

9-9-2000

DDASaccident365

Humanitarian Demining Accident and Incident Database
AID

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd>

 Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Database, Humanitarian Demining Accident and Incident, "DDASaccident365" (2000). *Global CWD Repository*. 565.
<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd/565>

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for International Stabilization and Recovery at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Global CWD Repository by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

DDAS Accident Report

Accident details

Report date: 19/05/2006	Accident number: 365
Accident time: Not recorded	Accident Date: 09/09/2000
Where it occurred: Chifunde MF, Chifunde District, Tete Province	Country: Mozambique
Primary cause: Field control inadequacy (?)	Secondary cause: Inadequate training (?)
Class: Other	Date of main report: 2001 [date unspecified]
ID original source: none	Name of source: NPA (field)
Organisation: Name removed	Ground condition: trees
Mine/device: Type 72 AP blast	Date last modified: 21/02/2004
Date record created: 21/02/2004	No of documents: 1
No of victims: 1	

Map details

Longitude:	Latitude:
Alt. coord. system:	Coordinates fixed by:
Map east:	Map north:
Map scale: Not recorded	Map series:
Map edition:	Map sheet:
Map name:	

Accident Notes

no independent investigation available (?)

inadequate area marking (?)

inadequate investigation (?)

inadequate training (?)

Accident report

No formal accident report was made by the demining NGO or the country MAC. The demining NGO did not class this as a demining accident. A summarised report was made available in March 2002 and is reproduced below (edited for anonymity).

The Victim was a driver. "On his normal site duties of transporting water from a water pump that was close to the minefield, [the Victim] went into the minefield behind a Baobab tree to

help himself to the bush toilet. Whilst defecating behind the tree he detonated an AP mine when he pricked on the ground with his machete.”

“He got slight injuries on his arms, legs, chest, abdomen and on the face. Wound in right eye, seriously wounded in left eye and as a consequence he lost respective eye. First aid treatment was administered by [demining group] paramedic and afterwards he was sent to Tete Provincial Hospital for further medical care. [This took approximately two hours.] After his total recovery [the demining group] offered him a new position as assistant transport officer at Tete office and he accepted.”

The victim was not compensated because, “Given the fact that there is no regulation in demining operations allowing the drivers to enter the minefield, [the Victim] violated [demining group] regulations, therefore, no compensation was given.

Victim Report

Victim number: 469	Name: Name removed
Age:	Gender: Male
Status: driver	Fit for work: yes
Compensation: none	Time to hospital: 2 hours
Protection issued: None	Protection used: none

Summary of injuries:

INJURIES

minor Abdomen

minor Arms

minor Chest

minor Eye

minor Legs

AMPUTATION/LOSS

Eye Left

COMMENT

No medical report was made available. After treatment the Victim was re-employed.

Analysis

The primary cause of this accident is listed as a “*Field control inadequacy*” because the victim was allowed to enter the uncleared area without his error being corrected. If he was able to enter a hazardous area without seeing any signs, the area marking may have been inadequate. Also the Victim’s apparent ignorance of the risk he was running implies that his training may have been inadequate. A driver who is required to enter a mined area regularly should be given some training in the potential risks they run. While it is recognised that the Victim may have been inattentive, the secondary cause is listed as “*Inadequate training*”.

The demining group’s decision that this was not a demining accident and that the victim did not deserve compensation were both highly questionable. His treatment in Tete hospital (which has no eye specialist) was less than might be expected from an internationally

respected NGO. However, the fact that he was found another position after treatment should be set against these failings.