence" necessary to bring criminal charges under international criminal law or under the domestic criminal law of states in whose territory those acts were committed. Some reports, however, contained specific information supported by evidence, such as affidavits, witness statements, photographs, maps, etc.

21. Since the submitting sources did not always provide sufficient

information to support their allegations, the incidents reported and entered into the database frequently lacked necessary information. Difficulties in data entry and analysis occurred because of the following common problems of the reports received: 1.) sources upon which reports were based were usually not verifiable because many reports did not disclose original sources; 2.) spellings of names and locations were often inconsistent, due to translation into the reporting language; 3.) locations were difficult to pinpoint, due to a lack of specific geographical information; 4.) reports of the same incident sometimes varied significantly in important details; 5.) property damage reports rarely included more than the type of property affected, and often lacked specific locations; 6.) numbers of victims or other variables were often reported within large ranges; 7.) names of victims, witnesses and perpetrators were often intentionally omitted from the reports; 8.) reports often failed to identify the specific military units involved in alleged incidents; and 9.) important details, which may not have seemed relevant to the reporter, were often omitted.

22. The Commission was not able to verify all of the reports received. In compiling reports, however, the IHRLI team of attorney-analysts were able to corroborate and check many of the allegations contained in the submitted reports by cross-referencing multiple reports of similar facts.

#### IV. THE IHRLI/LINDEN PRODUCTIONS VIDEOTAPE ARCHIVE PROJECT

23. IHRLI compiled a videotape archive containing media footage relating to alleged violations of international humanitarian law in the former Yugoslavia. In total, IHRLI received more than 300 videotapes. Of these, 36 videotapes were received from Commission sources, and the remainder were obtained by IHRLI independently.

24. All videotapes received at IHRLI were catalogued by a video documentarian. The documentarian labelled each videotape with the date received, the submitter, the title and a unique identification number. The video documentarian then screened each video, and prepared a brief summary for the video master index, which included a description of the tape's contents, running time, source of the tape, and broadcast date, if any. The tapes were then stored in a secure location.

25. Copies of all videotapes were then sent to Linden Productions 2/ in Los Angeles, which received a grant from IHRLI of \$80,000, funded by the Soros Foundation, to cover the costs of video archiving. The tapes sent to Linden Productions were incorporated into a computerized video database, utilizing QuickTime software to display videotape on MacIntosh computers. Although the IHRLI database utilized a Foxpro-based program, the Linden video archive and the IHRLI database could be converted to compatible formats.

26. All videotape footage was categorized by Linden Productions into major subject categories, including rape, torture, deportation, prison camps, paramilitary action, destruction of cultural property, etc. The footage was then further processed in a database "shot list" and each shot was fully described and time-coded. The information was also catalogued to include incidents, locations, dates, witnesses, perpetrators, etc.

27. The fields of the video database at Linden Productions and the database fields at IHRLI are compatible. The contents of the video database can also be printed for easy reference. On the print-out format that Linden Productions designed, the video images appear along with transcriptions of the accompanying dialogue and the subject-matter categories described above. Requests for footage pertaining to a particular subject can be collected and

downloaded from the database to standard VHS videocassette format. The computerized archive facilitates the customized design of videotape presentations from available footage. The videotapes were used by the IHRLI attorney-analysts to compile their reports to the Commission.

28. All videotapes are stored at Linden Productions in special humidity and dust-free vaults, protected by security systems, and available only to restricted personnel.

29. Videotapes from the following sources were placed in the video archive:

(a) United Nations sources of videotapes: Commission of Experts, UNPROFOR, UNESCO;

(b) Government-owned or government-controlled sources of videotapes: SAGA (BiH), TV BiH (BiH), State Commission for Gathering Facts on War Crimes in Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH), Croatian Information Centre (Croatia), Croatian Monitor (Croatia), RTV Belgrade (FRY), ARTE (France), Conseil Supérieur de l'Audiovisuel (France), France 2, France 3, TFI (France), Auslandsreport (Germany), Teleskop (Germany), Dublin 4 (Ireland), RAI (Italy), BBC (UK), Channel 4 TV (U.K), Center for Defense Information (US Department of Defense), and Worldnet Productions (US Information Agency);

(c) Non-governmental sources of videotapes from the United States: ABC, CBS, CNN, ITN, NBC, PBS, Feed the Children, Foundation for a Compassionate Society/Change of Heart, Inc., Globalvision, Mercy International, Inc., Physicians for Human Rights, and Serbian-American Media Center.

#### V. THE IHRLI MAP COLLECTION

30. IHRLI compiled a collection of maps to assist in the analysis of events in the former Yugoslavia. In addition to maps from commercial sources, maps were received from the Governments of the United States and United Kingdom, from the United Nations, and from IGOs and NGOs. These maps cover a wide spectrum of scale and detail, ranging from maps of single cities and counties to maps of the entire territory of the former Yugoslavia. Topical maps in the collection display the distribution of ethnic populations, the dispositions of warring factions, and the presence of detention sites.

