

DDAS Accident Report

Accident details

Report date: 23/01/2008	Accident number: 504
Accident time: 09:45	Accident Date: 13/08/2006
Where it occurred: Task # 0120, Sai Dokan Village, Bagram District, Parwan Province	Country: Afghanistan
Primary cause: Unavoidable (?)	Secondary cause: Inadequate training (?)
Class: Survey accident	Date of main report: 05/09/2006
ID original source: OPS/27/399-06	Name of source: UNMACA
Organisation: [Name removed]	
Mine/device: not known	Ground condition: agricultural (abandoned) dry/dusty grass/grazing area
Date record created:	Date last modified: 23/01/2008
No of victims: 1	No of documents: 2

Map details

Longitude:	Latitude:
Alt. coord. system: WGS 84	Coordinates fixed by: GPS
Map east: E 69 17 34.73	Map north: N 34 58 00.70
Map scale:	Map series:
Map edition:	Map sheet:
Map name:	

Accident Notes

inadequate training (?)
metal-detector not used (?)

Accident report

The report of this accident was made available in August 2007 as a PDF file. Its conversion to a text file for editing means that some of the formatting has been lost. The substance of the report is reproduced below, edited for anonymity. The original PDF file is held on record. Text in [] is editorial. An MDS is a Mine Dog Set.

Cover letter

File: OPS-27/3 71 / 06

To: Chief of Operations/DPM UNMACA M

From: Area Manager UNAMAC Kabul 05

Date: September 2006

Subject: Investigation Report

Attached please find the investigation report along with its supporting documents of the Demining Accident happened on Mr. Noor Agha dog handler of MDS-04 and his dog supporting [National survey agency] Sur-04 at the MF 120 in Sai Dokan village, Bagram district of Kabul province on 13 August 2006.

[Name removed] QM Assistant and [Name removed] OPS Assistant for AMAC Kabul have carried out the investigation.

The findings and recommendations are motioned in the report, forwarded for your information and action.

IMSMA report

[Data derived from IMSMA forms.]

Device was detonated by Mine dog handler and Mine Dog. While the dog was searching the leash of the dog touched the UXO and caused explosion. Unknown UXO caused the explosion. The leash of the dog touched the device on the ground surface.

History of the Minefield: MF# AF/0308/00000/120 located at Say Dokan village, Bagram district, Perwan province and is agricultural land. This MF is part of impact survey ID-1248 SHA-2, which is reported by ALIS as high impacted community. Its clearance has been requested by locals. It is an AP mine contaminated area. This area was frontline between the Taleban and the northern alliance forces for many years as the northern alliance forces planted the mines in this area to block entrance way of the Taleban forces.

The technical survey of the area has been started on 12 August 2006 by [National survey agency] Sur-04 which is supported by MDS-04. Survey operation on this task is in progress. After the clearance about 170 villagers will take benefit from this task.

Description of the incident/accident: On 13 August 2006 at 09:45 am a UXO was detonated on Noor Agha dog-handler of MDS-04 and his dog. The dog name is Taska with ID#269. The UXO was on the ground surface. When the dog was moving for search in a lane as proceeded about 4 meters from start point to the lane realized smell of a UXO changed its direction and returned back toward the UXO. At that time the dog had passed the UXO. Since The UXO was on the ground surface and the leash of the dog was loose, the leash touched the ground surface and displaced the UXO from its place. The UXO was too sensitive as detonated during displacement. As a result the dog handler received an injury in his right arm and his dog received injury on its right shoulder.

[The accident site is shown below.]



Soon the dog was shifted to MDC camp, Kabul for treatment and the dog handler after applying medical first aid was shifted to Bagram Air Base Hospital. After 24 hours the dog handler was released from the hospital. Now his condition is good, and went for leave at home to rest.

Location: WGS 84. E 69 17 34.73: N 34 58 00.70: GPS. Abandoned agricultural land, grazing.

Site conditions: The terrain was flat and open. The soil was medium, dry. The weather was clear, calm and mild. The vegetation was light bush.

