

Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP
Form 20-F
April 05, 2017
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 20-F

(Mark One)

**REGISTRATION STATEMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 12(b) OR (g) OF THE SECURITIES
EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

OR

**ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT
OF 1934**

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2016

OR

**TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE
ACT OF 1934**

OR

**SHELL COMPANY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES
EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

Date of event requiring this shell company report _____

For the transition period from _____ to _____

Commission file number 001-34104

Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation

(Exact name of Registrant as specified in its charter)

Not Applicable

(Translation of Registrant's Name into English)

Republic of Marshall Islands

(Jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)

7 Avenue de Grande Bretagne, Office 11B2

Monte Carlo, MC 98000 Monaco

(Address of principal executive offices)

Todd E. Mason

Thompson Hine LLP

335 Madison Ave

New York, NY 10017

Todd.Mason@thompsonhine.com

(212) 908-3946

(Name, Telephone, E-mail and/or Facsimile number and Address of Company Contact Person)

Securities registered or to be registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act.

Title of each class	Name of each exchange on which registered
Common Stock, par value \$.0001 per share	New York Stock Exchange LLC
Securities registered or to be registered pursuant to	None

Section 12(g) of the Act.

**Securities for which there is a reporting obligation
pursuant to**

Section 15(d) of the Act.

None

Indicate the number of outstanding shares of each of the issuer's classes of capital or common stock as of the close of the period covered by the annual report: 150,582,990 Shares of Common Stock

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes No

If this report is an annual or transition report, indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or (15)(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter periods that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such reporting requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§ 232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

Edgar Filing: Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP - Form 20-F

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, or a non-accelerated filer. See definition of accelerated filer and large accelerated filer in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large Accelerated Filer

Accelerated Filer
Filer

Non-Accelerated

Indicate by check mark which basis of accounting the registrant has used to prepare the financial statements included in this filing:

U.S. GAAP

International Financial Reporting Standards as issued

Other

by the International Accounting Standards Board

If this is an annual report, indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PART I</u>	3
<u>Item 1. Identity of Directors, Senior Management and Advisers</u>	3
<u>Item 2. Offer Statistics and Expected Timetable</u>	3
<u>Item 3. Key Information</u>	3
<u>Item 4. Information on the Company</u>	42
<u>Item 4A. Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	67
<u>Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects</u>	67
<u>Item 6. Directors, Senior Management and Employees</u>	98
<u>Item 7. Major Stockholders and Related Party Transactions</u>	104
<u>Item 8. Financial Information</u>	115
<u>Item 9. Listing Details</u>	117
<u>Item 10. Additional Information</u>	117
<u>Item 11. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risks</u>	132
<u>Item 12. Description of Securities Other than Equity Securities</u>	133
<u>PART II</u>	134
<u>Item 13. Defaults, Dividend Arrearages and Delinquencies</u>	134
<u>Item 14. Material Modifications to the Rights of Shareholders and Use of Proceeds</u>	134
<u>Item 15. Controls and Procedures</u>	134
<u>Item 16A. Audit Committee Financial Expert</u>	135
<u>Item 16B. Code of Ethics</u>	135
<u>Item 16C. Principal Accountant Fees and Services</u>	135
<u>Item 16D. Exemptions from the Listing Standards for Audit Committees</u>	136
<u>Item 16E. Purchases of Equity Securities by the Issuer and Affiliated Purchasers</u>	136
<u>Item 16F. Change in Registrant's Certifying Accountant</u>	136
<u>Item 16G. Corporate Governance</u>	136
<u>Item 16H. Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	136
<u>Item 17. Financial Statements</u>	136
<u>Item 18. Financial Statements</u>	136
<u>Item 19. Exhibits</u>	136
<u>Signatures</u>	142
<u>EX-4.54</u>	
<u>EX-8.1</u>	
<u>EX-12.1</u>	
<u>EX-12.2</u>	
<u>EX-13.1</u>	
<u>EX-15.1</u>	
<u>EX-15.2</u>	
<u>EX-15.3</u>	
<u>EX-15.4</u>	

Table of Contents

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Annual Report should be read in conjunction with the financial statements and accompanying notes included herein.

Statements included in this Annual Report on Form 20-F (this Annual Report) which are not historical facts (including our statements concerning plans and objectives of management for future operations or economic performance, or assumptions related thereto) are forward-looking statements. In addition, we and our representatives may from time to time make other oral or written statements which are also forward-looking statements. Such statements include, in particular, statements about our plans, strategies, business prospects, changes and trends in our business, and the markets in which we operate as described in this Annual Report. In some cases, you can identify the forward-looking statements by the use of words such as may, could, should, would, expect, plan, anticipate, intend, for, estimate, predict, propose, potential, continue or the negative of these terms or other comparable terminology.

Forward-looking statements appear in a number of places and include statements with respect to, among other things:

our ability to maintain or develop new and existing customer relationships with major refined product importers and exporters, major crude oil companies and major commodity traders, including our ability to enter into long-term charters for our vessels;

our ability to successfully grow our business and our capacity to manage our expanding business;

future levels of cash flow and levels of dividends, as well as our future cash dividend policy;

our current and future business and growth strategies and other plans and objectives for future operations;

our future operating and financial results, including the amount of fixed hire and profit share that we may receive;

our ability to identify and consummate desirable acquisitions, dispositions, joint ventures or strategic alliances, business strategy, areas of possible expansion, and expected capital expenditure or operating expenses;

tanker industry trends, including charter rates and vessel values and factors affecting vessel supply and demand;

our ability to take delivery of, integrate into our fleet, and employ any newbuildings we may order in the future and the ability of shipyards to deliver vessels on a timely basis;

the aging of our vessels and resultant increases in operation and drydocking costs;

the ability of our vessels to pass classification inspection and vetting inspections by oil majors;

significant changes in vessel performance, including increased vessel breakdowns;

the creditworthiness of our charterers and the ability of our contract counterparties to fulfill their obligations to us;

our ability to repay outstanding indebtedness, to fulfill other financial obligations, to obtain additional financing and to obtain replacement charters for our vessels, in each case, at commercially acceptable rates or at all;

potential liability from litigation and our vessel operations, including discharge of pollutants;

our track record, and past and future performance, in safety, environmental and regulatory matters;

changes in the availability and costs of funding due to conditions in the bank market, capital markets and other factors;

Table of Contents

global economic outlook and growth and changes in general economic and business conditions;

general domestic and international political conditions, including wars, acts of piracy and terrorism;

changes in production of or demand for oil and petroleum products, either globally or in particular regions;

changes in the standard of service or the ability of our technical manager to be approved as required;

increases or decreases in domestic or worldwide oil consumption;

increases in costs and expenses, including but not limited to: crew wages, insurance, provisions, port expenses, lube oil, bunkers, repairs, maintenance and general and administrative expenses;

the adequacy of our insurance arrangements and our ability to obtain insurance and required certifications;

the expected cost of, and our ability to comply with, governmental regulations and maritime self-regulatory organization standards, as well as standard regulations imposed by our charterers applicable to our business;

the changes to the regulatory requirements applicable to the shipping and oil transportation industry, including, without limitation, stricter requirements adopted by international organizations, such as the International Maritime Organization and the European Union, or by individual countries or charterers and actions taken by regulatory authorities and governing such areas as safety and environmental compliance;

potential liability and costs due to environmental, safety and other incidents involving our vessels;

the effects of increasing emphasis on environmental and safety concerns by customers, governments and others, as well as changes in maritime regulations and standards;

our ability to retain key executive officers; and

our ability to leverage to our advantage, Navios Maritime Holdings Inc. (Navios Holdings) relationships and reputation in the shipping industry.

These and other forward-looking statements are made based upon management's current plans, expectations, estimates, assumptions and beliefs concerning future events impacting us and therefore involve a number of risks and uncertainties, including those risks discussed in Item 3. Key Information .

The forward-looking statements, contained in this Annual Report, are based on our current expectations and beliefs concerning future developments and their potential effects on us. There can be no assurance that future developments affecting us will be those that we have anticipated.

The risks, uncertainties and assumptions involve known and unknown risks and are inherently subject to significant uncertainties and contingencies, many of which are beyond our control. We caution that forward-looking statements are not guarantees and that actual results could differ materially from those expressed or implied in the forward-looking statements.

We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statement or statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date on which such statement is made or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events. New factors emerge from time to time, and it is not possible for us to predict all of these factors. Further, we cannot assess the impact of each such factor on our business or the extent to which any factor, or combination of factors, may cause actual results to be materially different from those contained in any forward-looking statement.

Table of Contents**PART I****Item 1. Identity of Directors, Senior Management and Advisers**

Not Applicable.

Item 2. Offer Statistics and Expected Timetable

Not Applicable.

Item 3. Key Information**A. Selected Financial Data**

Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation (sometimes referred to herein as Navios Acquisition, the Company, we or us) was incorporated in the Republic of Marshall Islands on March 14, 2008 (refer to Item 4. Information on the Company).

Navios Acquisition's selected historical financial information and operating results for the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013 and 2012 is derived from the audited consolidated financial statements of Navios Acquisition. The selected consolidated statements of income for the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014 and the consolidated balance sheet data as of December 31, 2016 and 2015 have been derived from our audited consolidated financial statements included elsewhere in this Annual Report. The consolidated statements of operations data for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, and the consolidated balance sheet data as of December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012, have been derived from our audited consolidated financial statements which are not included in this document and are available at www.sec.gov. The selected consolidated financial data should be read in conjunction with Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects, and other financial information included elsewhere in this Annual Report. The selected consolidated financial data is a summary of, is derived from, and is qualified by reference to, our audited consolidated financial statements and notes thereto, which have been prepared in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (U.S. GAAP). The historical data included below and elsewhere in this Annual Report is not necessarily indicative of our future performance.

Statement of Income Data

	Year ended December 31, 2016	Year ended December 31, 2015	Year ended December 31, 2014	Year ended December 31, 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012
(In thousands of U.S. dollars)					
Revenue	\$ 290,245	\$ 313,396	\$ 264,877	\$ 202,397	\$ 151,097
Time charter expenses	(4,980)	(4,492)	(5,187)	(6,762)	(2,824)
Direct vessel expenses	(3,567)	(1,532)	(1,979)	(3,096)	(2,622)
Management fees (entirely through related party transactions)	(97,866)	(95,336)	(95,827)	(71,392)	(47,043)

Edgar Filing: Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP - Form 20-F

General and administrative expenses	(17,057)	(15,532)	(14,588)	(7,017)	(3,853)
Depreciation and amortization	(57,617)	(57,623)	(67,718)	(63,880)	(49,644)
Loss on bond and debt extinguishment				(33,973)	
Interest income	4,767	1,683	720	315	445
Interest expenses and finance cost	(75,987)	(73,561)	(78,610)	(58,386)	(49,432)
Impairment loss			(11,690)		
Gain/ (loss) on sale of vessels	11,749	5,771	22,599	(21,098)	
Change in fair value of other assets			(1,188)		
Equity in net earnings of affiliated companies	15,499	18,436	2,000		
Other income	377	41	280	4,787	280
Other expense	(2,685)	(1,514)	(642)	(487)	(202)
Net income/ (loss)	\$ 62,878	\$ 89,737	\$ 13,047	\$ (58,592)	\$ (3,798)
Net income/ (loss) per share, basic	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.08	\$ (0.57)	\$ (0.08)
Net income/ (loss) per share, diluted	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.56	\$ 0.08	\$ (0.57)	\$ (0.08)

Table of Contents

Balance Sheet Data (at period end)	Year Ended December 31, 2016	Year Ended December 31, 2015	Year ended December 31, 2014	Year ended December 31, 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012
Current assets, including cash	\$ 107,282	\$ 97,349	\$ 89,528	\$ 120,801	\$ 71,795
Vessels, net	\$ 1,306,923	\$ 1,441,635	\$ 1,375,931	\$ 1,353,131	\$ 940,738
Total assets	\$ 1,703,619	\$ 1,774,091	\$ 1,697,014^{(1),(2)}	\$ 1,633,415⁽¹⁾	\$ 1,349,917⁽¹⁾
Long-term debt, including current portion, net of premium and deferred finance costs	\$ 1,095,938	\$ 1,197,583	\$ 1,142,002 ⁽¹⁾	\$ 1,131,202 ⁽¹⁾	\$ 973,359 ⁽¹⁾
Series D Convertible Preferred Stock	\$	\$	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 6,000
Total Stockholders' equity	\$ 572,931	\$ 540,871	\$ 490,793⁽²⁾	\$ 450,822	\$ 225,304
Puttable common stock	\$ 2,500	\$ 6,500	\$	\$	\$
Common stock	\$ 15	\$ 15	\$ 15	\$ 13	\$ 4
Number of shares	150,582,990	149,782,990	151,664,942	136,714,942	40,517,413
Dividends declared/ paid	\$ 31,682	\$ 32,117	\$ 32,619	\$ 24,521	\$ 9,747
Cash Flow Data					
Net cash provided by/ (used in) operating activities	\$ 92,945	\$ 119,636	\$ 75,985	\$ (29,571)	\$ 81,877
Net cash used in investing activities	\$ 43,505	\$ (104,510)	\$ (145,729)	\$ (293,740)	\$ (205,956)
Net cash (used in)/ provided by financing activities	\$ (141,963)	\$ (14,814)	\$ 41,402	\$ 363,300	\$ 125,625
Cash dividends declared per common share	\$ 0.20	\$ 0.20	\$ 0.20	\$ 0.20	\$ 0.20
Fleet Data:					
Vessels at end of period	36	39	37	33	19

(1) The total assets and long-term debt, including current portion, net of premium and deferred finance costs presented in this table have been revised to reflect the adoption of ASU 2015-03.

