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Ottawa Survey Results

by Nicole Neitzey [ Center for International Stabilization and Recovery ]

In the last issue, The Journal ran an Editorial by Dennis Barlow suggesting the Ottawa Convention should be amended to redefine the endstate required for clearance goals to be met. We then asked our readers to submit their opinion via a short online survey.

Below we provide a summary of the raw responses we received to this survey (as of 15 March 2010). The results are not scientific, and only Question 1 was a required response, which is why there are not the same number of responses for all the questions. Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers to Questions 2 and 4 (unless they chose "none of the above.")

1. Do you believe the Ottawa Convention should be amended to clarify the endstate required for clearance efforts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that although 61 percent of respondents answered "No" to Question 1, at least three of those in this category chose options other than #1—"Destruction of all anti-personnel landmines in known mined areas"—to Question 2, which is contradictory.
For Question 3, one person who answered “No” to Question 1 chose option #2—“Each country should be allowed to negotiate an endstate unique to its circumstances”—and at least two No’s from Question 1 gave responses other than “none of the above” to Question 4. These inconsistencies would seem to indicate that there are special circumstances in which some people who regard full mine clearance as the only option may actually consider other scenarios to be acceptable.

We are providing the raw responses to the questionnaire, allowing you to draw your own conclusions to the survey. Please keep in mind that the low number of responses does not allow for statistical validity.
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