Team and task details: Last QA inspection: 29 May 2006; team been at the site since 22 June 2006. Working hours: From 05:30 am to 11:30 am. Rest break from 10:00 am to 10:30.

Detector type used: MIL-D1. Hand-tool: bayonet. PPE was used correctly. Last leave: 09 June 2006 to 20 June 2006.

Medical reaction time: Paramedic was on the accident site immediately. At 09:48 the Victim was put into the ambulance. At 10:15 the ambulance arrived at the hospital (10 km away). Total CASEVAC time 30 minutes. Last time a CASEVAC drill was done: 07 August 2006.

Conclusion

1. The set leader and the dog handler had not conducted visual search of the ground surface before dog operation.
2. The leash of the dog was too loose and had touched the ground surface while the accident happened.
3. The loose leash which was touching the ground surface displaced the UXO and caused the accident.
4. During investigation we could not specify the type of the detonated UXO, but just we extracted that the UXO was on the ground surface and was too sensitive.
5. The UXO located about 4 meters away from start point of the lane and was easily identifiable if the dog handler and the set leader were strict in their work.
6. After passing the UXO, the dog realized the smell of the UXO and returns back toward the UXO, at this time the leash of the dog which was loose and in touch with the ground surface displaced the UXO and caused the accident.
7. Starting the work without visual check shows that the team especially the set leader command and control was poor.

Recommendations

1. When the dog handler commands the dog for search should not release the leash so loose as to touch the ground surface.
2. Before starting to search by the dogs, the set leader and the dog handler should strictly conduct visual check on the site.
3. The set leader should strictly control the dog and the handler to work in accordance with the set procedure.
4. The survey team leader should not be reluctant with the MDS work in the site: he should strictly control the MDS activities in the site and ensure that they are working in accordance with assigned procedure.

Attachments: [Held on file.]

Related letter

To: Area Manager, UNAMAC Kabul

Subject: MINE /UXO/INCIDENT REPORT

From: Field Officer, [National survey agency] Kabul

Date: 13.08.06

1. Agency, Site, Team Number: [National survey agency] Central /MDS #04
2. Date / Time of Incident: 13.08.06: 9:45 AM
3. Location (District, Village): Parwan Bagram Seh Dokan
4. Name & Father's Name of Injured: [Name removed]
5. Description of Injury: Got injured between arm and Hand the soft part his hand muscle stab (wounded) by fragment.
6. Treatment Given: Level —one and level two treatment was passed.
7. [Nothing written here.]
8. Current Condition of Casualty: OK
9. Casualty Priority: Two
10. How Incident /Casualty Occurred: while dog was setting for indication the lash of dog touched with UXO and the incident happened.
11. Evacuation Route and Destination: [Nothing written here.]
12. Any other Information incident: Nil
13. Did the casualty occur in a survey or cleared area: During clearance of contaminated area of Reduction.
14. Mine /UXO/Type (if known): [not known]

TASKING ORDER NUMBER - CA - TS – 07106

Technical Survey of MFNo.AFI0308100000/120

Clearance Depth: 13 cm.

Start Date: 10-Aug-06

[National survey agency] is to assign a survey team to do technical survey MF # 120 in Sea Dokan area of Bagram district. The TS team should take brief of site from LIAT-01 prior starting their technical survey operation. It is to be mentioned that this area... is requested by the local people and people of the mentioned area would benefit from the water canal.

Follow-up letter

File: OPS/03/01-16

Date: November 21, 2006

To: See distribution list

From: Chief of Operations UNMACA, Kabul

Subject: Follow up action on de-mining accident happened to the dog handler of MDS-04 supporting [National survey agency] Sur-04 in task # 0120 in Sai Dokan village, Bagram district of Parwan province

Reference: Demining investigation report File: OPS/27/399-06 dated: September 05, 2006, of UN-AMAC Kabul.

A demining accident happened on August 13, 2006 in searching lane of dog handler Noor Agha's dog from MDS-04 supporting Survey team # 04 of [National survey agency] in task # 0120 of Sai Dokan village, Bagram district of Parwan province, causing right arm injuries to the dog handler and right shoulder injury to the dog (Teske ID # 269).