(2) The total assets and total stockholders' equity at December 31, 2014 have been revised to account for the investments in the common units of Navios Midstream under the equity method.

B. Capitalization and indebtedness

Not applicable.

C. Reasons for the offer and use of proceeds

Not applicable.

D. Risk factors

Table of Contents

RISK FACTORS

The following factors should be considered carefully in evaluating whether to purchase our securities. These factors should be considered in conjunction with any other information included or incorporated by reference herein, including in conjunction with forward-looking statements made herein.

Risk Factors Relating to Our Business

If we fail to manage our planned growth properly, we may not be able to expand our fleet successfully, which may adversely affect our overall financial position.

While we have no specific plans, we do intend to continue to expand our fleet in the future. Our growth will depend on:

locating and acquiring suitable vessels;

identifying reputable shipyards with available capacity and contracting with them for the construction of new vessels;

integrating any acquired vessels successfully with our existing operations;

enhancing our customer base;

managing our expansion;

obtaining required financing, which could include debt, equity or combinations thereof; and

Improve operating and financial system and controls.

Additionally, the marine transportation and logistics industries are capital intensive, traditionally using substantial amounts of indebtedness to finance vessel acquisitions, capital expenditures and working capital needs. If we finance the purchase of our vessels through the issuance of debt securities, it could result in:

default and foreclosure on our assets if our operating cash flow after a business combination or asset acquisition were insufficient to pay our debt obligations;

acceleration of our obligations to repay the indebtedness even if we have made all principal and interest payments when due if the debt security contained covenants that required the maintenance of certain

financial ratios or reserves and any such covenant were breached without a waiver or renegotiation of that covenant;

our immediate payment of all principal and accrued interest, if any, if the debt security was payable on demand; and

our inability to obtain additional financing, if necessary, if the debt security contained covenants restricting our ability to obtain additional financing while such security was outstanding.

In addition, our business plan and strategy is predicated on buying vessels in a market at what we believe is near the low, but recovering phase of the periodic cycle in what has typically been a cyclical industry. However, there is no assurance that charter rates and vessels asset values will not sink lower, or that there will be an upswing in shipping costs or vessel asset values in the near-term or at all, in which case our business plan and strategy may not succeed in the near-term or at all. Growing any business by acquisition presents numerous risks such as undisclosed liabilities and obligations, difficulty experienced in obtaining additional qualified personnel and managing relationships with customers and suppliers and integrating newly acquired operations into existing infrastructures. We may not be successful in growing and may incur significant expenses and losses.

We may face unexpected maintenance costs, which could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

If our vessels suffer damage or require upgrade work, they may need to be repaired at a drydocking facility. Our vessels may occasionally require upgrade work in order to maintain their classification society rating or as a

Table of Contents

result of changes in regulatory requirements. In addition, our vessels will be off-hire periodically for intermediate surveys and special surveys in connection with each vessel's certification by its classification society. The costs of drydock repairs are unpredictable and can be substantial and the loss of earnings while these vessels are being repaired and reconditioned, as well as the actual cost of these repairs, would decrease our earnings. Our insurance generally only covers a portion of drydocking expenses resulting from damage to a vessel and expenses related to maintenance of a vessel will not be reimbursed. In addition, space at drydocking facilities is sometimes limited and not all drydocking facilities are conveniently located. We may be unable to find space at a suitable drydocking facility on a timely basis or may be forced to move a damaged vessel to a drydocking facility that is not conveniently located to the vessel's position. The loss of earnings while any of our vessels are forced to wait for space or to relocate to drydocking facilities that are far away from the routes on which our vessels trade would further decrease our earnings.

We rely on our technical managers to provide essential services to our vessels and run the day-to-day operations of our vessels.

Pursuant to technical management agreements we are provided with services essential to the business of our vessels, including vessel maintenance, crewing, purchasing, shipyard supervision, insurance and assistance with vessel regulatory compliance, by our technical managers, including a subsidiary of Navios Holdings. Our operational success and ability to execute our strategy will depend significantly upon the satisfactory performance of the aforementioned services by the current technical manager. The failure of our technical managers to perform these services satisfactorily and a technical manager affiliated with the seller from the acquisition of seven VLCCs in September 2010 (the VLCC Acquisition) could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our vessels may be subject to unbudgeted periods of off-hire, which could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Under the terms of the charter agreements under which our vessels operate, or are expected to operate in the case of the newbuildings, when a vessel is off-hire, or not available for service or otherwise deficient in its condition or performance, the charterer generally is not required to pay the hire rate, and we will be responsible for all costs (including the cost of bunker fuel) unless the charterer is responsible for the circumstances giving rise to the lack of availability. A vessel generally will be deemed to be off-hire if there is an occurrence preventing the full working of the vessel due to, among other things:

operational deficiencies;

the removal of a vessel from the water for repairs, maintenance or inspection, which is referred to as drydocking;

delays due to accidents or deviations from course;

occurrence of hostilities in the vessel's flag state or in the event of piracy;

crewing strikes, labor boycotts, certain vessel detentions or similar problems;

our failure to maintain the vessel in compliance with its specifications, contractual standards and applicable country of registry and international regulations or to provide the required crew; or

a natural or man-made event of force majeure.

Risks Relating to the Shipping Industry and the Operation of our Vessels

The cyclical nature of the tanker industry may lead to volatility in charter rates and vessel values, which could adversely affect our future earnings.

Oil has been one of the world's primary energy sources for a number of decades. The global economic growth of previous years had a significant impact on the demand for oil and subsequently on the oil trade and the

Table of Contents

demand for shipping oil and oil products. However, the past several years were marked by a major economic slowdown and extreme volatility which has had, and continues to have, a significant impact on world trade, including the oil trade. Global economic conditions remain fragile with significant uncertainty with respect to recovery prospects, levels of recovery and long-term economic growth effects. In particular, the uncertainty surrounding the future of the Eurozone, the economic prospects of the United States and the future economic growth of China, Brazil, Russia, India and other emerging markets are all expected to affect demand for product and crude tankers going-forward. Demand for oil and refined petroleum products remains less than current supply as a result of the weak global economic environment and a general global trend towards energy efficient technologies, which in combination with the limited availability of trade credit and deteriorating international liquidity conditions, led to decreased demand for tanker vessels, creating downward pressure on charter rates. This economic downturn has also affected vessel values overall. Energy prices sharply declined from mid-2014 to mid-February 2016 primarily as a result of increased oil production worldwide. In response to this increased production, demand for tankers to move oil and refined petroleum products increased significantly and average spot and period charter rates for product and crude tankers rose to above historically average rates, but have since moderated. If oil demand grows in the future, it is expected to come primarily from emerging markets which have been historically volatile, such as China and India, and a slowdown in these countries' economies may severely affect global oil demand growth, and may result in protracted, reduced consumption of oil products and a decreased demand for our vessels and lower charter rates, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows, financial condition and ability to make cash distributions. Should the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) significantly reduce oil production or should there be significant declines in non-OPEC oil production, that may result in a protracted period of reduced oil shipments and a decreased demand for our vessels and lower charter rates, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows, financial condition and ability to make cash distributions.

Historically, the crude oil markets have been volatile as a result of the many conditions and events that can affect the price, demand, production and transport of oil, including competition from alternative energy sources. Decreased demand for oil transportation may have a material adverse effect on our revenues, cash flows and profitability. The factors affecting the supply and demand for tankers are outside of our control, and the nature, timing and degree of changes in industry conditions are unpredictable. The continuing global financial crisis has intensified this unpredictability.

The factors that influence demand for tanker capacity include:

demand for and supply of liquid cargoes, including petroleum and petroleum products;

developments in international trade;

waiting days in ports;

changes in oil production and refining capacity and regional availability of petroleum refining capacity;

environmental and other regulatory developments, including the adoption of any limits on the consumption of carbon-based fuels due to climate change agreements or protocols;

global and regional economic conditions;

the distance chemicals, petroleum and petroleum products are to be moved by sea;

changes in seaborne and other transportation patterns, including changes in distances over which cargo is transported due to geographic changes in where oil is produced, refined and used;

competition from alternative sources of energy;

armed conflicts and terrorist activities;

natural or man-made disasters that affect the ability of our vessels to use certain waterways;

Table of Contents

political developments; and

embargoes and strikes.

The factors that influence the supply of tanker capacity include:

the number of newbuilding deliveries;

the scrapping rate of older vessels;

port or canal congestion;

the number of vessels that are used for storage or as floating storage offloading service vessels;

the conversion of tankers to other uses, including conversion of vessels from transporting oil and oil products to carrying drybulk cargo and the reverse conversion;

availability of financing for new tankers;

the phasing out of single-hull tankers due to legislation and environmental concerns;

the price of steel;

the number of vessels that are out of service;

national or international regulations that may effectively cause reductions in the carrying capacity of vessels or early obsolescence of tonnage; and

environmental concerns and regulations, including ballast water management and low sulphur fuel consumption regulations.

Furthermore, the extension of refinery capacity in China, India and particularly the Middle East through 2018 is expected to exceed the immediate consumption in these areas, and an increase in exports of refined oil products is expected as a result. This coupled with announced refinery closures in Australia, Japan and Europe should increase trade in refined oil products.

Historically, the tanker markets have been volatile as a result of the many conditions and factors that can affect the price, supply and demand for tanker capacity. The recent global economic crisis may further reduce demand for transportation of oil over long distances and supply of tankers that carry oil, which may materially affect our future revenues, profitability and cash flows.

We believe that the current order book for tanker vessels represents a significant percentage of the existing fleet; however the percentage of the total tanker fleet on order as a percent of the total fleet declined from 18% at the end of 2011 to 12% at the beginning of March 2017. An over-supply of tanker capacity may result in a reduction of charter hire rates. If a reduction in charter rates occurs, we may only be able to charter our vessels at unprofitable rates or we may not be able to charter these vessels at all, which could lead to a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

Spot market rates for tanker vessels are highly volatile and may decrease in the future, which may materially adversely affect our earnings in the event that our vessels are chartered in the spot market.

We may deploy at least some of our product tankers, chemical tankers and VLCCs in the spot market directly or in pools. Although spot chartering is common in the product, chemical, tanker and VLCC sectors, product tankers, chemical tanker and VLCC charter hire rates are highly volatile and may fluctuate significantly based upon demand for seaborne transportation of crude oil and oil products and chemicals, as well as tanker supply. World oil demand is influenced by many factors, including international economic activity; geographic changes in oil production, processing, and consumption; oil price levels; inventory policies of the major oil and oil trading companies; and strategic inventory policies of countries such as the United States and China. The

Table of Contents

successful operation of our vessels in the spot charter market depends upon, among other things, obtaining profitable spot charters and minimizing, to the extent possible, time spent waiting for charters and time spent traveling unladen to pick up cargo. Furthermore, as charter rates for spot charters are fixed for a single voyage that may last up to several weeks, during periods in which spot charter rates are rising, we will generally experience delays in realizing the benefits from such increases. The spot market is highly volatile, and, in the past, there have been periods when spot rates have declined below the operating cost of vessels. Currently, spot charter hire rates are at or above operating costs for most vessel sizes but there is no assurance that the crude oil, product and chemical tanker charter market will rise over the next several months or will not decline further. A decrease in spot rates may decrease the revenues and cash flow we derive from vessels employed in pools or on index linked charters. Such volatility in pool or index linked charters may be mitigated by any minimum rate due to us that we negotiate with our charterers.

