

SANKARA – Editorial and redaction log

Updated: 13 August 2026 · Version ^{10.5.0}

- Source files reviewed: 148
- Published photographs with metadata removed: 64
- Published document pages with permanent redactions: 80
- Private source files not published: 4

Redacted categories

- Names of individual employees, assessors and private third parties
- Claim, case and membership numbers
- Private email addresses, telephone numbers and postal addresses
- IBAN/BIC and other banking details
- Transfer links, signatures and direct identifiers

Technical process

The publication uses newly generated raster images. Black redaction areas were permanently burned into the image pixels before downscaling. Original files and hidden layers are not part of the website. EXIF and GPS metadata were removed when the public files were saved.

Sources intentionally not published

Four files remain private: three images of an identity document and one photograph of medical records. The identity images add no material public evidentiary value. The medical image is considered in the private source review but remains entirely outside the public build because of its high sensitivity. The website limits itself to my health statements, expressly identified as my account, and neither makes an independent diagnosis nor claims a medically established causal link. Seven sources that had previously been withheld were published after cropping or irreversible redaction.

New pre-collision images

I added nine additional photographs to the public file as images from before the collision and published them as new metadata-free WebP derivatives. Their precise capture dates are not publicly verified. They therefore document general pre-collision condition and actual use, while the dated image from 8 January 2026 remains the strongest public evidence of the immediate pre-collision condition. Publication does not create a general licence for external reuse.

Central editorial distinction

Liability in principle is described as accepted or no longer disputed on the basis of the documented liability handling, the liability analysis in the assessor text and the compensation offer. The amount of compensation remains separate and disputed. Two objections to the valuation are documented: the transmission email of 30 March shows both pages of the purchase contract attached when sent to MAIF, while the assessor describes only a truncated version without buyer, seller or vessel particulars. The stated pre-loss value was also derived from a later review of records and photographs of the already damaged vessel. The public record does not establish where the document discrepancy arose.

Editorial limits

My allegations are identified as my positions. Submissions to public authorities are not presented as findings by those authorities. Comparative decisions concern different facts and do not establish systematic conduct.

Health data are limited to the summary needed for the account of the case. Raw records, test values, treatment details and direct identifiers are not published.