The investigation report concluded that, the accident occurred because of poor supervision/control by set leader even the team leader of survey team and carelessness of the injured dog handler, as an obvious UXO was located about 4m away from where the dog started searching but the set leader and dog handler had not visually checked the lane. And also when the dog started searching, after passing from UXO, returned back to the scent of mentioned item, as it was very sensitive and leash of dog was too slack, so touched with UXO and explosion happened.

Recommendations:

1. All the command group of survey teams are recommended to fully brief their surveyors/dog handlers on their daily tasks.
2. The team command group should strictly control the surveyors/dog handlers during operation in order to make sure that they are using correct methodology and proper tools.
3. A refresher training to be held for the team.
4. The set leader and dog handler are recommended to do a possible visual check of their clearance lane for surface dangerous obstacles before commencing operation.

Distribution List

With attachment: AMACs (5), Sub AMAC Gardez, Directors [[National survey agency] and Director of specialist MDD group]

Less attachment: [All demining groups in-country.]

Victim Report

Victim number: 665	Name: [Name removed]
Age: 36	Gender: Male
Status: dog-handler	Fit for work: presumed
Compensation: Not made available	Time to hospital: 30 minutes
Protection issued: Frontal apron Long visor	Protection used: Frontal apron, Long visor

Summary of injuries:

minor Face

minor Hand

minor Shoulder

severe Arm

COMMENT: See Medical report.

Medical report

No formal medical report was made available.

From the main file and statements:

The Dog handler had got injured on the right arm and the right shoulder.

DoB: 1970

Right arm fragment injuries to the dog handler and right shoulder injury to the dog.

Got injured between arm and Hand the soft part his hand muscle stab (wounded) by fragment.

"I washed his eyes completely by serums. I washed all the dust from his eyes and there were no injuries in his eyes. There were some slight injuries on his face."

A photograph showed the Victim with his forearm and wrist bandaged.

STATEMENTS

Statement and Witness Report 1: Team Leader, Sur-04

Q1. Where were you located while the accident occurred and how long was the distance between you and the accident point?

A1. While the accident happened I was in the control point (CCP) at the distance of 100 meters from the accident point.

Q2. Please explain how the accident happened?

A2. After finishing the security check, I instructed the set leader to start his work. The set leader Mr. [Name removed] together with [the Victim], dog handler, along with a surveyor moved toward worksite to re start the work. After a while I heard the voice of explosion at the same time the set leader voiced that accident happened then I ordered the team to stop work. Then I ordered the team medic and ambulance driver to get ready for applying medical first aid and shifting the victim to the hospital. The victim was admitted to Bagram air base military hospital.

Q3. In your opinion which mistake has caused the accident?

A3. In my opinion, before starting the work the site should be visibly checked by set leader and dog handler, not conducting visual check caused this accident.

Q4. Are you happy with MDS working procedures?

A4. Yes, their performance is good but they need to work more strictly.

Q5. What time the accident happened, what was the type of the detonated device and where it was located on the surface of the ground or was buried if it was buried in how depth?

A5. The accident occurred at on 13 August 2006, at 9:45 am. I think it was UXO and located at the ground surface.

Q6. If it was UXO, what was the type of it, please clear it?

A6. We could not find any piece of it to specify its type.

Q7. Have you find any other mine in this task if yes what was the type of the mines?

A7. Being the second day of our work in this task, we could not find any mine or UXO in this task. At the boundary lane of our previous task we found an Iranian No.4 AP mine.

Statement and Witness Report 2: MD Set Leader

Q1. Please briefly explain how and when the accident happened?

A1. Dear investigation team member I got your question. It was 13.08.06 minefield No 120 located in Sah Dokan village while we were checking and making reduction of the area during the signal check in second panel while we had checked about 50 meters and [the Victim] started to check the area after few leash while the dog had a distance of five meters from us. At the moment a change came to the dog and it turned and we heard the explosion. Then I rushed to [the Victim] and saw him he got injured on his right hand it was 0945 in the morning.

Q2. In your opinion what caused the accident Mine or UXO and also, mention it was it surface of sub surface?