31. IHRLI received digitized maps from the Defense Mapping Agency of the United States Government. The maps, on compact disc, cover the entire area of the former Yugoslavia and permit viewing on a computer monitor at various levels of detail.

32. Maps received from United Nations sources include the following: dispositions of warring factions in Sarajevo, dispositions of warring factions in Bosnia and Herzegovina at various dates, dispositions of United Nations forces at various dates, population distribution maps, and province boundary maps.

33. IHRLI added a cartographer to its staff to assist its attorney-analysts in the best use of the map collection and to create maps based upon the analysis done at IHRLI. The IHRLI cartographer worked with the IHRLI attorney-analysts to develop maps of detention sites, rape sites, ethnic distributions, and the targets of shelling in Sarajevo.



## VI. THE IHRLI DOCUMENTATION SYSTEM

34. The IHRLI documentation system was developed to meet the following goals: 1.) preserving the integrity of the documents received; 2.) facilitating the retrieval of documents; and 3.) verifying that the documents are analyzed and correlated. The system was predicated on the sequential numbering of all documents received. Relevant source information for each document was entered into a separate source database that interfaced with the main database. This system was developed after consulting with attorneys experienced in complex and multi-party litigation.

35. Documents received by IHRLI from all sources were submitted directly to a documentarian, who monitored the flow of all documents pertaining to IHRLI's work on the Commission project. All documents were reviewed initially to determine whether they should be filed by document number in a master file or solely in an administrative file (see explanation below).

36. The documentation system follows a two-step process which was the responsibility of the IHRLI documentarian. First, all original documents pertinent to the work of the Commission were stamped with a sequential document number and stored in the master file. Second, source information pertaining to each document was entered into a database. This information created a computerized index which enabled the Rapporteur to locate any document that was received, and permitted access to source information during the data entry process (described below) so that source information in the main database was consistent and accurate.

37. All documents in the master file were then reviewed by an attorney analyst to determine whether they were database relevant. Database relevant documents were photocopied for assignment to data-entry analysts. Data cover sheets were then attached to each of these documents. The cover sheets accompanied the documents through the entire data entry process, and contained space to record analyst names, database incident numbers based on the document, and quality control information.

A. The administrative file

38. Documents placed in the administrative file were organized by subject matter rather than by document number. As of 30 April 1994, the administrative file contained approximately 30,000 pages of documents. The administrative file contained four primary types of documents: 1.) all documents relating to the function of the IHRLI Commission project, such as correspondence, resumes and confidentiality agreements; 2.) background material relevant to the Commission project, such as academic articles, media clippings, UN resolutions, and information regarding NGOs or individuals who assisted the project; 3.) all reports and work product of IHRLI, which were filed in chronological order; 4.) subject-matter files, which were used to collect documents relating to topics such as military command structures or specific incidents. The documents in these subject-matter files were often duplicates of the originals in the master file, and therefore accessible either by document number or by subject matter.

B. The master file

39. The master file contained all substantive reports received by IHRLI relating to breaches of humanitarian law in the former Yugoslavia. As of 30 April 1994, the Rapporteur received 65,000 pages of documents which were filed in the master file. The master file was organized by sequential

numbering. All incoming documents were stamped with a unique document number as they were received and filed in numerical order, regardless of subject matter or document date. All information entered in the documentarian database and incident database (described below) was cross-referenced to these document numbers. Therefore, an analyst working with information retrieved from the database could directly consult the source documents.

40. While most of the documents which were numbered and placed in the master file contained information relevant to the incident database, some general source documents were also catalogued in the master file so that they were readily accessible to IHRLI analysts.

41. Access to documents in the master file was strictly controlled by the documentarian. If any photocopying was done, the documentarian inventoried these documents and verified that they were all returned.

#### C. The submitter/source file

42. The entire master file was duplicated in the submitter/source file. Photocopies of all original documents were filed according to the submitting group or individual and cross-referenced according to the primary source of each report.

#### D. Security and data protection

43. The documentation centre and other offices of the Rapporteur and his staff were protected by an electronic security system monitored by DePaul University security personnel. On-site original and photocopied documents were kept in locked file cabinets. Additional copies of all documents were stored in a secure off-site facility. The data in the IHRLI database was backed up daily, and backup disks were stored off-site.

44. All IHRLI staff were required to sign a confidentiality agreement prohibiting the disclosure of any information from the IHRLI documentation to outside parties.

### VII. DOCUMENTARIAN DATABASE

45. The documentarian database contains numerous fields to fulfill its function as an index of the master file. By dividing the information in each document into separate database fields, the documentarian can generate reports which sort the entire database by several categories. For example, the documentarian database can be sorted by document number, or alphabetically by source or submitter name.