Additionally, if the spot market rates or short-term time charter rates become significantly lower than the time charter equivalent rates that some of our charterers are obligated to pay us under our existing charters, the charterers may have incentive to default under that charter or attempt to renegotiate the charter. If our charterers fail to pay their obligations, we would have to attempt to re-charter our vessels at lower charter rates, which would affect our ability to comply with our loan covenants and operate our vessels profitably. If we are not able to comply with our loan covenants and our lenders choose to accelerate our indebtedness and foreclose their liens, we could be required to sell vessels in our fleet and our ability to continue to conduct our business would be impaired.

Certain of our VLCC vessels are contractually committed to time charters or operation in pools, with the remaining terms of these charters expiring during the period from and including 2017 through 2018. We are not permitted to unilaterally terminate the charter agreements of the VLCC vessels due to upswings in the tanker industry cycle, when spot market voyages might be more profitable. We may also decide to sell a vessel in the future. In such a case, should we sell a vessel that is committed to a long-term charter, we may not be able to realize the full charter free fair market value of the vessel during a period when spot market charters are more profitable than the charter agreement under which the vessel operates. We may re-charter the VLCC vessels on long-term charters or charter them in the spot market or place them in pools upon expiration or termination of the vessels' current charters. Furthermore, in connection with the initial public offering (IPO) of Navios Midstream, we have provided backstop commitments for a two-year period as of the redelivery of each of the Nave Celeste, the Shinyo Ocean and the Shinyo Kannika from their original charters, at a net rate of \$35,000, \$38,400 and \$38,025, respectively. Navios Midstream has currently entered into new charter contracts for the above vessels with third parties upon their redelivery in first quarter of 2017. Those contracts provide for index linked charter rates or pool earnings, as the case may be. If the actual rates achieved are below the agreed backstop rates our results of operations and operating cash flows may suffer.

An oversupply of tanker vessel capacity may lead to reductions in charter hire rates, vessel values and profitability.

The market supply of tankers is affected by a number of factors, such as demand for energy resources and primarily oil and petroleum products, level of charter hire rates, asset and newbuilding prices, availability of financing as well as overall economic growth in parts of the world economy, including Asia, and has been increasing as a result of the delivery of substantial newbuilding orders over the last few years. We believe that the current order book for tanker vessels represents a significant percentage of the existing fleet; however the percentage of the total tanker fleet on order as a percent of the total fleet declined from 48% in 2008 to 12% as of the beginning of March 2017. If the capacity of new ships delivered exceeds the capacity of tankers being scrapped and lost, tanker capacity will increase. If the supply of tanker capacity increases and if the demand for tanker capacity does not increase correspondingly, charter rates and vessel values could materially decline. If such a reduction occurs, we may only be able to recharter our vessels at reduced or unprofitable rates as their current charters expire, or we may not be able to charter these vessels at all, which could lead to a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

Table of Contents***Increasing self-sufficiency in energy by the United States could lead to a decrease in imports of oil to that country, which to date has been one of the largest importers of oil worldwide.***

The United States is expected to be the largest contributor to non-OPEC supply growth in the medium term, according to the 2017 annual Market Report Series: Oil by the International Energy Agency (IEA). Increased drilling, helped by cost deflation and efficiency improvements, sees the US output expanding by nearly 1.6 million barrels per day (MBPD) through 2022, even assuming stable crude oil prices of around USD60/bbl over the period. In its 2016 Medium Term Oil Market Report, the IEA said that the steep rise in shale oil and gas production is expected to push the country toward self-sufficiency in energy. In recent years the share of total U.S. consumption met by total liquid fuel net imports, including both crude oil and products, has been decreasing since peaking at over 60% in 2005. The US Energy Information Administration (EIA) statistics through 2016 show that US crude oil imports rose 7% to an average of 7.9 million barrels per day (MBPD) in 2016 2015 period, but the average imports are still below the 2005 peak of 10.1 MBPD. EIA statistics note that US crude oil exports rose 12% to 520,000 barrels per day in 2016 but remained a very significant increase over the most recent low of 9,100 barrels per day exported in 2002. A slowdown in oil imports to or exports from the United States, one of the most important oil trading nations worldwide, may result in decreased demand for our vessels and lower charter rates, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows, financial condition and ability to make cash distributions.

A number of third party owners have ordered so-called modern vessels, which offer substantial bunker savings as compared to older vessels. Increased demand for and supply of modern vessels could reduce demand for certain of our existing older vessels and expose us to lower vessel utilization and/or decreased charter rates.

The product tanker newbuilding order book as of March 2017 is estimated at 231 vessels or 9% of the current product tanker fleet according to Clarksons Research Services Limited. The majority of these orders are based on vessel improvements such as improved propulsion system or new point systems, which purport to offer material bunker savings compared to older vessels, which include certain of our vessels. Such savings could result in a substantial reduction of bunker cost for charterers compared to such vessels of ours. As the supply of such modern vessel increases and if charterers prefer such vessels over our vessels, this may reduce demand for our existing older vessels, impair our ability to recharter such vessels at competitive rates and have a material adverse effect on our cash flows and operations.

Charter rates in the crude oil tankers sector in which we operate and in the product and chemical tanker sectors of the seaborne transportation industry have significantly declined from historically high levels in 2008 and may remain depressed or decline further in the future, which may adversely affect our earnings.

Charter rates in the crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors have significantly declined from historically high levels in 2008 and may remain depressed or decline further. For example, the Baltic Dirty Tanker Index declined from a high of 2,347 in July 2008 to 453 in mid-April 2009, which represents a decline of approximately 81%. Since January 2015, it has traded between a low of 496 and a high of 1,088; as of March 13, 2017, it stood at 850. The Baltic Clean Tanker Index fell from 1,509 in the early summer of 2008 to 345 in April 2009, or an approximate 77% decline. It has traded between a low of 346 and a high of 867 since January 2015 and stood at 646 as of March 13, 2017. Of note is that Chinese imports of crude oil have steadily increased from three million barrels per day in 2008 to an all-time record of about 8.6 million barrels per day in December 2016 and the U.S. has steadily increased its total petroleum product exports by almost 400% to about 5.0 million barrels per day in December 2016 from one million barrels per day in January 2006. If the tanker sector of the seaborne transportation industry, which has been highly cyclical, is depressed in the future at a time when we may want to sell a vessel, our earnings and available cash flow may be adversely affected. We cannot assure you that we will be able to successfully charter our vessels in the future at rates sufficient to allow us to operate our business profitably or to meet our obligations, including payment of debt

service to our lenders. Our ability to renew the charters on vessels that we may acquire in the future, the charter rates payable under any replacement charters and vessel values will depend upon, among other things, economic conditions in the sector in which our

Table of Contents

vessels operate at that time, changes in the supply and demand for vessel capacity and changes in the supply and demand for the seaborne transportation of energy resources and commodities.

Any decrease in shipments of crude oil from the Arabian Gulf or West Africa may adversely affect our financial performance.

The demand for VLCC oil tankers derives primarily from demand for Arabian Gulf and West African crude oil, which, in turn, primarily depends on the economies of the world's industrial countries and competition from alternative energy sources. A wide range of economic, social and other factors can significantly affect the strength of the world's industrial economies and their demand for Arabian Gulf and West African crude oil.

Among the factors that could lead to a decrease in demand for exported Arabian Gulf and West African crude oil are:

increased use of existing and future crude oil pipelines in the Arabian Gulf or West African regions;

increased demand for crude oil in the Arabian Gulf or West African regions;

a decision by OPEC or other petroleum exporters to increase their crude oil prices or to further decrease or limit their crude oil production;

any increase in refining of crude into petroleum products for domestic consumption or export;

armed conflict or acts of piracy in the Arabian Gulf or West Africa and political or other factors;

increased oil production in other regions, such as the United States, Russia and Latin America; and

the development and the relative costs of nuclear power, natural gas, coal and other alternative sources of energy.

Any significant decrease in shipments of crude oil from the Arabian Gulf or West Africa may materially adversely affect our financial performance.

Delays in deliveries of any newbuilding vessels we may contract to acquire or order in the future, or our decision to cancel, or our inability to otherwise complete the acquisitions of any newbuildings, could harm our operating results and lead to the termination of any related charters.

Any newbuildings we may contract to acquire or order in the future could be delayed, not completed or cancelled, which would delay or eliminate our expected receipt of revenues under any charters for such vessels. The shipbuilder or third party seller could fail to deliver the newbuilding vessel or any other vessels we acquire or order, or we could cancel a purchase or a newbuilding contract because the shipbuilder has not met its obligations, including its obligation to maintain agreed refund guarantees in place for our benefit. For prolonged delays, the customer may

terminate the time charter.

Our receipt of newbuildings could be delayed, canceled, or otherwise not completed because of:

quality or engineering problems or failure to deliver the vessel in accordance with the vessel specifications;

changes in governmental regulations or maritime self-regulatory organization standards;

work stoppages or other labor disturbances at the shipyard;

bankruptcy or other financial or liquidity problems of the shipbuilder;

a backlog of orders at the shipyard;

political or economic disturbances in the country or region where the vessel is being built;

Table of Contents

weather interference or a catastrophic event, such as a major earthquake or fire;

the shipbuilder failing to deliver the vessel in accordance with our vessel specifications;

our requests for changes to the original vessel specifications;

shortages of or delays in the receipt of necessary construction materials, such as steel; or

our inability to finance the purchase of the vessel.

If delivery of any newbuild vessel acquired, or any vessel we contract to acquire in the future is materially delayed, it could materially adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition.

Fifteen of the vessels in our fleet are second-hand vessels, and we may acquire more second-hand vessels in the future. The acquisition and operation of such vessels may result in increased operating costs and vessel off-hire, which could materially adversely affect our earnings.

As of April 4, 2017, the vessels in our fleet had an average age of approximately 6.2 years and most tanker vessels have an expected life of approximately 25 years. Two of our LR1 product tanker vessels, five of our MR2 product tanker vessels and our eight VLCC vessels are second-hand vessels, and we may acquire more second-hand vessels in the future. Our inspection of second-hand vessels prior to purchase does not provide us with the same knowledge about their condition and cost of any required or anticipated repairs that we would have had if these vessels had been built for and operated exclusively by us. Generally, we will not receive the benefit of warranties on second-hand vessels.

In general, the costs to maintain a vessel in good operating condition increase with the age of the vessel. Due to improvements in engine technology, older vessels are typically less fuel efficient and more costly to maintain than more recently constructed vessels. Cargo insurance rates increase with the age of a vessel, making older vessels less desirable to charterers.

Governmental regulations, safety or other equipment standards related to the age of vessels may require expenditures for alterations or the addition of new equipment to our vessels and may restrict the type of activities in which the vessels may engage or the geographic regions in which we may operate. We cannot predict what alterations or modifications our vessels may be required to undergo in the future. As our vessels age, market conditions may not justify those expenditures or enable us to operate our vessels profitably during the remainder of their useful lives.

Although we have considered the age and condition of the vessels in budgeting for operating, insurance and maintenance costs, we may encounter higher operating and maintenance costs due to the age and condition of these vessels, or any additional vessels we acquire in the future. The age of some of our VLCC vessels may result in higher operating costs and increased vessel off-hire periods relative to our competitors that operate newer fleets, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

Our growth depends on continued growth in demand for crude oil, refined petroleum products (clean and dirty) and bulk liquid chemicals and the continued demand for seaborne transportation of such cargoes.

Our growth strategy focuses on expansion in the crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors. Accordingly, our growth depends on continued growth in world and regional demand for crude oil, refined petroleum (clean and dirty) products and bulk liquid chemicals and the transportation of such cargoes by sea, which could be negatively affected by a number of factors, including:

the economic and financial developments globally, including actual and projected global economic growth;

fluctuations in the actual or projected price of crude oil, refined petroleum products or bulk liquid chemicals;

Table of Contents

refining capacity and its geographical location;

increases in the production of oil in areas linked by pipelines to consuming areas, the extension of existing, or the development of new, pipeline systems in markets we may serve, or the conversion of existing non-oil pipelines to oil pipelines in those markets;

decreases in the consumption of oil due to increases in its price relative to other energy sources, other factors making consumption of oil less attractive or energy conservation measures or pollution reduction measures or those intended to reduce global warming;

availability of new, alternative energy sources; and

negative or deteriorating global or regional economic or political conditions, particularly in oil-consuming regions, which could reduce energy consumption or its growth.

