

RESPONSES RECEIVED ON DRAFT REPORT 'PERCEPTION OF PILOTAGE - COLLISION BETWEEN PILOT VESSEL AND BULK CARRIER IN THE SCHELDT AREA'

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
1	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	5	19	What were the options for action available to the captain of the Nord Taurus?	The captain was never aware of a risk of collision. He was informed by the crew on the fore part that a collision had taken place. Consideration could therefore be given to leaving out this investigation question entirely. A better investigation question could be: What were the options for action available to the bridge team (including the pilot) of the Nord Taurus before the collision occurred?	No	The specific question is what more a captain can do if he and his ship are in the pilotage operation, when the risk of collision occurs.
2	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	6	5	Loodswezen	capital letter	Yes	
3	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	6	17	In the Scheldemonen region, pilotage operations are carried out by three	Better terminology	Yes	
4	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	6	24	With a SWATH and/or tenders	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	
5	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	6	29	In the Scheldemonen region, there are two P-class pilot cutters available.	Leave out the Pollux and Procyon. This could equally be the Polaris. This changes yearly.	Yes	
6	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	6	32	There is (almost) always one cutter and one SWATH at the pilot station.	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	
7	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	6	34	From the Schelde Coordination Centre in Flushing, vessel traffic coordinators employed by Rijkswaterstaat (RWS) manage shipping traffic, in collaboration with a registered pilot.	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	
8	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	6	37	Together. (delete to guide vessels from sea to berth in an uninterrupted chain)	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	
9	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	7	9	Scheldemonen region there are two P-class pilot station vessels available.	Leave out Pollux and Procyon. Instead limit to P-class pilot station vessels. See also comment page 6 line 29	Yes	
10	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	10	7	January 2018 the sea pilot came on board to guide the vessel out to sea, from Flushing.	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	
11	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	10	9	In connection with the draught of the vessel) and then followed a northeasterly heading towards the pilot station	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	
12	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	10	14	With every vessel that is piloted in the Scheldemonen region, a decision is taken	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
13	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	10	19	Makes contact with the crew of the SWATH about the course to be followed	This is an important point: the pilot station vessel can only provide information about a good course. It is entirely up to the bridge team of the piloted vessel whether it is safe to sail this course. We will return to this point in several subsequent comments.	Yes	
14	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	10	24	Approximately one mile northwest of the Schouwenbank Zuid buoy (SBZ buoy). Between then and 03.45 hours	Incorrect name of the SBZ buoy	Yes	
15	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	10	25	A series of pilotage operations were undertaken, all by the Perseus.	Better terminology	Yes	
16	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	11	19	To set course for the Perseus to safely disembark the pilot, via the VHF radio, the Nord Taurus was informed that the heading was 030° and the speed 10 knots.	Pilot vessels do not give instructions. They are only able to provide information. The fact that the bridge team of the Nord Taurus failed to check first whether the change of heading to 030 could be carried out safely made an important contribution to this incident. That is not mentioned here.	Partly	Not the instruction but the information was adopted. In this case, the Pollux was clearly recognisable as a pilot vessel, and the crew on board the Pollux knew that the pilot was to be taken off the Nord Taurus. The pilot on board the Nord Taurus therefore assumed that the Pollux would monitor the pilotage operation and where necessary would facilitate that process.
17	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	11	21	The Nord Taurus then shifted its heading to port, adopting a heading of 030° without actively informing the Pollux of this change of heading. This change of heading created an immediate risk of collision with the Pollux.	This is an important detail. If the Nord Taurus had sought to contact the Pollux, the incident would not have occurred. (The question is why did the Nord Taurus not inform the Pollux? Was that a) because they assumed that the Pollux had observed the change in heading, and would take evasive action? Or was it b) because they were not aware of the proximity of the Pollux?)	No	See comment 16.