#### A. Document short title

46. A short source name was assigned to each document, typically based on the topic or submitting group and the date of the document. In addition to being entered in the documentarian database, the document short title was attached to each document which was assigned for data-entry. When this short source name was entered into the database, each data entry analyst was provided with full and uniform source information.

#### B. Submitter category

47. Each document was categorized according to the type of submitter from which IHRLI received the document. Thus, the documentarian characterized each submitter as a government, IGO, NGO, private organization, or private individual.

#### C. Submitter Name

48. The submitter name referred to the specific government, NGO, individual, etc., that sent a particular report to the Commission. It may have differed from the organization which prepared the document. If a Helsinki Watch report, for example, was sent to the Commission by the US Government, the submitter recorded in the documentarian database was the US Government and not Helsinki Watch. However, cross-referencing permitted the identification of the primary and secondary sources, as described below.

#### D. Primary source

49. The primary source of a report was the source upon which the submitter relied in preparing the document or report it sent to the Commission or IHRLI. If an organization submitted a report that it prepared and the report was not based on any other source or publication, then the organization was both the submitter and primary source.

#### E. Secondary source

50. Secondary sources were any sources cited by the primary source which related to a particular incident. Secondary sources were usually entered by the data-entry analysts, rather than by the documentarian.

#### F. Citation

51. The citation field provided standard bibliographic information for each document, including titles, organizations, authors, page numbers, etc. Where appropriate, descriptive information about documents was provided as well, to assist analysts in referring to the documentarian database.

52. Known duplicates within the master file were cross-referenced by document number in the citation field. In this way, the documentarian tracked duplicate reports submitted by different governments, organizations, or individuals.

#### G. Document number

53. The document number range of each document was recorded in a separate field. All records in the documentarian database could thus be sorted sequentially, reflecting the order of the physical master file. A separate field was provided for the specific document number within the range of the entire document that corresponded to a specific incident. This field was used by the data-entry analysts.

#### H. Date

54. If known, the date of a document was recorded in this field. If the document contained several dates, the earliest was used.

#### I. Notes

55. Finally, a notes field was available for the documentarian to enter any information which appeared important but did not fit into any of the above categories. Sometimes the notes field was used to indicate questions or uncertainties which would be resolved later.

### VIII. THE IHRLI DATABASE

56. The database provides a comprehensive record of alleged violations. 3/ The database, developed with Foxpro database software, operates on several levels and manages multiple categories and sub-categories of information. The database categories capture information pertaining to locations, victims, perpetrators, witnesses, sources, evidence, etc. Over 5,600 incidents were entered into the database as of 30 April 1994. Specialized topical databases were also developed to facilitate the work of IHRLI attorney-analysts on the following specific research projects: the battle and siege of Sarajevo, rape and sexual assault, mass graves, detention facilities, and the military structure and order of battle of the warring factions.

57. The database is capable of generating reports and searches based on categories of information. These reports can be statistical in nature (e.g., calculating the number of times a particular type of violation has occurred) or may contain significant amounts of information related to a particular category in the database. For example, a search may be generated to contain the names of victims, witnesses, and perpetrators associated with a particular location. The database can also be searched using context-sensitive queries. Search terms can include the name of a particular victim, witness, perpetrator, location, etc. As a result, when a search term is entered, the computer will search categories in each file and produce a list of every case number where that term appears.

58. Database entries (or "cases") typically concerned multiple events that may or may not have constituted several independent violations of international humanitarian law. Given time constraints, it would be practically impossible to segregate every possible violation and create a separate incident file. If a report contained roughly the same set of facts concerning victims, witnesses, perpetrators, and locations, it was consolidated into a single incident.

59. At the data-entry stage, reports were not distinguished on the basis of credibility or possible bias, and no reports were omitted from the database based on such criteria. The cumulative nature of the vast amount of information in the database allowed for subsequent credibility assessments, although verification is needed for prosecutorial purposes.

#### A. Database categories

60. The database is organized by multiple categories, including the date, location, and type of reported violation. The information in the database can be sorted and retrieved by any of these categories.

### 1. Date and time

61. The date and time of the incident were entered into separate fields of the database. If an incident involved multiple dates, the earliest date was used.

### 2. Summary description

62. A narrative description summarized each incident in the database. It provided the relevant locations, existence and location of evidence, types of violations alleged, and the names of victims, witnesses and perpetrators, etc. The summary description was intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the incident. It included information which was also categorized in the specific database fields described below.

### 3. Location information

63. The location category of the database provided numerous sub-categories to record all of the information relevant to the location of incidents. In addition to fields for the country, municipality, and city where an incident occurred, the data analyst can categorize the location as a private house, public building, police station, concentration camp, mass grave, etc. Within the location field, memo fields were also available to enter relevant addresses, landmarks or site descriptions.