The refining and chemical industries may respond to the economic downturn and demand weakness by reducing operating rates, partially or completely closing refineries and by reducing or cancelling certain investment expansion plans, including plans for additional refining capacity, in the case of the refining industry. Continued reduced demand for refined petroleum products and bulk liquid chemicals and the shipping of such cargoes or the increased availability of pipelines used to transport refined petroleum products, and bulk liquid chemicals would have a material adverse effect on our future growth and could harm our business, results of operations and financial condition.

Our growth depends on our ability to obtain customers, for which we face substantial competition. In the highly competitive tanker industry, we may not be able to compete for charters with new entrants or established companies with greater resources, which may adversely affect our results of operations.

We employ our tanker vessels in the highly competitive crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors of the shipping industry that is capital intensive and fragmented. Competition arises primarily from other vessel owners, including major oil companies and traders as well as independent tanker companies, some of whom have substantially greater resources and experience than us. Competition for the chartering of tankers can be intense and depends on price, location, size, age, condition and the acceptability of the vessel and its managers to the charterers. Such competition has been enhanced as a result of the downturn in the shipping industry, which has resulted in an excess supply of vessels and reduced charter rates.

Medium to long-term time charters and bareboat charters have the potential to provide income at pre-determined rates over more extended periods of time. However, the process for obtaining longer term time charters and bareboat charters is highly competitive and generally involves a lengthy, intensive and continuous screening and vetting process and the submission of competitive bids that often extends for several months. In addition to the quality, age and suitability of the vessel, longer term shipping contracts tend to be awarded based upon a variety of other factors relating to the vessel operator. Competition for the transportation of crude oil, refined petroleum products and bulk liquid chemicals can be intense and depends on price, location, size, age, condition and acceptability of the vessel and our managers to the charterers.

In addition to having to meet the stringent requirements set out by charterers, it is likely that we will also face substantial competition from a number of competitors who may have greater financial resources, stronger reputations

or experience than we do when we try to re-charter our vessels. It is also likely that we will face increased numbers of competitors entering in the crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors, including in the ice class sector. Increased competition may cause greater price competition, especially for medium- to long-term charters. Due in part to the highly fragmented markets, competitors with greater resources could operate larger fleets through consolidations or acquisitions that may be able to offer better prices and fleets than ours.

As a result of these factors, we may be unable to obtain customers for medium- to long-term time charters or bareboat charters on a profitable basis, if at all. Even if we are successful in employing our vessels under longer

Table of Contents

term time charters or bareboat charters, our vessels will not be available for trading in the spot market during an upturn in the crude oil, product and chemical tanker market cycles, when spot trading may be more profitable. If we cannot successfully employ our vessels in profitable time charters our results of operations and operating cash flow could be adversely affected.

The market values of tanker vessels have declined from historically high levels and may fluctuate significantly, which could cause us to breach covenants in our credit facilities, result in the foreclosure of certain of our vessels, limit the amount of funds that we can borrow and adversely affect our ability to purchase new vessels and our operating results. Depressed vessel values could also cause us to incur impairment charges.

Due to the decline in world trade and tanker charter rates, the market values of our vessels and any contracted newbuildings and of tankers generally, are currently significantly lower than they would have been prior to the downturn in the second half of 2008. Within the past year smaller product tanker yard resale prices have decreased slowly to prices lower than the average 2015 price. Vessel values may remain at current low, or lower, levels for a prolonged period of time and can fluctuate substantially over time due to a number of different factors, including:

prevailing level of charter rates;

general economic and market conditions affecting the shipping industry;

competition from other shipping companies;

types and sizes of vessels;

where the ship was built and as-built specifications;

lifetime maintenance record;

supply and demand for vessels;

other modes of transportation;

cost of newbuildings;

governmental or other regulations, including environmental regulations; and

technological advances; and

ability of buyers to access financing and capital

If the market value of our vessels decreases, we may breach some of the covenants contained in the financing agreements relating to our indebtedness at the time. Our credit facilities contain covenants including maximum total net liabilities over total net assets (effective in general after delivery of the vessels), minimum net worth and value to loan ratio covenants of 137% or lower, applicable after delivery of the vessels. If we breach any such covenants in the future and we are unable to remedy the relevant breach, our lenders could accelerate or require us to prepay a portion of our debt and foreclose on our vessels. In addition, if the book value of a vessel is impaired due to unfavorable market conditions, we would incur a loss that could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In addition, as vessels grow older, they generally decline in value. We will review our vessels for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of the assets may not be recoverable.

We review certain indicators of potential impairment, such as undiscounted projected operating cash flows expected from the future operation of the vessels, which can be volatile for vessels employed on short-term charters or in the spot market. Any impairment charges incurred as a result of declines in charter rates would

Table of Contents

negatively affect our financial condition and results of operations. In addition, if we sell any vessel at a time when vessel prices have fallen and before we have recorded an impairment adjustment to our financial statements, the sale may be at less than the vessel's carrying amount on our financial statements, resulting in a loss and a reduction in earnings. Conversely, if vessel values are elevated at a time when we wish to acquire additional vessels, the cost of acquisition may increase and this could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Future increases in vessel operating expenses, including rising fuel prices, could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Under our time charter agreements, the charterer is responsible for substantially all of the voyage expenses, including port and canal charges and fuel costs, and we are generally responsible for vessel operating expenses. Vessel operating expenses are the costs of operating a vessel, primarily consisting of crew wages and associated costs, insurance premiums, management fees, lubricants and spare parts and repair and maintenance costs. In particular, the cost of fuel is a significant factor in negotiating charter rates. As a result, an increase in the price of fuel beyond our expectations may adversely affect our profitability. The price and supply of fuel is unpredictable and fluctuates based on events outside our control, including geopolitical developments, supply and demand for oil, actions by members of OPEC and other oil and gas producers, war, terrorism and unrest in oil producing countries and regions, regional production patterns and environmental concerns and regulations.

We have fixed the fees for ship management services of our owned fleet, provided by a subsidiary of Navios Holdings, through May 2018 at \$6,350 per MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel, \$7,150 per LR1 product tanker vessel and \$9,500 per VLCC vessel. Drydocking expenses under our Management Agreement are reimbursed at cost for all vessels.

We generally receive a daily rate for the use of our vessels, which is fixed through the term of the applicable charter agreement. Our charter agreements do not provide for any increase in the daily hire rate in the event that vessel-operating expenses increase during the term of the charter agreement. Increases in the fees for shipmanagement services of our vessels over the term of a charter agreement will effectively reduce our operating income and, if such increases in operating expenses are significant, adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

The crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors are subject to seasonal fluctuations in demand and, therefore, may cause volatility in our operating results.

The crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors of the shipping industry have historically exhibited seasonal variations in demand and, as a result, in charter hire rates. This seasonality may result in quarter-to-quarter volatility in our operating results. The product and chemical tanker markets are typically stronger in the fall and winter months in anticipation of increased consumption of oil and natural gas in the northern hemisphere. In addition, unpredictable weather patterns in these months tend to disrupt vessel scheduling and supplies of certain commodities. As a result, revenues are typically weaker during the fiscal quarters ended June 30 and September 30, and, conversely, typically stronger in fiscal quarters ended December 31 and March 31. Our operating results, therefore, may be subject to seasonal fluctuations.

A decrease in the level of China's imports of crude oil or petroleum products or a decrease in oil trade globally could have a material adverse impact on our charterers' business and, in turn, could cause a material adverse impact on our results of operations, financial condition and cash flows.

China imports significant quantities of crude oil and trades significant quantities of petroleum products. For example in 2016, China imported about 354 million tons of crude oil by sea compared with crude oil imports to the United States of about 252 million tons. Our tanker vessels are deployed by our charterers on routes involving

Table of Contents

crude oil and petroleum product trades in and out of emerging markets, and our charterers' oil shipping and business revenue may be derived from the shipment of goods within and to the Asia Pacific region from various overseas export markets. Any reduction in or hindrance to China-based importers could have a material adverse effect on the growth rate of China's imports and on our charterers' business. For instance, the government of China has implemented economic policies aimed at reducing pollution and increasing the strategic stock piling of crude oil. Should these policies change, this may have the effect of reducing crude oil imports or petroleum product exports and may, in turn, result in a decrease in demand for oil shipping. Additionally, though in China there is an increasing level of autonomy and a gradual shift in emphasis to a market economy and enterprise reform, many of the reforms, particularly some limited price reforms that result in the prices for certain commodities being principally determined by market forces, are unprecedented or experimental and may be subject to revision, change or abolition. The level of imports to and exports from China could be adversely affected by changes to these economic reforms by the Chinese government, as well as by changes in political, economic and social conditions or other relevant policies of the Chinese government. Although China exerts a large effect on the seaborne market for crude oil and petroleum products, any decreases in trade in those commodities by any of the countries in other major trading regions in North America, Europe and Asia could depress time charter rates which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and our ability to pay cash distributions to our shareholders.

Our operations expose us to the risk that increased trade protectionism from China, the United States or other nations will adversely affect our business. If the global recovery is undermined by downside risks and the recent economic downturn returns, governments may turn to trade barriers to protect their domestic industries against foreign imports, thereby depressing the demand for shipping. Specifically, increasing trade protectionism in the markets that our charterers serve may cause (i) a decrease in cargoes available to our charterers in favor of Chinese charterers and Chinese owned ships and (ii) an increase in the risks associated with importing goods to China. Any increased trade barriers or restrictions on trade, especially trade with China, would have an adverse impact on our charterers' business, operating results and financial condition and could thereby affect their ability to make timely charter hire payments to us and to renew and increase the number of their time charters with us. This could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and our ability to pay cash distributions to our unitholders.

The employment of our vessels could be adversely affected by an inability to clear the oil majors' risk assessment process, and we could be in breach of our charter agreements with all of our tanker vessels.

The shipping industry, and especially the shipment of crude oil, refined petroleum products (clean and dirty) and bulk liquid chemicals, has been, and will remain, heavily regulated. The so-called "oil majors," such as Exxon Mobil, BP p.l.c., Royal Dutch Shell plc., Chevron, ConocoPhillips and Total S.A., together with a number of commodities traders, represent a significant percentage of the production, trading and shipping logistics (terminals) of crude oil and refined products worldwide. Concerns for the environment have led the oil majors to develop and implement a strict ongoing due diligence process when selecting their commercial partners. This vetting process has evolved into a sophisticated and comprehensive risk assessment of both the vessel operator and the vessel, including physical ship inspections, completion of vessel inspection questionnaires performed by accredited inspectors and the production of comprehensive risk assessment reports. In the case of term charter relationships, additional factors are considered when awarding such contracts, including:

office assessments and audits of the vessel operator;

the operator's environmental, health and safety record;

compliance with the standards of the International Maritime Organization (the IMO), a United Nations agency that issues international trade standards for shipping;

compliance with oil majors' codes of conduct, policies and guidelines, including transparency, anti-bribery and ethical conduct requirements and relationships with third parties;

compliance with heightened industry standards that have been set by several oil companies;

Table of Contents

shipping industry relationships, reputation for customer service, technical and operating expertise;

shipping experience and quality of ship operations, including cost-effectiveness;

quality, experience and technical capability of crews;

the ability to finance vessels at competitive rates and overall financial stability;

relationships with shipyards and the ability to obtain suitable berths;

construction management experience, including the ability to procure on-time delivery of new vessels according to customer specifications;

willingness to accept operational risks pursuant to the charter, such as allowing termination of the charter for force majeure events; and

competitiveness of the bid in terms of overall price.

Under the terms of our charter agreements, our charterers require that these vessels and the technical manager are vetted and approved to transport oil products by multiple oil majors. Our failure to maintain any of our vessels to the standards required by the oil majors could put us in breach of the applicable charter agreement and lead to termination of such agreement, and could give rise to impairment in the value of our vessels.