18	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	11	23	(Purple block Perseus) Captain of the Perseus informs Nord Taurus of the heading 030° at a speed of 10 knots.	The Perseus can neither advise nor issue instructions. They can only provide information. The decision to sail a heading is taken on board the vessel to be piloted.	Yes	
19	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	11	23	(Yellow block Nord Taurus) Nord Taurus decides to follow the course of 030° at a speed of 10 knots, to bring the Perseus alongside.	The Perseus did not issue an instruction. See text above.	Yes	
20	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	12	6	The long gangway and pilot ladder increased the risk that the Perseus could damage the gangway.	Better description of the actual situation	Yes	
21	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	12	19	minor injury (<i>lichtgewond</i> in Dutch)	Spelling	Yes	
	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	11	The indicated appropriate heading of 030 so that the Perseus could come alongside safely	The pilot issues advice on heading and speed. Pilot vessels inform a ship of the course to be followed in order to come alongside. The moment of making lee is up to the bridge team of the ship from which the pilot is to be disembarked, when safe.	Yes	
23	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	13	Approaching the Nord Taurus from the starboard. The Nord Taurus was therefore required to take evasive action.	The term priority is not used in shipping.	Yes	

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
24	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	19	Consider adding the following sentence: In advance of this, the pilot must take the necessary preventive measures to ensure that immediately following disembarkation, the vessel can continue on a safe heading.		Yes	
25	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	20	With the Perseus practically alongside the Nord Taurus.	Leave out practically.	Yes	
26	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	21	While the pilotage operation is underway, it is unusual and potentially risky	Leave out the word potentially and change piloting to pilotage operation	Yes	
27	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	24	If the Nord Taurus had realised that there was an immediate risk of collision, there was still not any time left to change course following completion of the pilotage operation.	The bridge team on the Nord Taurus had not realised that a collision had occurred, let alone attempting to avoid it. The captain only realised that a collision had occurred after the collision.	No	The crew of the Nord Taurus was at all times operating under the assumption that the Pollux would change course because the Nord Taurus was in the pilotage operation.
28	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	31	This fact indicates ...	Is this confirmed by the pilot or is it an assumption?	No	The pilot indicated that he thought that the Pollux would change course.
29	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	15	35	The situation in the Scheldt area whereby two independently operating pilot vessels are present on a regular basis at practically the same location can cause confusion. As a consequence, on the Nord Taurus it was (wrongly) assumed that the two pilot vessels were aware of each other's actions, and the actions of the Nord Taurus.	2 pilot vessels at the same location is not unusual. It is common in Flanders, Rotterdam and Germany and not unknown to the Nord Taurus. The Nord Taurus regularly visits these ports.	No	It is a question of the combination of (semi) independently operating pilot vessels close to one another. The combination of cutter and SWATH on the Westerschelde is relatively unique.
30	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	16	3	pilotage operation	pilotage operation rather than piloting	Yes	
31	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	16	9	To deviate from the requested course from the moment that the Perseus came alongside and/or the pilot was on the ladder.	This addition is important because it clarifies that the moment of making lead lies with the Nord Taurus.	Yes	
32	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	16	9	The crew of the Nord Taurus assumed that the Pollux was involved in the pilotage operation.	Here leave out the pilot. He is aware of the procedure at the pilot station. For him, there can be no possibility of confusion about who is involved in what.	Yes	Added that the pilot believed that the Pollux would change course.
33	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	16	20	However, at practically that same moment, the Nord Taurus decided to adopt a heading of 030°.	See earlier comments. It is the Nord Taurus that makes the decision. There is no designated heading or an instruction.	Yes	
34	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	16	37	The Nord Taurus was required to take evasive action but according to the rules of good seamanship, the Pollux should have given way.	The term priority is not used in shipping.	Yes	
35	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	16	42	The captain decided to sail to the lozenge marked on the chart indicating the pilot station.	Remove ahead. At the time the captain took the decision to sail to the starting position, there was no risk of collision. Instead, the captain of the Pollux assumed that the Nord Taurus would also sail to the pilot station (the lozenge marked on the chart).	Partly	The captain planned to sail ahead, so leave the term in place.

