Based on the given assurance case pattern and the domain information for BlueROV2, here is the instantiated assurance case for the BlueROV2 system displayed in a hierarchical tree format:

```

G1: Hazards for BlueROV2 system addressed in accordance with ALARP principle

- S1: Argument by risk reduction/elimination of each hazard

-- G2: No intolerable risks present in the system

--- S2: Argue that risk posed by any remaining hazards is negligible (undeveloped)

--- S3: Argue that no other risks have been identified (undeveloped)

--- C1: Definition of "intolerable"

-- G3: Risk from "Deviation from the operating area" has been reduced as low as reasonably practicable

--- S4: Apply ReSonAte to estimate level of risk from hazard condition "Deviation from the operating area"

---- G4: Model "Deviation from the operating area BTD" accurately describes possible propagation of hazard "Deviation from the operating area" (uninstantiated)

----- G6: Possible hazard propagation paths correctly captured in BTD (undeveloped)

----- G7: Barriers in the BTD correctly describe their respective control action including any required system functions (undeveloped)

----- G8: All non-negligible threats have been identified (undeveloped)

---- G5: Quantitative risk estimates are accurate and below acceptable threshold

----- G9: State probability distribution used for risk estimation is an accurate representation of expected system states (undeveloped)

----- G10: Estimated probability of "collision" is below allowable threshold for severity class "Major" (uninstantiated)

------ Sn1: Estimated risk level "10^-3 per hour" (uninstantiated)

---- A1: Function "Avoidance Maneuver" required by "Obstacle encounter BTD" is available (uninstantiated)

---- C2: Assigned severity class is "Major" (uninstantiated)

-- G3: Risk from "Obstacle encounter" has been reduced as low as reasonably practicable (repeated pattern for each identified hazard)

... (similar structure as above)

-- G3: Risk from "Loss of pipeline" has been reduced as low as reasonably practicable

... (similar structure as above)

```

\*\*Explanation:\*\*

- Each goal (G) and sub-goal is listed with its strategy (S) if required.

- Depth is denoted by dashes, showing the hierarchical nature of the goals and strategies.

- Contexts (C) and assumptions (A) are linked to their respective strategies/goals.

- Solutions (Sn) that directly support goals are listed under the goal they support.

- Placeholders are replaced with specific cases from the domain information. In this example, `{A::System}` becomes "BlueROV2 system" and `{B::Hazard}` for specific hazards like "Deviation from the operating area."

- Undeveloped nodes remain within the pattern but are marked as such to indicate areas needing further development.

- Some details are summarized or repeated patterns indicated to show how other hazard assessments would be structured in similar ways as shown.