Should we not be able to successfully clear the oil majors' risk assessment processes on an ongoing basis, the future employment of our vessels, as well as our ability to obtain charters, whether medium- or long-term, could be adversely affected. Such a situation may lead to the oil majors' terminating existing charters and refusing to use our vessels in the future, which would adversely affect our results of operations and cash flows.

We depend on significant customers for part of our revenue. Charterers may terminate or default on their obligations to us, which could materially adversely affect our results of operations and cash flow, and breaches of the charters may be difficult to enforce.

We derive a significant part of our revenue from a number of charterers. For the year ended December 31, 2016, Navig8 Chemicals Shipping and Trading Co (Navig8), Shell Tankers Singapore Private LTD (Shell) and Mansel LTD (Mansel). accounted for 33.0%, 20.0% and 14.7%, respectively, of our total revenue. The loss of these or any of our customers, a customer's failure to make payments or perform under any of the applicable charters, a customer's termination of any of the applicable charters, the loss or damage beyond repair to any of our vessels, our failure to deliver the vessel within a fixed period of time or a decline in payments under the charters could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition. The charter agreements for our vessels are generally governed by English law and provide for dispute resolution in English courts or London-based arbitral proceedings. There can be no assurance that we would be able to enforce any judgments against these charterers in jurisdictions where they are based or have their primary assets and operations. Even after a charter contract is entered,

charterers may terminate charters early under certain circumstances. The events or occurrences that will cause a charter to terminate or give the charterer the option to terminate the charter generally include a total or constructive total loss of the related vessel, the requisition for hire of the related vessel, the vessel becoming subject to seizure for more than a specified number of days or the failure of the related vessel to meet specified performance criteria.

In addition, the ability of a charterer to perform its obligations under a charter will depend on a number of factors that are beyond our control. These factors may include general economic conditions, the condition of the crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors of the shipping industry, the charter rates received for specific types of vessels and various operating expenses. The costs and delays associated with the default by a charterer of a vessel may be considerable and may adversely affect our business, results of operations, cash flows and financial condition.

We cannot predict whether our charterers will, upon the expiration of their charters, re-charter our vessels on favorable terms or at all. If our charterers decide not to re-charter our vessels, we may not be able to re-charter

Table of Contents

them on terms similar to our current charters or at all. Even if we manage to successfully charter our vessels in the future, our charterers may go bankrupt or fail to perform their obligations under the charter agreements, they may delay payments or suspend payments altogether, they may terminate the charter agreements prior to the agreed-upon expiration date or they may attempt to renegotiate the terms of the charters. In the future, we may also employ our vessels on the spot charter market, which is subject to greater rate fluctuation than the time charter market. If we receive lower charter rates under replacement charters or are unable to re-charter all of our vessels, our results of operations and financial condition could be materially adversely affected.

The risks and costs associated with vessels increase as the vessels age.

As of April 4, 2017, the vessels in our fleet had an average age of approximately 6.2 years and most tanker vessels have an expected life of approximately 25 years. We may acquire older vessels in the future. Older vessels are typically more costly to maintain than more recently constructed vessels due to improvements in engine technology. Cargo insurance rates also increase with the age of a vessel, making older vessels less desirable to charterers as well. Governmental regulations, safety or other equipment standards related to the age of the vessels may require expenditures for alterations or the addition of new equipment, to our vessels and may restrict the type of activities in which these vessels may engage. We cannot assure you that as our vessels age, market conditions will justify those expenditures or enable us to operate our vessels profitably during the remainder of their useful lives. If we sell vessels, we may have to sell them at a loss, and if charterers no longer charter out vessels due to their age, it could materially adversely affect our earnings.

If we experienced a catastrophic loss and our insurance is not adequate to cover such loss, it could lower our profitability and be detrimental to operations.

The ownership and operation of vessels in international trade is affected by a number of inherent risks, including mechanical failure, personal injury, vessel and cargo loss or damage, business interruption due to political conditions in foreign countries, hostilities, piracy, terrorism, labor strikes and/or boycotts, adverse weather conditions and catastrophic marine disaster, including environmental accidents and collisions. All of these risks could result in liability, loss of revenues, increased costs and loss of reputation. We maintain hull and machinery insurance, protection and indemnity insurance, which include environmental damage and pollution and war risk insurance, consistent with industry standards, against these risks on our vessels and other business assets. However, we cannot assure you that we will be able to insure against all risks adequately, that any particular claim will be paid out of our insurance, or that we will be able to procure adequate insurance coverage at commercially reasonable rates in the future. Our insurers also require us to pay certain deductible amounts, before they will pay claims, and insurance policies may contain limitations and exclusions, which, although we believe will be standard for the shipping industry, may nevertheless increase our costs and lower our profitability. Additionally, any increase in environmental and other regulations may also result in increased costs for, or the lack of availability of, insurance against the risks of environmental damage, pollution and other claims. Our inability to obtain insurance sufficient to cover potential claims or the failure of insurers to pay any significant claims could lower our profitability and be detrimental to our operations.

Furthermore, even if insurance coverage is adequate to cover our losses, we may not be able to timely obtain a replacement ship in the event of a loss. We may also be subject to calls, or premiums, in amounts based not only on our own claim records but also the claim records of all other members of the protection and indemnity associations through which we receive indemnity insurance coverage for tort liability. In addition, our protection and indemnity associations may not have enough resources to cover claims made against them. Our payment of these calls could result in significant expenses to us, which could reduce our cash flows and place strains on our liquidity and capital resources.

Table of Contents

We are subject to various laws, regulations and conventions, including environmental and safety laws that could require significant expenditures both to maintain compliance with such laws and to pay for any uninsured environmental liabilities including any resulting from a spill or other environmental incident.

The shipping business and vessel operation are materially affected by government regulation in the form of international conventions, national, state and local laws, and regulations in force in the jurisdictions in which vessels operate, as well as in the country or countries of their registration. Governmental regulations, safety or other equipment standards, as well as compliance with standards imposed by maritime self-regulatory organizations and customer requirements or competition, may require us to make capital and other expenditures. Because such conventions, laws and regulations are often revised, we cannot predict the ultimate cost of complying with such conventions, laws and regulations, or the impact thereof on the fair market price or useful life of our vessels. In order to satisfy any such requirements, we may be required to take any of our vessels out of service for extended periods of time, with corresponding losses of revenues. In the future, market conditions may not justify these expenditures or enable us to operate our vessels, particularly older vessels, profitably during the remainder of their economic lives. This could lead to significant asset write downs. In addition, violations of environmental and safety regulations can result in substantial penalties and, in certain instances, seizure or detention of our vessels.

Additional conventions, laws and regulations may be adopted that could limit our ability to do business, require capital expenditures or otherwise increase our cost of doing business, which may materially adversely affect our operations, as well as the shipping industry generally. For example, in various jurisdictions, legislation has been enacted, or is under consideration, that would impose more stringent requirements on air pollution and effluent discharges from our vessels. For example, the IMO periodically proposes and adopts amendments to revise the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), such as the revision to Annex VI which came into force on July 1, 2010. The revised Annex VI implements a phased reduction of the sulfur content of fuel and allows for stricter sulfur limits in designated emission control areas (ECAs). Thus far, ECAs have been formally adopted for the Baltic Sea area (limits SOx emissions only); the North Sea area including the English Channel (limiting SOx emissions only) and the North American ECA (which came into effect on August 1, 2012 limiting SOx, NOx and particulate matter emissions). In October 2016, the IMO approved the designation of the North Sea and the Baltic Sea as ECAs for NOx under Annex VI, which is scheduled for adoption in 2017 and would take effect in January 2021. The United States Caribbean Sea ECA entered into force on January 1, 2013 and has been effective since January 1, 2014, limiting SOx, NOx and particulate matter emissions. In January 2015, the limit for fuel oil sulfur levels fell to 0.10% m/m in ECAs established to limit SOx and particulate matter emissions.

After considering the issue for many years, the IMO announced on October 27, 2016 that it was proceeding with a requirement for 0.5% m/m sulfur content in marine fuel (down from current levels of 3.5%) outside the ECAs starting on January 1, 2020. Under Annex VI, the 2020 date was subject to review as to the availability of the required fuel oil. Annex VI required the fuel availability review to be completed by 2018 but was ultimately completed in 2016. Therefore, by 2020, ships will be required to remove sulfur from emissions through the use of emission control equipment, or purchase marine fuel with 0.5% sulfur content, which may see increased demand and higher prices due to supply constraints. Installing pollution control equipment or using lower sulfur fuel could result in significantly increased costs to our company. Similarly, MARPOL Annex VI requires Tier III standards for NOx emissions to be applied to ships constructed and engines installed in ships operating in NOx ECAs from January 1, 2016.

California has adopted more stringent low sulfur fuel requirements within California-regulated waters. In addition, the IMO, the U.S. and states within the U.S. have proposed or implemented requirements relating to the management of ballast water to prevent the harmful effects of foreign invasive species.

In February 2004, the IMO adopted the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (the BWM Convention). The BWM Convention's implementing regulations call

Table of Contents

for a phased introduction of mandatory ballast water exchange requirements, to be replaced in time with mandatory concentration limits, as well as other obligations including recordkeeping requirements and implementation of a Ballast Water and Sediments Management Plan. The BWM Convention stipulates that it will enter into force twelve months after it has been adopted by at least 30 states, the combined merchant fleets of which represent at least 35% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant shipping. With Finland's accession to the agreement on September 8, 2016, the 35% threshold was reached, and the BWM convention will enter into force on September 8, 2017. Thereafter, on October 19, 2016, Panama also acceded to the BWM convention, adding its 18.02% of world gross tonnage. As of March 14, 2017, the BWM Convention had 54 contracting states for 53.41% of world gross tonnage. The BWM Convention requires ships to manage ballast water in a manner that removes, renders harmless or avoids the uptake or discharge of aquatic organisms and pathogens within ballast water and sediment. Recently updated Ballast Water and Sediment Management Plan guidance includes more robust testing and performance specifications. The entry of the BWM Convention and revised guidance will likely result in additional compliance costs.

The operation of vessels is also affected by the requirements set forth in the International Safety Management Code (the ISM Code). The ISM Code requires ship owners and bareboat charterers to develop and maintain an extensive Safety Management System that includes the adoption of a safety and environmental protection policy setting forth instructions and procedures for safe vessel operation and describing procedures for dealing with emergencies. Further to this, the IMO has introduced the first ever mandatory measures for an international greenhouse gas reduction regime for a global industry sector. These energy efficiency measures took effect on January 1, 2013 and apply to all ships of 400 gross tonnage and above. They include the development of a ship energy efficiency management plan (SEEMP) which is akin to a safety management plan, with which the industry will have to comply. The failure of a ship owner or bareboat charterer to comply with the ISM Code and IMO measures may subject such party to increased liability, may decrease available insurance coverage for the affected vessels, and may result in a denial of access to, or detention in, certain ports.

We operate a fleet of crude, product and chemical tankers that are subject to national and international laws governing pollution from such vessels. Several international conventions impose and limit pollution liability from vessels. An owner of a tanker vessel carrying a cargo of persistent oil as defined by the International Convention for Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage (the CLC) is subject under the convention to strict liability for any pollution damage caused in a contracting state by an escape or discharge from cargo or bunker tanks. This liability is subject to a financial limit calculated by reference to the tonnage of the ship, and the right to limit liability may be lost if the spill is caused by the ship owner's intentional or reckless conduct. Liability may also be incurred under the CLC for a bunker spill from the vessel even when she is not carrying such cargo, but is in ballast.

When a tanker is carrying clean oil products that do not constitute persistent oil that would be covered under the CLC, liability for any pollution damage will generally fall outside the CLC and will depend on other international conventions or domestic laws in the jurisdiction where the spillage occurs. The same principle applies to any pollution from the vessel in a jurisdiction which is not a party to the CLC. The CLC applies in over 100 jurisdictions around the world, but it does not apply in the United States, where the corresponding liability laws such as the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (the OPA) discussed below, are particularly stringent. For vessel operations not covered by the CLC, including those operated under our fleet, at present, international liability for oil pollution is governed by the International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage (the Bunker Convention). In 2001, the IMO adopted the Bunker Convention, which imposes strict liability on ship owners for pollution damage and response costs incurred in contracting states caused by discharges, or threatened discharges, of bunker oil from all classes of ships not covered by the CLC. The Bunker Convention also requires registered owners of ships over a certain size to maintain insurance to cover their liability for pollution damage in an amount equal to the limits of liability under the applicable national or international limitation regime, including liability limits calculated in accordance with the Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims 1976, as amended (the 1976 Convention), discussed in

more detail in the following paragraph. The Bunker Convention became effective in contracting states on November 21, 2008 and, as of March 14, 2017,

Table of Contents

had 83 contracting states. In non-contracting states, liability for such bunker oil pollution typically is determined by the national or other domestic laws in the jurisdiction where the spillage occurs.