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
36	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	17	5	The change in course initiated by the Nord Taurus went unnoticed on board the Pollux.	See previous comments. The Perseus merely issues information about the heading to be followed. The choice of when to change heading is taken by the Nord Taurus.	Yes	
37	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	17	9	As a consequence, the repositioning manoeuvre, which was unnecessary at the time, resulted in a collision.	The question is whether the words 'which was unnecessary at the time' add any value. Is it relevant whether it was necessary or not?	No	At that moment it was not necessary to sail to the lozenge mark. The captain of the Pollux could have waited until the pilotage operation of the Nord Taurus was completed.
38	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	17	27	Two pilot vessels close together	At least for the pilot, it was not an unusual situation. The crew of the Nord Taurus must also have regularly come across this situation. The ship regularly visits Flanders/ the Netherlands and Germany. This area is also marked on the chart as a caution area, which requires very careful handling.	No	It can cause confusion if there are two large pilot vessels close together, and one of them could possibly be viewed as 'other shipping traffic', while in fact bearing standard pilot lights.
39	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	17	38	This can lead to confusion for shipping, especially for vessels not well versed in this area.	It is not an unusual situation.	No	See comment 29.
40	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	17	43	Consider adding: Incorrect assumptions by the parties involved made an important contribution to the incident.	All parties involved assumed that: Assumptions are the mother of all ... etc..	Partly	Partially other formulation selected.
41	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	18	2	Being located close together during a pilotage operation can lead to confusion for shipping. This is a regular occurrence in the Scheldemonden region, Rotterdam and German ports.		Yes	
42	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	18	6		And against that background was also perceived as being involved in the pilotage operation. This sentence is not ideal and its meaning is unclear.	Yes	
43	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	19	3	1. The captain of the Nord Taurus viewed the Pollux as part of the pilotage operation. For that reason, the Nord Taurus believed it could safely sail on a heading of 030 and assumed that the Pollux would subsequently take evasive action, and no agreements were reached.	In our judgement, this conclusion may be drawn for the captain of the Nord Taurus but not for the pilot. He knew that the Pollux was not part of the pilotage operation.	Partly	The pilot assumed, just like on other occasions, that the Pollux would not get in his way.
44	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	19	14	The underlying cause of the accident is the confusion that arose due to the presence of two vessels clearly recognisable as pilot vessels during the pilotage operation.	The word unusual is incorrect in our judgement. See previous comments.	No	See comment 29.
45	Nederlands Loodswezen BV	20		Caterpillar	Caterpillar instead of Catterpillar in vessel data Pollux	Yes	

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
46	Loods	15	13	and ... priority.	Until 04 hours (separation between the vessels 3NM and therefore with absolute certainty visually observable) the Nord Taurus approached the Pollux from the starboard. At that time, the headings of the two vessels were diverging (060° and 222°) respectively and the CPA>1.5NM in other words no risk of collision. Only after the Pollux had made a heading change of 80° to starboard and altered its speed did the risk of collision arise. A vessel which (in the event of opposing or crossing headings) itself creates a risk of collision by changing heading/speed can of course not become the priority vessel, and demand priority.	Partly	Added that the Pollux was approaching the Nord Taurus from starboard, at the moment of the collision.
47	Loods	15	29	instructions	A pilot issues advice and not instructions.	Yes	
48	Loods	15	35	with some regularity	It is more a rule than an exception that both vessels are present at the same location.	yes	
49	Loods	16	11	and ... done so	Cf. above. In addition, the Nord Taurus was 'a vessel involved in the transfer of persons and therefore subject to limited manoeuvrability', as a consequence of which the Pollux should have changed course.	yes	
50	Loods	16	37	priority	Cf. above.	yes	
51	Loods	18	3	with some regularity	Cf. above.	yes	
52	Nord Taurus	1		"Perception of pilotage"	See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, paragraphs 4-9 and 16-18. There was no "perception" of pilotage; this was an actual and planned pilot operation in which both Nord Taurus and Perseus and Pollux, the latter two both showing their pilot lights, participated (also see annex 5. par. 6-7).	No	This case is about the perception and the resultant assumptions.
