

James Madison University

JMU Scholarly Commons

Global CWD Repository

Center for International Stabilization and
Recovery

11-13-2003

DDASaccident519

HD-AID

Humanitarian Demining Accident and Incident Database

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

HD-AID, "DDASaccident519" (2003). *Global CWD Repository*. 718.
<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd/718>

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: 27/01/2008	Accident number: 519
Accident time: Not made available	Accident Date: 13/11/2003
Where it occurred: Not made available	Country: Iraq
Primary cause: Field control inadequacy (?)	Secondary cause: Management/control inadequacy (?)
Class: Other	Date of main report: Not made available
ID original source: None	Name of source: [Name removed]
Organisation: [Name removed]	
Mine/device: Valmara 69 AP Bfrag	Ground condition: not recorded
Date record created:	Date last modified: 27/01/2008
No of victims: 3	No of documents: 1

Map details

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

Accident Notes

inadequate investigation (?)

safety distances ignored (?)

Accident report

Details of this accident have been withheld by the demining NGO that employed the Victim. A spreadsheet including the Victim's name and very brief details of the accident was made available in 2007. Some details can be inferred from the information released. For example, the fact that there were three Victims implies that safety distances were not being enforced.

This entry will be expanded if access to the report of the investigation is made available in future.

The spreadsheet data is reproduced below, edited for anonymity.

"Date and country. [Victim No.1: name removed] - Deminer, other staff involved – [Victim No.2: name removed] - Deminer, and their driver.

Mine Exploded - traumatic amputation of both legs following V69 detonation, two other staff injured only superficial injuries."

Victim Report

Victim number: 681	Name: [Name removed]
Age:	Gender: Male
Status: deminer	Fit for work: no
Compensation: Not made available	Time to hospital: Not made available
Protection issued: Not recorded	Protection used: Not made available

Summary of injuries:

AMPUTATION/LOSS: Legs

COMMENT: "Traumatic amputation of both legs." No medical report was made available.

Victim Report

Victim number: 682	Name: [Name removed]
Age:	Gender: Male
Status: deminer	Fit for work: presumed
Compensation: Not made available	Time to hospital: Not made available
Protection issued: Not recorded	Protection used: Not made available

Summary of injuries:

COMMENT: "Superficial injuries". No Medical report was made available.

Victim Report

Victim number: 683	Name: [Name removed]
Age:	Gender: Male
Status: driver	Fit for work: presumed
Compensation: Not made available	Time to hospital: Not made available
Protection issued: Not recorded	Protection used: Not made available

Summary of injuries:

COMMENT: "Superficial injuries". No Medical report was made available.

Analysis

The accident classification is listed as “Other” because there is not enough information to determine the activity at the time of the accident.

The primary cause of this accident is listed as a “Field control inadequacy” because there were three Victims which implies that the appropriate safety distances were not being enforced by field controllers.

The secondary cause is listed as a “Management control inadequacy” because the management of the demining group declined to make the accident details available. Although this is sometimes done to protect the Victims, in this case the Victims’ names were among the limited detail made available. It is possible that the managers have chosen to avoid transparency because they are afraid that the circumstances of the accident would reflect badly on their organisation.