The CLC and Bunker Convention also provide vessel owners a right to limit their liability, depending on the applicable national or international regime. The CLC includes its own liability limits. The 1976 Convention is the most widely applicable international regime limiting maritime pollution liability. Rights to limit liability under the 1976 Convention are forfeited where a spill is caused by a ship owner's intentional or reckless conduct. Certain jurisdictions have ratified the IMO's Protocol of 1996 to the 1976 Convention, referred to herein as the Protocol of 1996. The Protocol of 1996 provides for substantially higher liability limits in those jurisdictions than the limits set forth in the 1976 Convention. Finally, some jurisdictions, such as the United States, are not a party to either the 1976 Convention or the Protocol of 1996, and, therefore, a ship owner's rights to limit liability for maritime pollution in such jurisdictions may be uncertain.

Environmental legislation in the United States merits particular mention as it is in many respects more onerous than international laws, representing a high-water mark of regulation with which ship owners and operators must comply, and of liability likely to be incurred in the event of non-compliance or an incident causing pollution. Such regulation may become even stricter if laws are changed as a result of the April 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico (the Deepwater Horizon incident). In the United States, the OPA establishes an extensive regulatory and liability regime for the protection and cleanup of the environment from cargo and bunker oil spills from vessels, including tankers. The OPA covers all owners and operators whose vessels trade in the United States, its territories and possessions or whose vessels operate in United States waters, which includes the United States territorial sea and its 200 nautical mile exclusive economic zone. Under the OPA, vessel owners, operators and bareboat charterers are responsible parties and are jointly, severally and strictly liable (unless the spill results solely from the act or omission of a third party, an act of God or an act of war) for all containment and clean-up costs and other damages arising from discharges or substantial threats of discharges, of oil from their vessels. In response to the Deepwater Horizon incident, the U.S. House of Representatives passed and the U.S. Senate considered but did not pass a bill to strengthen certain requirements of the OPA; similar legislation may be introduced in the future.

In addition to potential liability under the federal OPA, vessel owners may in some instances incur liability on an even more stringent basis under state law in the particular state where the spillage occurred. For example, California regulations prohibit the discharge of oil, require an oil contingency plan be filed with the state, require that the ship owner contract with an oil response organization and require a valid certificate of financial responsibility, all prior to the vessel entering state waters.

In recent years, the EU has become increasingly active in the field of regulation of maritime safety and protection of the environment. In some areas of regulation the EU has introduced new laws without attempting to procure a corresponding amendment to international law. Notably, in 2005 the EU adopted a directive, as amended in 2009, on ship-source pollution, imposing criminal sanctions for pollution not only where pollution is caused by intent or recklessness (which would be an offence under MARPOL), but also where it is caused by serious negligence. The concept of serious negligence may be interpreted in practice to be little more than ordinary negligence. The directive could therefore result in criminal liability being incurred in circumstances where it would not be incurred under international law. In February 2017, EU member states met to consider independently regulating the shipping industry under the Emissions Trading System (ETS), which requires ETS-regulated businesses to report on carbon emissions and provides for a credit trading system for carbon allowances. On February 15, 2017, European Parliament voted in favor of a bill to include maritime shipping in the ETS by 2023 if the IMO has not promulgated a comparable system by 2021. If the bill becomes law, the ETS may result in additional compliance costs for our vessels.

Edgar Filing: Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP - Form 20-F

In response to the Deepwater Horizon incident, the European Union issued Directive 2013/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of June 12, 2013 on safety of offshore oil and gas operations. The objective of this Directive is to reduce as far as possible the occurrence of major accidents relating to offshore oil

Table of Contents

and gas operations and to limit their consequences, thus increasing the protection of the marine environment and coastal economies against pollution, establishing minimum conditions for safe offshore exploration and exploitation of oil and gas and limiting possible disruptions to Union indigenous energy production, and to improve the response mechanisms in case of an accident. The Directive was implemented on July 19, 2015. As far as the environment is concerned, the UK has various new or amended regulations such as: the Offshore Petroleum Activities (Offshore Safety Directive) (Environmental Functions) Regulations 2015 (OSDEF), the 2015 amendments to the Merchant Shipping (Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation Convention) Regulations 1998 (OPRC 1998) and other environmental Directive requirements, specifically the Environmental Management System. The Offshore Petroleum Licensing (Offshore Safety Directive) Regulations 2015 will implement the licensing Directive requirements.

Criminal liability for a pollution incident could not only result in us incurring substantial penalties or fines, but may also, in some jurisdictions, facilitate civil liability claims for greater compensation than would otherwise have been payable.

We maintain insurance coverage for each owned vessel in our fleet against pollution liability risks in the amount of \$1.0 billion in the aggregate for any one event. The insured risks include penalties and fines as well as civil liabilities and expenses resulting from accidental pollution. However, this insurance coverage is subject to exclusions, deductibles and other terms and conditions. If any liabilities or expenses fall within an exclusion from coverage, or if damages from a catastrophic incident exceed the aggregate liability of \$1.0 billion for any one event, our cash flow, profitability and financial position would be adversely impacted.

Climate change and government laws and regulations related to climate change could negatively impact our financial condition.

We are and will be, directly and indirectly, subject to the effects of climate change and may, directly or indirectly, be affected by government laws and regulations related to climate change. A number of countries have adopted or are considering the adoption of regulatory frameworks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrogen oxides. In the United States, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has declared greenhouse gases to be dangerous pollutants and has issued greenhouse gas reporting requirements for emissions sources in certain industries (which currently do not include the shipping industry). The EPA does require owners of vessels subject to MARPOL Annex VI to maintain records for nitrogen oxides standards and in-use fuel specifications.

In addition, while the emissions of greenhouse gases from international shipping are not subject to the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (the UNFCCC), which requires adopting countries to implement national programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the IMO intends to develop limits on greenhouse gases from international shipping. It has responded to the global focus on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions by developing specific technical and operational efficiency measures and a work plan for market-based mechanisms in 2011. These include the mandatory measures of SEEMP, outlined above, and an energy efficiency design index (EEDI) for new ships. The IMO is also considering its position on market-based measures through an expert working group. Among the numerous proposals being considered by the working group are the following: a port state levy based on the amount of fuel consumed by the vessel on its voyage to the port in question; a global emissions trading scheme which would allocate emissions allowances and set an emissions cap; and an international fund establishing a global reduction target for international shipping, to be set either by the UNFCCC or the IMO.

At its 64th session (2012), the IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee (the MEPC) indicated that 2015 was the target year for member states to identify market-based measures for international shipping. At its 66th session

(2014), the MEPC continued its work on developing technical and operational measures relating to energy-efficiency measures for ships, following the entry into force of the mandatory efficiency measures on January 1, 2013. It adopted the 2014 Guidelines on the Method of Calculation of the Attained EEDI, applicable

Table of Contents

to new ships. It further adopted amendments to MARPOL Annex VI concerning the extension of the scope of application of the EEDI to Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) carriers, ro-ro cargo ships (vehicle carriers), ro-ro cargo ships, ro-ro passenger ships and cruise passenger ships with nonconventional propulsion. At its 67th session (2014), the MEPC adopted the 2014 Guidelines on survey and certification of the EEDI, updating the previous version to reference ships fitted with dual-fuel engines using LNG and liquid fuel oil. The MEPC also adopted amendments to the 2013 Interim Guidelines for determining minimum propulsion power to maintain the maneuverability of ships in adverse conditions, to make the guidelines applicable to phase 1 (starting January 1, 2015) of the EEDI requirements. At its 68th session (2015), the MEPC amended the 2014 Guidelines on EEDI survey and certification as well as the method of calculating an EEDI for new ships, the latter of which was again amended at the 70th session (2016). At its 70th session, the MEPC also adopted mandatory requirements for ships of 5,000 gross tonnage or greater to collect fuel consumption data for each type of fuel used, and report the data to the flag State after the end of each calendar year.

In December 2011, UN climate change talks took place in Durban and concluded with an agreement referred to as the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. The Durban Conference did not result in any proposals specifically addressing the shipping industry's role in climate change but the progress that has been made by the IMO in this area was widely acknowledged throughout the negotiating bodies of the UNFCCC process and an ad hoc working group was established.

Although regulation of greenhouse gas emissions in the shipping industry was discussed during the 2015 UN Climate Change Conference in Paris (the Paris Conference), the agreement reached among the 195 nations did not expressly reference the shipping industry. Following the Paris Conference, the IMO announced it would continue its efforts on this issue at the MEPC, and at its 70th session, the MEPC approved a roadmap for developing a comprehensive GHG emissions reduction strategy for ships, which includes the goal of adopting an initial strategy and emission reduction commitments in 2018. The roadmap also provides for additional studies and further intersessional work, to be continued at the 71st session in 2017, with a goal of adopting a revised strategy in 2023 to include short-, mid- and long-term reduction measures and schedules for implementation.

The EU announced in April 2007 that it planned to expand the EU emissions trading scheme by adding vessels, and a proposal from the European Commission (EC) was expected if no global regime for reduction of seaborne emissions had been agreed to by the end of 2011. As of January 31, 2013, the EC had stopped short of proposing that emissions from ships be included in the EU's emissions-trading scheme. However, on October 1, 2012, it announced that it would propose measures to monitor, verify and report on greenhouse-gas emissions from the shipping sector. On June 28, 2013, the EC adopted a communication setting out a strategy for progressively including greenhouse gas emissions from maritime transport in the EU's policy for reducing its overall GHG emissions. The first step proposed by the EC was an EU Regulation (as defined below) to an EU-wide system for the monitoring, reporting and verification of carbon dioxide emissions from large ships starting in 2018. The EU Regulation (2015/757) was adopted on April 29, 2015 and took effect on July 1, 2015, with monitoring, reporting and verification requirements beginning on January 1, 2018. This Regulation may be seen as indicative of an intention to maintain pressure on the international negotiating process. The EC also adopted an Implementing Regulation, which entered into force in November 2016, setting templates for monitoring plans, emissions reports and compliance documents pursuant to Regulation 2015/757.

We cannot predict with any degree of certainty what effect, if any, possible climate change and government laws and regulations related to climate change will have on our operations, whether directly or indirectly. However, we believe that climate change, including the possible increase in severe weather events resulting from climate change, and government laws and regulations related to climate change may affect, directly or indirectly, (i) the cost of the vessels we may acquire in the future, (ii) our ability to continue to operate as we have in the past, (iii) the cost of operating

our vessels, and (iv) insurance premiums, deductibles and the availability of coverage. As a result, our financial condition could be negatively impacted by significant climate change and related governmental regulation, and that impact could be material.

Table of Contents

We are subject to vessel security regulations and we incur costs to comply with adopted regulations. We may be subject to costs to comply with similar regulations that may be adopted in the future in response to terrorism.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, there have been a variety of initiatives intended to enhance vessel security. On November 25, 2002, the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (the MTSA) came into effect. To implement certain portions of the MTSA, in July 2003, the U.S. Coast Guard issued regulations requiring the implementation of certain security requirements aboard vessels operating in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Similarly, in December 2002, amendments to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (the SOLAS) created a new chapter of the convention dealing specifically with maritime security. The new chapter went into effect in July 2004, and imposes various detailed security obligations on vessels and port authorities, most of which are contained in the International Ship and Port Facilities Security Code (the ISPS Code). Among the various requirements are:

on-board installation of automatic information systems (AIS), to enhance vessel-to-vessel and vessel-to-shore communications;

on-board installation of ship security alert systems;

the development of vessel security plans; and

compliance with flag state security certification requirements.

The U.S. Coast Guard regulations, intended to be aligned with international maritime security standards, exempt non-U.S. vessels from MTSA vessel security measures, provided such vessels have on board a valid International Ship Security Certificate (ISSC) that attests to the vessel s compliance with SOLAS security requirements and the ISPS Code. We will implement the various security measures addressed by the MTSA, SOLAS and the ISPS Code and take measures for our vessels or vessels that we charter to attain compliance with all applicable security requirements within the prescribed time periods. Although management does not believe these additional requirements will have a material financial impact on our operations, there can be no assurance that there will not be an interruption in operations to bring vessels into compliance with the applicable requirements and any such interruption could cause a decrease in charter revenues. Furthermore, additional security measures could be required in the future that could have significant financial impact on us.