53	Nord Taurus	5	12	"The DSB... questions"	See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, page 2: no interviews on the part of Nord Taurus took place. The "relevant documents" are not listed. The documents made available to the Safety Board by Pedregal have clearly not been used, nor are they reflected, in the analysis. The text, therefore, and unjustly so, suggests an objective analysis of all available information and that both sides of the argument have been considered, which is not the case.	No	Via the legal counsel of the Nord Taurus, statements have been received from the crew members, together with the VDR data. The Dutch Safety Board does not publish a list of documents used, and all information available has been included in the analysis.

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
54	Nord Taurus	5	17	"What...collision"	Pedregal was never informed about these questions and the Safety Board never asked her for her input on same. The questions are clearly biased as the only focus on the Nord Taurus and completely ignore the multiple violations of safety regulations on board the Pollux, and as no attention is paid to Perseus' role in the operation. Further, the questions are based on the incorrect assumption that this was not a pilotage operation and merely a "perception" of same: see letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020 par. 1-8 and 11-15 and 16-18. Question 2 unjustly suggests that i) it was incumbent upon Nord Taurus to prevent the collision, and ii) that she was in a position where he could have prevented the collision. Nord Taurus and Perseus were the stand-on vessels, and Pollux was the give-way vessel. See Annex 1.	No	The Dutch Safety Board decides on its own investigation questions and does not discuss them with the parties involved. Regulation 8 f (iii) of the Convention on the International Regulations for preventing collisions at sea states: "A vessel the passage of which is not to be impeded remains fully obliged to comply with the Rules of this Part when the two vessels are approaching one another so as to involve risk of collision." The question here is what more a vessel that is involved in a pilotage operation can do, in this case.
55	Nord Taurus	9	1	Internal investigation NL BV	See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, page 2 and 3: we reserve all rights. We have not received a copy of the (one-sided) internal investigation and evaluation reports, but it is clear the Safety Board heavily relied on same. This makes it biased and unverifiable/nearly impossible to adequately rebut. This biased manner of conducting an investigation and reporting is contrary to the Safety Board's mission and essential values of neutrality, objectivity and transparency.	No	The Dutch Safety Board is not permitted to share investigation information with other parties.
56	Nord Taurus	11	4	The occurrence	The change of crew of the Perseus took place at the same time as the disembarkation of the two pilots, which had been collected by the Perseus, aboard the Pollux	No	This addition is not relevant to the case.
57	Nord Taurus	11	15	"set a course of 305°"	This incorrect. According that VDR data the Pollux set a course of 300°, which is stated and confirmed by het Loodswezen in her writ of summons (annex 5). The Nautical Committee has made a minute by minute transcript of courses and speeds, which we shall provide to you upon request.	Yes	
58	Nord Taurus	15	3	"To... Pollux and Perseus"	Firstly, this is not about "perspective", but about facts and the application of the Collision Regulations (Colregs) which serve to prevent collisions and enhance safety. Secondly, there was no "perspective" from the Pollux as captain xxxxx was basically absent. See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 16-18. Thirdly, the word "perspective" had not been defined by the Safety Board, but in as far as it pertains to (supposed) personal perspectives, same are unfounded. My clients were never interviewed, and captain xxxxx is the only "witness" on board Pollux. Finally, the role of the Perseus is unjustly downplayed.	No	Here we describe three different viewpoints which we refer to as perspectives.
59	Nord Taurus	15	6	Figure 11	The figure is unreadable. The few details that can be read are incorrect.	Yes	

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
60	Nord Taurus	15	22	"Pollux...priority"	This is incorrect, see letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par 11-15 and judgement Court of Rotterdam (annex 5): Nord Taurus (and Perseus) had priority. Secondly, this analysis is outside the ambit of the Safety Board and in clear violation of art. 61 of the Rijkswet OVV. This "opinion" of the Safety Board, which is exactly the same of Loodswezen, shows the Safety Board's bias. All rights are reserved.	Yes	What this means is that the Pollux approached from the starboard, and that under normal circumstances, the Nord Taurus would therefore have to give way. If the Nord Taurus was involved in the transfer of persons, then the Pollux would have to give way.