64. The database contains a location list containing the specific map coordinates of all locations entered into the database. Analysts could use a preexisting location record or create a new location record.

### 4. Source information

65. As mentioned above, the source records from the documentarian database were used to build the source records in the main database. When an analyst entered the document short title into the source field, the source information was retrieved automatically from the documentarian database. The analyst then entered the specific document numbers pertaining to the incident and added incident-specific source information.

### 5. Property damage

66. The property damage field provided a memo field for a narrative description of reported property damage, including the location and owner of property, the manner and extent of damage, and the perpetrator. Fields were also available to enter the value of affected property, if known, and to indicate whether the incident involved damage to religious or cultural property.

### 6. Violations/victim counts

67. The violations/victim counts field of the database enabled analysts to indicate the particular type of violation and to enter numbers of victims, if known. All categories that pertained to a particular incident were selected by the analyst. The following violation categories are available in this field: mass killing, killed after torture, killed after rape, killed after imprisonment, killed after forced eviction, killed in flight, killed in

combat, killed - other, battery, torture, mutilation, wounded, rape, kidnapping/hostage taking, forced eviction, missing, imprisonment. If the violation contained in a particular report is not part of the available list, a memo field is available to describe the type of violation that occurred.

#### 7. Victims/witnesses/perpetrators

68. All information regarding victims, witnesses and perpetrators was entered in a uniform format, with the same fields available for data entry in each category. In addition to the memo fields used to enter information regarding those involved in an incident, category fields are available to identify characteristics such as ethnicity, religion, and military status. The following types of information are entered into the victim/witnesses/perpetrators field: Name, Sex, Age, Date of Birth, Address, Ethnicity, Religion, Parents' Names, Occupation, Military Status, Physical Characteristics, Antemortem Data.

69. Many of these fields contain sub-categories to enable the entry of more detailed information. For instance, the military status field provides space to enter information pertaining to service, rank, commanding officer, insignia, etc.

#### 8. Evidence

70. The evidence field provides space for a narrative description of the type and location of any supporting evidence of the incident, such as audio tapes, videotapes, affidavits, etc.

#### B. Data entry

71. Data entry proceeded on a small, independent computer network consisting of six computer workstations. Data was entered simultaneously from each workstation.

72. Assignments for database entry were distributed by a staff attorney who monitored the progress of each document through the data entry system. Information was entered into the database by analysts with a legal and/or human rights background. The information was entered into the appropriate categories of the database according to guidelines established by the legal staff. A narrative description of each report was also entered for each incident.

73. All documents assigned to data entry personnel were accompanied by a data cover sheet, on which the analysts recorded the database incident numbers associated with the document. This form accompanied the document throughout the data entry and quality control process and contained the following information: 1.) document numbers; 2.) document short title; 3.) name of the data entry person; 4.) date of assignment; 5.) incident numbers generated by the computer; 6.) dates of data entry; and 7.) results of the quality control process.

74. Data was entered into the database from December 1992 until April 1994. Four to five computers were utilized for data entry for an average of twelve hours per day, Monday through Friday. On Saturdays and Sundays, three to four computers were used approximately seven hours per day. The sixth computer was used by the documentarian to enter document source information. This data entry was a very labour-intensive and often tedious process, which required a

significant amount of training. Because IHRLI had to rely largely on graduate and post-graduate student volunteers who had limited time to commit to the project, there was frequent turnover in the data entry staff. This slowed the data entry procedure, as new volunteers were continuously recruited and trained.

#### C. Quality control

75. The quality control process was an on-going effort to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of the database. Every time a new incident was opened, the computer incident number was entered on the data cover sheet. After completing data entry for a document, the data entry analyst printed and edited a hard copy of all of the incidents completed. These printouts were then given to a supervising attorney, along with the document and the data cover sheet. The attorney verified the completeness and accuracy of the work. Documents which satisfied this quality control check were returned to the documentarian. Documents which need additional work were returned to the analyst.

Notes

1/ Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights, an NGO based in Minneapolis, Minnesota, assisted IHRLI with the collection and analysis of media reports from LEXIS/NEXIS and other sources. IHRLI also had access to the FBIS database through the efforts of attorney Thomas S. Warrick of Washington, D.C.

2/ Linden Productions of Los Angeles, California, through its President and Chief Executive Officer, Pippa Scott, provided IHRLI and the Commission of Experts with volunteer services in creating a computerized videotape database archive, allowing all videotape footage to be stored in a digital format.

3/ The database software was developed for IHRLI by computer consultant Jack Endicott in consultation with the Rapporteur, his legal staff, and others experienced in the fields of computer science, information management and complex litigation.