The cost of vessel security measures has also been affected by the escalation in recent years in the frequency and seriousness of acts of piracy against ships, notably off the coast of Somalia, including the Gulf of Aden and Arabian Sea area. Attacks of this kind have commonly resulted in vessels and their crews being detained for several months, and being released only on payment of large ransoms. Substantial loss of revenue and other costs may be incurred as a result of such detention. Although we insure against these losses to the extent practicable, the risk remains of uninsured losses which could significantly affect our business. Costs are incurred in taking additional security measures in accordance with Best Management Practices to Deter Piracy, notably those contained in the BMP3 industry standard. A number of flag states have signed the 2009 New York Declaration, which expresses commitment to Best Management Practices in relation to piracy and calls for compliance with them as an essential part of compliance with the ISPS Code.

Our international activities increase the compliance risks associated with economic and trade sanctions imposed by the United States, the European Union and other jurisdictions.

Our international operations and activities could expose us to risks associated with trade and economic sanctions prohibitions or other restrictions imposed by the United States or other governments or organizations, including the United Nations, the European Union and its member countries. Under economic and trade sanctions laws, governments may seek to impose modifications to, prohibitions/restrictions on business practices and activities, and modifications to compliance programs, which may increase compliance costs, and, in the event of a violation, may subject us to fines and other penalties.

Table of Contents
Iran

During the last few years, the scope of sanctions imposed against the government of Iran and persons engaging in certain activities or doing certain business with and relating to Iran was expanded by a number of jurisdictions, including the United States, the European Union and Canada. In 2010, the U.S. enacted the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act (CISADA), which expanded the scope of the former Iran Sanctions Act. The scope of U.S. sanctions against Iran were expanded subsequent to CISADA by, among other U.S. laws, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 (the 2012 NDAA), the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (ITRA), Executive Order 13662, and the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA). The foregoing laws, among other things, expanded the application of prohibitions to non-U.S. companies, such as our company, and introduced limits on the ability of companies and persons to do business or trade with Iran when such activities relate to specific activities such as investment in Iran, the supply or export of refined petroleum or refined petroleum products to Iran, the supply and delivery of goods to Iran which could enhance Iran's petroleum or energy sectors, and the transportation of crude oil from Iran to countries which do not enjoy Iran crude oil sanctions waivers (our tankers called in Iran but did not engage in the prohibited activities specifically identified by these sanctions). U.S. economic sanctions on Iran fall into two general categories: Primary sanctions, which prohibit U.S. companies and their foreign branches, U.S. citizens, U.S. permanent residents, persons within the territory of the United States from engaging in all direct and indirect trade and other transactions with Iran without U.S. government authorization, and secondary sanctions, which are mainly nuclear-related sanctions. While most of the nuclear-related sanctions with respect to Iran (including, *inter alia*, CISADA, ITRA, and IFCA) were lifted on January 16, 2016 through the implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) entered into between the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States) and Germany, there are still certain limitations in place with which we need to comply. The primary sanctions with which U.S. persons or transactions with a U.S. nexus must comply are still in force and have not been lifted or relaxed, except in a very limited fashion. Additionally, the sanctions lifted under the JCPOA could be reimposed (snapped back) at any time if Iran violates the JCPOA.

After the lifting of most of the nuclear-related sanctions on January 16, 2016, EU sanctions remain in place in relation to the export of arms and military goods listed in the EU common military list, missiles-related goods and items that might be used for internal repression. The main nuclear-related EU sanctions which remain in place include restrictions on:

- i. Graphite and certain raw or semi-finished metals such as corrosion-resistant high-grade steel, iron, aluminium and alloys, titanium and alloys and nickel and alloys (as listed in Annex VIIB to EU Regulation 267/2012 as updated by EU Regulation 2015/1861 (the EU Regulation));
- ii. Goods listed in the Nuclear Suppliers Group list (listed in Annex I to the EU Regulation);
- iii. Goods that could contribute to nuclear-related or other activities inconsistent with the JCPOA (as listed in Annex II to the EU Regulation); and
- iv. Software designed for use in nuclear/military industries (as listed in Annex VIIA to the EU Regulation).

Dealing with the above is no longer prohibited, but prior authorization must be obtained first and is granted on a case-by-case basis. The remaining restrictions apply to the sale, supply, transfer or export, directly or indirectly to any Iranian person/for use in Iran, as well as the provision of technical assistance, financing or financial assistance in relation to the restricted activity. Certain individuals and entities remain sanctioned and the prohibition to make available, directly or indirectly, economic resources or assets to or for the benefit of sanctioned parties remains.

Economic resources is widely defined and it remains prohibited to provide vessels for a fixture from which a sanctioned party (or parties related to a sanctioned party) directly or indirectly benefits. It is therefore still necessary to carry out due diligence on the parties and cargoes involved in fixtures involving Iran.

Table of Contents

Russia/Ukraine

As a result of the crisis in Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014, both the U.S. and EU have implemented sanctions against certain persons and entities.

The EU has imposed travel bans and asset freezes on certain persons and entities pursuant to which it is prohibited to make available, directly or indirectly, economic resources or assets to or for the benefit of the sanctioned parties. Certain Russian ports including Kerch Commercial Seaport; Sevastopol Commercial Seaport and Port Feodosia are subject to the above restrictions. Other entities are subject to sectoral sanctions which limit the provision of loans or credit to the listed entities. In addition, various restrictions on trade have been implemented which, amongst others, include a prohibition on the import into the EU of goods originating in Crimea or Sevastopol as well as restrictions on trade in certain dual-use and military items and restrictions in relation to various items of technology associated with the oil industry for use in deep water exploration and production, Arctic oil exploration and production or shale oil projects in Russia. As such, it is important to carry out due diligence on the parties and cargoes involved in fixtures relating to Russia.

The U.S. has imposed sanctions against certain designated Russian entities and individuals (U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets). These sanctions block the property and all interests in property of the U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets. This effectively prohibits U.S. persons from engaging in any economic or commercial transactions with the U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets unless the same are authorized by the U.S. Treasury Department. Similar to EU sanctions, U.S. sanctions also entail restrictions on certain exports from the United States to Russia. While the prohibitions of these sanctions are not directly applicable to us, we have compliance measures in place to guard against transactions with U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets which may involve the United States or U.S. persons and thus implicate prohibitions. The United States also maintains prohibitions on imports from Crimea, and it has also tightened restrictions on exports of certain goods and technology to Russia.

Other U.S. Economic Sanctions Targets

In addition to Iran and certain Russian entities and individuals, as indicated above, the United States maintains economic sanctions against Syria, Sudan, Cuba, North Korea, and sanctions against entities and individuals (such as entities and individuals in the foregoing targeted countries, designated terrorists, narcotics traffickers) whose names appear on the List of SDNs and Blocked Persons maintained by the U.S. Treasury Department (collectively, Sanctions Targets). We are subject to the prohibitions of these sanctions to the extent that any transaction or activity we engage in involves Sanctions Targets and a U.S. person or otherwise has a nexus to the United States.

Other E.U. Economic Sanctions Targets

The EU also maintains sanctions against Syria, Sudan, North Korea and certain other countries and against individuals listed by the EU. These restrictions apply to our operations and as such, to the extent that these countries may be involved in any business it is important to carry out checks to ensure compliance with all relevant restrictions and to carry out due diligence checks on counterparties and cargoes.

Compliance

Although we believe that we are in compliance with all applicable sanctions and embargo laws and regulations, and intend to maintain such compliance, there can be no assurance that we will be in compliance in the future, particularly as the scope of certain laws may be unclear and may be subject to changing interpretations, and the law may change. Moreover, despite, for example, relevant provisions in charter parties forbidding the use of our vessels in trade that

would violate economic sanctions, our charterers may nevertheless violate applicable sanctions and embargo laws and regulations as a result of actions that do not involve us or our vessels, and those violations could in turn negatively affect our reputation and be imputed to us. In addition,

Table of Contents

given our relationship with Navios Midstream and Navios Holdings, we cannot give any assurance that an adverse finding against Navios Midstream or Navios Holdings by a governmental or legal authority or others with respect to the matters discussed herein or any future matter related to regulatory compliance by Navios Midstream, Navios Holdings or ourselves will not have a material adverse impact on our business, reputation or the market price or trading of our common stock.

We are constantly monitoring developments in the United States, the European Union and other jurisdictions that maintain economic sanctions against Iran, other countries, and other sanctions targets, including developments in implementation and enforcement of such sanctions programs. Expansion of sanctions programs, embargoes and other restrictions in the future (including additional designations of countries and persons subject to sanctions), or modifications in how existing sanctions are interpreted or enforced, could prevent our vessels from calling in ports in sanctioned countries or could limit their cargoes. If any of the risks described above materialize, it could have a material adverse impact on our business and results of operations.

To reduce the risk of violating economic sanctions, we have a policy of compliance with applicable economic sanctions laws and have implemented and continue to implement and diligently follow compliance procedures to avoid economic sanctions violations.

We could be materially adversely affected by violations of the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, the U.K. Bribery Act and anti-corruption laws in other applicable jurisdictions.

As an international shipping company, we may operate in countries known to have a reputation for corruption. The U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (the "FCPA") and other anti-corruption laws and regulations in applicable jurisdictions generally prohibit companies registered with the SEC and their intermediaries from making improper payments to government officials for the purpose of obtaining or retaining business. Under the FCPA, U.S. companies may be held liable for some actions taken by strategic or local partners or representatives. Legislation in other countries includes the U.K. Bribery Act of 2010 (the "U.K. Bribery Act") which is broader in scope than the FCPA because it does not contain an exception for facilitation payments. We and our customers may be subject to these and similar anti-corruption laws in other applicable jurisdictions. Failure to comply with legal requirements could expose us to civil and/or criminal penalties, including fines, prosecution and significant reputational damage, all of which could materially and adversely affect our business and results of operations, including our relationships with our customers, and our financial results. Compliance with the FCPA, the U.K. Bribery Act and other applicable anti-corruption laws and related regulations and policies imposes potentially significant costs and operational burdens on us. Moreover, the compliance and monitoring mechanisms that we have in place including our Code of Ethics and our anti-bribery and anti-corruption policy, may not adequately prevent or detect all possible violations under applicable anti-bribery and anti-corruption legislation. However, we believe that the procedures we have in place to prevent bribery are adequate and that they should provide a defense in most circumstances to a violation or a mitigation of applicable penalties, at least under the U.K. Bribery Act.

Increased inspection procedures and tighter import and export controls could increase costs and disrupt our business.

International shipping is subject to various security and customs inspections and related procedures in countries of origin and destination. Inspection procedures can result in the seizure of contents of vessels, delays in the loading, offloading or delivery and the levying of customs, duties, fines and other penalties.

It is possible that changes to inspection procedures could impose additional financial and legal obligations on us. Furthermore, changes to inspection procedures could also impose additional costs and obligations on our future

customers and may, in certain cases, render the shipment of certain types of cargo impractical. Any such changes or developments may have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, and results of operations.

Table of Contents

A failure to pass inspection by classification societies could result in our vessels becoming unemployable unless and until they pass inspection, resulting in a loss of revenues from such vessels for that period and a corresponding decrease in operating cash flows.

The hull and machinery of every commercial vessel must be classed by a classification society authorized by its country of registry. The classification society certifies that a vessel is safe and seaworthy in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations of the country of registry of the vessel and with SOLAS. A vessel must undergo an annual survey, an intermediate survey and a special survey. In lieu of a special survey, a vessel's machinery may be on a continuous survey cycle, under which the machinery would be surveyed periodically over a five-year period. Every vessel is also required to be drydocked every two to three years for inspection of the underwater parts of such vessel. If any of our vessels fail any annual survey, intermediate survey, or special survey, the vessel may be unable to trade between ports and, therefore, would be unemployable, potentially causing a negative impact on our revenues due to the loss of revenues from such vessel until it was able to trade again.

We are subject to inherent operational risks that may not be adequately covered by our insurance.