61	Nord Taurus	15	22	"only a short ... collision."	The pilotage operation had not been completed. See annex 5. At the time of the collision the pilotage operation was ongoing (not a mistaken perception thereof). Loodswezen (and we) have CCTV footage from the Pollux showing Perseus was still alongside the Nord Taurus when the collision occurred. We insist that you watch same first.	No	These CCTV images had never previously been issued to the Dutch Safety Board. Whether the Perseus was just or was just not any longer alongside the Nord Taurus does not change the outcome of the investigation.
62	Nord Taurus	15	23	"As a result ... operation."	As the pilotage was still ongoing, it was not incumbent upon Nord Taurus to change its heading, quite the opposite. The more so as Nord Taurus had priority and Pollux had to make way and stay clear of the operation. See annex 5. This statement is therefore also biased and in violation of art. 61 Rijkswet OVV.	Partly	See comment 58.
63	Nord Taurus	15	30	"This information ... operation."	This paragraph wrongfully implies that the Pollux was "a normal participant", but was mistakenly not viewed as such by the pilot."	Partly	See comment 58.
64	Nord Taurus	15	35	"independently"	should read: jointly of in tandem, see letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 4.	No	The pilot was picked up by the Perseus and not by a dinghy from the Pollux. As a consequence, the Pollux was not part of the pilotage operation of the Nord Taurus.
65	Nord Taurus	15	36	"is unusual"	This is not unusual. See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 1-4. Also see annex 4.	No	See comment 29.
66	Nord Taurus	16	1	"this is therefore ... course."	See comments above and letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, page 2-3: the Safety Board is merely copying the (false) allegations of het Loodswezen. The paragraph is based on the incorrect allegation that the situation was unclear (which it was not), that Pollux was not engaged in pilotage duty (which she was, as evidenced by her pilot lights), and/or that it is up to the pilot to warn the Pollux. It furthermore completely ignores captain xxxxx's duty to navigate, look out and listen out, in which he surely would have made way. We object against the biased nature of this Analysis.	No	The Perseus disembarked the pilot and not the dinghy from the Pollux. As a result, the Pollux was not actively involved. The importance of maintaining a lookout and actively listening are clearly reflected in the report.
67	Nord Taurus	16	10	"assumed"	They did not "assume" same, they knew it and could count on same, because of Pollux' pilot lights. And Pollux was indeed engaged in pilotage duty. She was to pick up the pilot from the Perseus. See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par 5-8 and annex 5, par 6-7.	No	Assumptions were certainly made but these were not assessed. See also comment 68.

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
68	Nord Taurus	16	10	"Although ... have done so."	It is incorrect that the instructed lee course caused Pollux and Nord Taurus to be on a collision course. The Safety Board's (and Loodswezen's) "opinion" on the legal viewpoint is outside the Safety Board's ambit and in violation of art. 61. Rijkswet OVV. The court of Rotterdam had moreover already ruled on this, see annex 1. Furthermore, we find it hard to believe that this "opinion" stems from the Safety Board, as changing course would jeopardize the safety of Perseus and Nord Taurus. That is contrary to the Safety Board's mission, and we resent that.	No	See comments 1 and 54.
69	Nord Taurus	16	17	"At around 04.00 hours ... ahead of Nord Taurus."	See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 5-10 and annex 5, par 6-7. This should read: "At around 04.00 hours the Pollux set a course (on the autopilot) of 300° and a speed of 8 knots, towards the Perseus, who would take of the pilot from the Nord Taurus and subsequently transfer the pilot to the Pollux. The instruction for the lee course, given by Perseus, was at 04.06 hours, therefore well after setting the course on the autopilot. Further, it is incorrect that the Pollux would cross ahead of Nord Taurus and it is incorrect that the instructed lee course caused Pollux and Nord Taurus to be on a collision course: see letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 10. According to the Colregs the vessels were already on a collision course when Pollux started steering 300°, see annex 1.	No	The risk of collision arose due to the change of course by the Nord Taurus to the recommended course to be followed.
70	Nord Taurus	16	25	"It could be ... Pollux"	It should be added that the Nord Taurus altering course "could also be observed on the radar and visually".	No	Adds no value because the captain of the Pollux was working on the administration and was not focusing on navigation.
