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Accident details

Report date: 15/05/2006
Accident time: 13:55
Where it occurred: Phum Sdao(u) Village, Battambang Province
Primary cause: Field control inadequacy (?)
Class: Missed-mine accident
ID original source: JAH/GF
Organisation: Name removed
Mine/device: PMN-2 AP blast
Date record created: 14/02/2004
No of victims: 2

Accident number: 200
Accident Date: 11/10/1993
Country: Cambodia
Secondary cause: Field control inadequacy (?)
Name of source: CMAC
Ground condition: route/path
Date last modified: 14/02/2004
No of documents: 2

Map details

Longitude: 
Latitude: 
Alt. coord. system: MF: M1096
Coordinates fixed by: 
Map east: 
Map scale: 
Map edition: 
Map name: 

Accident Notes

no independent investigation available (?)
inadequate communications (?)
mine/device found in "cleared" area (?)
inadequate area marking (?)

Accident report

An internal investigation was carried out by an expatriate technical advisor and found on file in January 1999. This investigation did not include a summary of the events surrounding the accident. However, a brief report following an investigation by UNTAC Military Police was attached to Victim No.1's compensation claim. This stated that the two victims were walking "through a cleared area to the rest area at the completion of their day's work. They followed a path which was used daily…. the evidence tends to suggest that the mine was laid after
clearance by unknown persons”. An attached document added that the area where the accident occurred (at 13:10) had been cleared “a month back”.

The country MAC investigator interviewed “all concerned” and was still in “doubt as to where the mine came from”. He found no evidence to support the idea that this was a case of remining.

The Site Supervisor’s version of events varies by adding that Victim No.2 “jumped out of the way and was miraculously uninjured”.

The Platoon Supervisor added that the people helping the victims “prodded their way around the victims and then evacuated the casualties”. He added that he thought the mine had been laid on the last rest day.

The Platoon Commander added that he had just blown the whistle to indicate that it was time to prepare to destroy the mines found that day. He said he took a detector and prodder to clear around the casualties.

Victim No.2 stated that the deminers now felt unsafe in cleared areas and wanted sentries to guard them.

Conclusion

The investigator concluded that the accident showed “that no method of clearance is 100% efficient”.

Recommendations

The investigator recommended that the staff be commended for their handling of the accident; that the victim be compensated; that routes into mined areas be marked and the markings left until all work is over; that routes into mined areas be checked with a detector before use each time; that operations must cease when “there are no communications”. [The last implies a communications problem that was not explained.]

Victim Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim number: 255</th>
<th>Name: Name removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 27</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: deminer</td>
<td>Fit for work: not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation: US$1,080</td>
<td>Time to hospital: 2 hours 50 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection issued: Safety spectacles</td>
<td>Protection used: not recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of injuries:

minor Face
minor Hand
severe Leg
AMPUTATION/LOSS
Leg Below knee
COMMENT
See medical report.
Medical report

The military medical Officer at Malbatt stated that he saw both victims on the day of the accident at 16:00 (at Ratnak Mondul hospital). He said that Victim No.1 had the lower part of his left leg "traumatically amputated." The victim also had injuries to his "upper right leg" and knee and right hand" (fragmentation).

Both victims were flown to an ICRC Hospital, arriving at 16:45.

Compensation of US$1,080 (36% x 30 x $120) was awarded to Victim No.1 on 1st December 1993.

The ICRC surgeon at the Mongkol Borei hospital listed Victim No.1's injuries as: "1) amputation left leg below knee; 2) open 3º fracture tibia right; 3) Patella fracture (open) right knee; 4) multiple superficial skin injuries; 5) haemorrhagic shock."

Victim Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim number: 256</th>
<th>Name: Name removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: deminer</td>
<td>Fit for work: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation: not made available</td>
<td>Time to hospital: 2 hours 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection issued: Safety spectacles</td>
<td>Protection used: not recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of injuries:
minor Arm
minor Body
minor Leg

COMMENT
See medical report.

Medical report

The military medical Officer at Malbatt stated that he saw both victims on the day of the accident at 16:00 (at Ratnak Mondul hospital). He said that Victim No.2 had superficial burns on his back and the rear of his right thigh and right arm.

He was given pain killers and discharged.

Both victims were flown to an ICRC Hospital, arriving at 16:45.

A "case summary" attached to the insurance claim stated that Victim No.2 "suffered minor injuries".

Analysis

The primary cause of this accident is listed as a "Field control inadequacy" because the victim's were apparently injured by a mine that had been missed during routine clearance. This mine has a relatively large metal content and should have been found if the deminers had been working properly using an appropriate method.
Related papers

A "case summary" attached to the insurance claim stated that the victim was leaving his place of work as a deminer at 13:55 when he "stepped on a mine". His "left leg was blown-off below the knee. He also suffered fractures on his right leg...."

A record of payment showed that Victim No.1 was a deminer and was paid US$160 per month at that time.

His "Service Agreement" was on file along with a photograph taken at an unspecified time during treatment showing his left leg missing about 10cm above the ankle and his face heavily bandaged.