A2. While I heard the explosion suddenly I took all medical equipment, which were in need and then rushed to the accident point. 10 M distance to cleared area I checked the casualty step by step. I checked the general condition of the casualty I could not see any major problem. At that time as smoke and dust had affect the patient by the way he could find the way and could recognize his friends. He get in to the stretcher himself and we did all the first Aid. He lay down on the bed. I start the second step, I washed his eyes completely by

serums. I washed all the dust from his eyes and there were no injuries in his eyes. There were some slight injuries on his face. Finally we took the patient to Bagram Hospital.

Q3. In case it was sub-surface device the device does not detonate by pressure in this case we can say it was a mine that it has detonated by pressure. Please write us your opinion.

A3. I got your questions I have already mentioned I don't know weather it was a UXO or a mine.

Q4. Does the dog handler had his PPE, Helmet and Visor on his body and does he observe all the safety procedures?

A4. Yes, [the Victim] the dog handler and myself we had the PPEs, Helmets, and the visor and we had concerned the safety procedures.

Q5. Have you and your dog handler [the Victim] searched the area prior to start the operations or not?

A5. Yes, we did the visual check prior to start the operation.

Q6. What was the name of the dog, which the accident happened on? What was the number and how old was it and were you happy with his work?

A6. The dog name was [Name removed] with serial. Number 269 and it was seven year and six months old. He had worked with us for ten months and we were happy with his work.

Statement and Witness Report 3: paramedic

Q1. Where were you located while the accident occurred and how long was the distance between you and the accident point?

A1. While the accident happened I was located in the area where the team leader selected it and it was about 100 Mts away from the accident point.

Q2. When the accident does happened and after how long did you reached the patient to do the first aid for him?

A2. The accident happened at 0945 in the morning and we reached the patient after 2-3 minutes.

Q3. After how long did you make the patient ready to be taken to the hospital?

A3. We made the patient ready within 20 — 30 minutes to be taken to the hospital and he was shifted from She Dokan village to Bagram 14th Combat support hospital. Within 30 —40 minutes the patient reached the hospital.

Q4. Could you please tell us which part of the body of dog handler was injured and which part of the dog body?

A4. The Dog handler had got injured on the right arm and the right shoulder.

Q5. Where are the dog handler and the dog for the time being?

A5. The Dog handler is in the base and his condition is ok and the dog is under the treatment in the compound of the main office.

Statement and Witness Report 4: The Victim

Date: 14.08.06

Questions:

1. Would you please explain how the accident happened?
2. Could you please tell us what type of device caused the accident?
3. In your opinion which fault caused the accident?
4. So, what is the main cause of the accident?
5. While the accident happened how much was the distance between the leash and the dog how long was the distance between you and the dog?

1. I was checking the signals in the second panel it was 94th leash that the accident happened. The accident happened while the dog was in turning position and the leash touched the ground and the device. I was located at the 5 mts distance from the accident point. The device was too small and I could not see it. The paramedic reached on time and did the first aid and then they evacuate me to Bagram hospital.
2. Since after the accident my situation was not normal thus I could not mention any thing.
3. As per my two years experience I did not make any mistake that may caused the accident.
4. I don't remember the main cause of the accident.

Analysis

The unidentified item that detonated was probably largely concealed. When it detonated, the dog was below the fragmentation cone associated with the detonation of a buried device, and so avoided severe injury. The dog handler was higher and his exposed arm was inside the fragmentation cone. A picture of his body armour showed no damage, but fragments may have bounced off.

The primary cause of this accident is listed as a "Unavoidable" because when a leashed dog that is well trained turns around, it is not unusual for the leash to be slack. It is possible that the handler did not make a good visual search of the area before deploying the dog to search, but it is also possible that this may not be true. In dry and dusty conditions, even surface items may be readily camouflaged by dust.

The secondary cause is listed as "Inadequate training" because it is very likely that the dog-handler and his Set Leader had not been trained in the identification of fuzes and parts of devices, and so would not have recognised a small threat half-buried and several metres away even if it was not coated in dust.