71	Nord Taurus	16	29	"Moreover ... the watch"	The watch orders are in violation with international mandatory requirements, pertaining to safety. We do not understand that same is ignored and that the Safety Board appears to seek an excuse for this violation of legal requirements. It merely underlines the Safety Board's bias.	No	The report describes the statutory regulations but also the Bridge Routine Standard Watch Orders on the Pollux. On the basis of these watch orders, it was understandable that there was no second lookout, but this does not suggest that the Dutch Safety Board approves the deviation from the statutory regulations.
72	Nord Taurus	16	37	"The Pollux ... give wat"	This is incorrect, biased and outside the DSB's ambit. See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 11-15 and annex 1.	Yes	
73	Nord Taurus	16	42	"the captain ... Nord Taurus"	This is incorrect. See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, p. 5-10 and annex 5. See comments on lines 15-33 of page 15 and on lines 17-22 of page 16, which are repeated here.	No	See comments 64 and 69.
74	Nord Taurus	16	46	"The Pollux ... operation."	See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par 4. See comments on lines 30-33 of page 15 and on lines 1-5 of page 16, which are repeated here.	No	See comments 58 and 66.
75	Nord Taurus	17	4	"The ... operation"	See comments on line 36, page 15, which are repeated here. See also letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 1-4.	No	See comment 29.

No.	Organization	Page	Line no.	Tekst to be corrected (first ... last word)	Argumentation	Corrected	Response from the Dutch Safety Board
76	Nord Taurus	17	6	"The change ... collision."	We believe that not only the fact that there was no second look-out on the bridge should be inserted and considered. We fail to see "the understandable reasons" for the alarm being switched off.	Yes	
77	Nord Taurus	17	17	"Nonetheless ... Pollux"	We have seen no documents proving the alleged perspective of the Perseus.	No	See comment 55.
78	Nord Taurus	17	36	"However ... vessel"	This is not unusual. See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020, par. 1-4. See comments on lines 30-33 and 36 of page 15 and comments on lines 1-5 of page 6, which are repeated here.	No	See comment 29.
79	Nord Taurus	18	1	"A ... assessed"	See all comments on the Analysis, which are repeated here. The conclusion is biased, incorrect and unfounded, the more so as the main cause of the collision - the Pollux basically being deaf and blind - is ignored. We do not believe the Safety Board to seriously want to ignore same, the more so as the Pollux might just as well have collided with the Perseus.	No	See comment 29.
80	Nord Taurus	19	3	"viewed"	Should read: "correctly viewed"	No	See comment 66.
81	Nord Taurus	19	6	"crew of the Pollux"	Should read: "captain", there was no one else on the bridge	Yes	
82	Nord Taurus	19	13	"The underlying ... situation"	See all comments on "perception", "unusual" and "assumptions". The situation was not unusual. The word "assumptions" moreover suggests that those involved were acting under a misapprehension, and that the situation in reality was different from how it presented itself and was perceived by those involved. The conclusions are incorrect and unfounded, and moreover they show that the conclusions are completely one-sided and biased. See letter to Safety Board dated 11.09.2020 - in full. All rights reserved.	No	See comment 52.
83	Nord Taurus	19	24	"crewmembers"	Should read: "captain", there was no one else on the bridge	Yes	
84	Nord Taurus	19	31	"On board ... assumed"	Not only Nord Taurus, but also pilot and Perseus counted on (not "assumed") the Pollux to keeping clear.	No	See comment 67.
85	Nord Taurus	19	34	"The Perseus ... Pollux"	There is no evidence that Perseus did not call or warn Pollux "because they were confident". When they saw the Pollux, the collision had already occurred. According to the statements taken by the Nautical Committee which we submitted to you, they were totally shocked and surprised about Pollux' presence.	No	See comment 67.
86	Nord Taurus	19	37	"The ... situation"	This conclusion rests on a distortion of the facts, and on the false assumption that the Pollux was not engaged in the, at the time of the collision, ongoing pilot operation.	No	See comment 64.