

# DDAS Accident Report

## Accident details

<b>Report date:</b> 18/05/2006	<b>Accident number:</b> 246
<b>Accident time:</b> 10:00	<b>Accident Date:</b> 27/08/1998
<b>Where it occurred:</b> Tazi village, Shah Joi, Zabul Province	<b>Country:</b> Afghanistan
<b>Primary cause:</b> Unavoidable (?)	<b>Secondary cause:</b> Unavoidable (?)
<b>Class:</b> Excavation accident	<b>Date of main report:</b> [No date recorded]
<b>ID original source:</b> none	<b>Name of source:</b> MAPA/UNOCHA
<b>Organisation:</b> Name removed	
<b>Mine/device:</b> PMN AP blast	<b>Ground condition:</b> agricultural (abandoned)  hard  metal scrap
<b>Date record created:</b> 17/02/2004	<b>Date last modified:</b> 17/02/2004
<b>No of victims:</b> 1	<b>No of documents:</b> 1

## Map details

<b>Longitude:</b>	<b>Latitude:</b>
<b>Alt. coord. system:</b>	<b>Coordinates fixed by:</b>
<b>Map east:</b>	<b>Map north:</b>
<b>Map scale:</b> not recorded	<b>Map series:</b>
<b>Map edition:</b>	<b>Map sheet:</b>
<b>Map name:</b>	

## Accident Notes

victim working prone (?)

visor not worn or worn raised (?)

## Accident report

An investigation on behalf of the UN MAC was carried out and its report made available in September 1999. The following summarises its content.

The demining group were using a one-man breaching drill with two-man teams at the time of the accident. The victim had been a deminer for eight years. It was five months since he had attended a revision course and 34 days since his last leave. The accident occurred in "an

irrigation and agricultural type of minefield with medium ground condition". The device was identified from fragments found at the site.

The investigators decided that the victim was exposing a detector reading and found several tin-cans. He continued prodding but became tired so changed hands and prodded with his left hand. A mine detonated at 10:00. The victim suffered minor right-hand injury and dust in his eyes. He was treated on site and taken to the ICRC hospital in Kandahar.

The investigators decided that his visor provided the required protection and was damaged in the accident.

**The Section Leader** said that the victim had a problem pinpointing the detector reading and that caused the accident.

**The victim** said that he was working properly when the accident occurred.

### **Conclusion**

The investigators concluded that after finding several cans the victim thought the reading was another can and was careless. They thought that the use of his left hand made it difficult to maintain the correct prodding angle.

### **Recommendations**

The investigators recommended that deminers be reminded to treat every detector reading as a mine, that deminers should avoid changing from the hand they favour when they prod and that the use of the visor in this case should be used as a good example in future training.

## **Victim Report**

<b>Victim number:</b> 320	<b>Name:</b> Name removed
<b>Age:</b>	<b>Gender:</b> Male
<b>Status:</b> deminer	<b>Fit for work:</b> presumed
<b>Compensation:</b> not made available	<b>Time to hospital:</b> not recorded
<b>Protection issued:</b> Helmet	<b>Protection used:</b> helmet
Thin, short visor	

### **Summary of injuries:**

INJURIES

minor Eyes

minor Hand

COMMENT

See medical report.

### **Medical report**

The initial casualty report listed the victim's injuries as "Both eyes injuries and F.B. and multiple wounds upper member". His condition was described as "moderate" and the priority rated at "2".

The victim reported his injuries after treatment as being that "dust and soil" affected his eyes, his left hand index-finger "does not work" and he had other minor injuries on his left hand.

The field medic's report included a sketch in which both eyes were indicated as having minor lacerations. No other injuries were indicated.

The field doctor recorded the injuries as "both eye injury. Multiple injuries on the left hand. Injury of index finger".

## **Analysis**

The primary cause of this accident is listed as "*Unavoidable*" because the victim may have been working as directed at the time of the accident. If his visor was raised, that would represent a "*Field control inadequacy*" because the field supervisors failed to correct his error.

No mention is made of the victim's working stance in the investigation. It is possible that he was working prone (although the reference to "multiple wounds upper member" implies that he was not).

The injuries to the victim's eyes imply that his visor was partly raised. The lack of injury to his hand when he detonated a large mine with a short bayonet implies that he was approaching it at a shallow angle, contrary to the investigator's view. The investigators in Afghanistan appear to be ignorant of the ease with which a PMN may be detonated by pressure on the outer edge of the mine's pressure plate (September 1999).

Photocopied photographs included in the file were too dark to provide detail of the injury, the site or the damaged equipment, so the extent of damage to the visor is not known. Documents were not made available for copying.