Whether an act by a civilian constitutes taking a direct part in hostilities is likely to depend highly on the context, such as the weapon systems or methods of warfare employed by the civilian’s side in the conflict. For example, in some contexts, training and logistical support may be viewed as taking a direct part in hostilities, while in other contexts it might not. The following considerations may be relevant:

- the degree to which the act causes harm to the opposing party’s persons or objects, such as
  - whether the act is the proximate or “but for” cause of death, injury, or damage to persons or objects belonging to the opposing party; or
  - the degree to which the act is likely to affect adversely the military operations or military capacity of the opposing party;

- the degree to which the act is connected to the hostilities, such as
  - the degree to which the act is temporally or geographically near the fighting; or
  - the degree to which the act is connected to military operations;

- the specific purpose underlying the act, such as
  - whether the activity is intended to advance the war aims of one party to the conflict to the detriment of the opposing party;

- the military significance of the activity to the party’s war effort, such as
  - the degree to which the act contributes to a party’s military action against the opposing party;
  - whether the act is of comparable or greater value to a party’s war effort than acts that are commonly regarded as taking a direct part in hostilities;
  - whether the act poses a significant threat to the opposing party;

- the degree to which the activity is viewed inherently or traditionally as a military one, such as
  - whether the act is traditionally performed by military forces in conducting military operations against the enemy (including combat, combat support, and combat service support functions), or
  - whether the activity involves making decisions on the conduct of hostilities, such as determining the use or application of combat power.