The operation of ocean-going vessels in international trade is inherently risky. Although we carry insurance for our fleet against risks commonly insured against by vessel owners and operators, including hull and machinery insurance, war risks insurance and protection and indemnity insurance (which include environmental damage and pollution insurance), all risks may not be adequately insured against, and any particular claim may not be paid. We do not currently maintain off-hire insurance, which would cover the loss of revenue during extended vessel off-hire periods, such as those that occur during an unscheduled drydocking due to damage to the vessel from accidents. Other events that may lead to off-hire periods include natural or man-made disasters that result in the closure of certain waterways and prevent vessels from entering or leaving certain ports. Accordingly, any extended vessel off-hire, due to an accident or otherwise, could have a material adverse effect on our business. Any claims covered by insurance would be subject to deductibles, and since it is possible that a large number of claims may be brought, the aggregate amount of these deductibles could be material.

We may be unable to procure adequate insurance coverage at commercially reasonable rates in the future. For example, more stringent environmental regulations have led in the past to increased costs for, and in the future may result in the lack of availability of, insurance against risks of environmental damage or pollution. A catastrophic oil spill or marine disaster could exceed our insurance coverage, which could harm our business, financial condition and operating results. Changes in the insurance markets attributable to terrorist attacks may also make certain types of insurance more difficult for us to obtain. In addition, the insurance that may be available to us may be significantly more expensive than our existing coverage. We do not carry strike insurance.

Even if our insurance coverage is adequate to cover our losses, we may not be able to timely obtain a replacement vessel in the event of a loss. Furthermore, in the future, we may not be able to obtain adequate insurance coverage at reasonable rates for our fleet. Our insurance policies also contain deductibles, limitations and exclusions which can result in significant increased overall costs to us.

The operation of ocean-going vessels entails the possibility of marine disasters, including damage or destruction of a vessel due to accident, the loss of a vessel due to piracy, terrorism or political conflict, damage or destruction of cargo and similar events that are inherent operational risks of the tanker industry and may cause a loss of revenue from affected vessels and damage to our business reputation and condition, which may in turn lead to loss of business.

The operation of ocean-going vessels entails certain inherent risks that may adversely affect our business and reputation. Our vessels and their cargoes are at risk of being damaged or lost due to events such as:

damage or destruction of a vessel due to marine disaster such as a collision;

the loss of a vessel due to piracy and terrorism;

Table of Contents

cargo and property losses or damage as a result of the foregoing or less drastic causes such as human error, mechanical failure and bad weather;

environmental accidents as a result of the foregoing;

business interruptions and delivery delays caused by mechanical failure, human error, acts of piracy, war, terrorism, political action in various countries, labor strikes, potential government expropriation of our vessels or adverse weather conditions; and

other events and circumstances.

In addition, increased operational risks arise as a consequence of the complex nature of the crude oil, product and chemical tanker industry, the nature of services required to support the industry, including maintenance and repair services, and the mechanical complexity of the tankers themselves. Compared to other types of vessels, tankers are exposed to a higher risk of damage and loss by fire, whether ignited by a terrorist attack, collision or other cause, due to the high flammability and high volume of the oil transported in tankers. Damage and loss could also arise as a consequence of a failure in the services required to support the industry, for example, due to inadequate dredging. Inherent risks also arise due to the nature of the product transported by our vessels. Any damage to, or accident involving, our vessels while carrying crude oil could give rise to environmental damage or lead to other adverse consequences. Each of these inherent risks may also result in death or injury to persons, loss of revenues or property, higher insurance rates, damage to our customer relationships, delay or rerouting.

Any of these circumstances or events could substantially increase our costs. For example, the costs of replacing a vessel or cleaning up environmental damage could substantially lower our revenues by taking vessels out of operation permanently or for periods of time. Furthermore, the involvement of our vessels in a disaster or delays in delivery, damage or the loss of cargo may harm our reputation as a safe and reliable vessel operator and cause us to lose business. Our vessels could be arrested by maritime claimants, which could result in the interruption of business and decrease revenue and lower profitability.

Some of these inherent risks could result in significant damage, such as marine disaster or environmental incidents, and any resulting legal proceedings may be complex, lengthy, costly and, if decided against us, any of these proceedings or other proceedings involving similar claims or claims for substantial damages may harm our reputation and have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flow and financial position. In addition, the legal systems and law enforcement mechanisms in certain countries in which we operate may expose us to risk and uncertainty. Further, we may be required to devote substantial time and cost defending these proceedings, which could divert attention from management of our business. Crew members, tort claimants, claimants for breach of certain maritime contracts, vessel mortgagees, suppliers of goods and services to a vessel, shippers of cargo and other persons may be entitled to a maritime lien against a vessel for unsatisfied debts, claims or damages, and in many circumstances a maritime lien holder may enforce its lien by arresting a vessel through court processes. Additionally, in certain jurisdictions, such as South Africa, under the sister ship theory of liability, a claimant may arrest not only the vessel with respect to which the claimant's lien has arisen, but also any associated vessel owned or controlled by the legal or beneficial owner of that vessel. If any vessel ultimately owned and operated by us is arrested, this could result in a material loss of revenues, or require us to pay substantial amounts to have the arrest lifted.

Any of these factors may have a material adverse effect on our business, financial conditions and results of operations.

The smuggling of drugs or other contraband onto our vessels may lead to governmental claims against us.

We expect that our vessels will call in ports in South America and other areas where smugglers attempt to hide drugs and other contraband on vessels, with or without the knowledge of crew members. To the extent our

Table of Contents

vessels are found with contraband, whether inside or attached to the hull of our vessel and whether with or without the knowledge of any of our crew, we may face governmental or other regulatory claims which could have an adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows and financial condition.

Acts of piracy on ocean-going vessels have increased in frequency and magnitude, which could adversely affect our business.

The shipping industry has historically been affected by acts of piracy in regions such as the South China Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Gulf of Aden off the coast of Somalia and the Red Sea. Although the frequency of sea piracy worldwide has decreased in recent years, sea piracy incidents continue to occur, particularly in the Gulf of Aden and towards the Mozambique Channel in the North Indian Ocean and increasingly in the Gulf of Guinea. A significant example of the heightened level of piracy came in February 2011 when the M/V Irene SL, a crude oil tanker in the Arabian Sea which was not affiliated with us, was captured by pirates in the Arabian Sea while carrying crude oil estimated to be worth approximately \$200 million. In December 2009, the Navios Apollon, a vessel owned by Navios Maritime Partners L.P. (Navios Partners), was seized by pirates 800 miles off the coast of Somalia while transporting fertilizer from Tampa, Florida to Rozi, India and was released on February 27, 2010. In January 2014, the Nave Atropos, a vessel owned by us, came under attack from a pirate action group in international waters off the coast of Yemen and in February 2016, the Nave Jupiter, a vessel also owned by us, came under attack from pirate action groups on her way out from her loading terminal about 50 nautical miles off Bayelsa, Nigeria. In both instances, the crew and the on-board security team successfully implemented the counter piracy action plan and standard operating procedures to deter the attack with no consequences to the vessels or their crew. These piracy attacks have resulted in regions (in which our vessels are deployed) being characterized by insurers as war risk zones or Joint War Committee war and strikes listed areas. Premiums payable for insurance coverage could increase significantly and insurance coverage may be more difficult to obtain. Crew costs, including those due to employing onboard security guards, could increase in such circumstances. While the use of security guards is intended to deter and prevent the hijacking of our vessels, it could also increase our risk of liability for death or injury to persons or damage to personal property. In addition, while we believe the charterer remains liable for charter payments when a vessel is seized by pirates, the charterer may dispute this and withhold charter hire until the vessel is released. A charterer may also claim that a vessel seized by pirates was not on-hire for a certain number of days and it is therefore entitled to cancel the charter party, a claim that we would dispute. We may not be adequately insured to cover losses from these incidents, which could have a material adverse effect on us. In addition, detention hijacking as a result of an act of piracy against our vessels, an increase in cost, or unavailability of insurance for our vessels, could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. Acts of piracy on ocean-going vessels could adversely affect our business and operations.

Political and government instability, terrorist attacks, increased hostilities or war could lead to further economic instability, increased costs and disruption of our business.

We conduct most of our operations outside of the United States. In particular, we derive our revenues from shipping oil and oil products from politically unstable regions and our business, results of operations, cash flows, financial condition and ability to make cash distributions may be adversely affected by the effects of political instability, terrorist or other attacks, war or international hostilities. Terrorist attacks, such as the attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, the attacks in London on July 7, 2005, in Paris on January 7, 2015 and November 13, 2015, and the bombings in Spain on March 11, 2004, along with the recent conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, Ukraine and other current and future conflicts, and the continuing response of the United States and other countries to these attacks, as well as the threat of future terrorist attacks, continue to cause uncertainty in the world financial markets, including the energy markets. Continuing hostilities in the Middle East may lead to additional armed conflicts or to further acts of terrorism and civil disturbance in the United States or elsewhere, which could result in increased

volatility and turmoil in the financial markets and may contribute further to economic instability. Current and future conflicts and terrorist attacks may adversely affect our business, operating results, financial condition, ability to raise capital and future growth. Terrorist

Table of Contents

attacks on vessels, such as the October 2002 attack on the M/V Limburg, a VLCC not related to us, may in the future also negatively affect our operations and financial condition and directly impact our vessels or our customers.

In addition, oil facilities, shipyards, vessels, pipelines and oil and gas fields could be targets of future terrorist attacks. Any such attacks could lead to, among other things, bodily injury or loss of life, vessel or other property damage, increased vessel operational costs, including insurance costs, and the inability to transport oil and other refined products to or from certain locations. Terrorist attacks, war or other events beyond our control that adversely affect the distribution, production or transportation of oil and other refined products to be shipped by us could entitle our customers to terminate our charter contracts, which would harm our cash flow and our business.

Furthermore, our operations may be adversely affected by changing or adverse political and governmental conditions in the countries where our vessels are flagged or registered and in the regions where we otherwise engage in business. Any disruption caused by these factors may interfere with the operation of our vessels, which could harm our business, financial condition and results of operations. Our operations may also be adversely affected by expropriation of vessels, taxes, regulation, tariffs, trade embargoes, economic sanctions or a disruption of or limit to trading activities, or other adverse events or circumstances in or affecting the countries and regions where we operate or where we may operate in the future.

Governments could requisition vessels of a target business during a period of war or emergency, resulting in a loss of earnings.

A government could requisition a business' vessels for title or hire. Requisition for title occurs when a government takes control of a vessel and becomes her owner, while requisition for hire occurs when a government takes control of a vessel and effectively becomes her charterer at dictated charter rates. Generally, requisitions occur during periods of war or emergency, although governments may elect to requisition vessels in other circumstances. Requisition of one or more of our vessels would have a substantial negative effect on us as we would potentially lose all revenues and earnings from the requisitioned vessels and permanently lose the vessels. Such losses might be partially offset if the requisitioning government compensated us for the requisition, although the amount and timing of payment would be uncertain.

Disruptions in world financial markets and the resulting governmental action in Europe, the United States and in other parts of the world could have a material adverse impact on our ability to obtain financing required to acquire vessels or new businesses. Furthermore, such a disruption would materially adversely affect our results of operations, financial condition and cash flows.

Global financial markets and economic conditions have been severely disrupted and volatile in recent years and remain subject to significant vulnerabilities, such as the deterioration of fiscal balances and the rapid accumulation of public debt, continued deleveraging in the banking sector and a limited supply of credit. The renewed crisis in Argentina, civil unrest in Ukraine and other parts of the world, and continuing concerns relating to the European sovereign debt crisis have led to increased volatility in global credit and equity markets. Several European countries, including Greece, have been affected by increasing public debt burdens and weakening economic growth prospects. In recent years, Standard and Poor's Rating Services and Moody's Investors Service downgraded the long-term ratings of most European countries' sovereign debt and initiated negative outlooks. Such downgrades could negatively affect those countries' ability to access the public debt markets at reasonable rates or at all, materially affecting the financial conditions of banks in those countries, including those with which we maintain cash deposits and equivalents, or on which we rely on to finance our vessel and new business acquisitions.

Cash deposits and cash equivalents in excess of amounts covered by government-provided insurance are exposed to loss in the event of non-performance by financial institutions. We maintain cash deposits and

Table of Contents

equivalents in excess of government-provided insurance limits at banks in Greece and other European banks, which may expose us to a loss of cash deposits or cash equivalents.

The credit markets worldwide and in the U.S. have experienced significant contraction, de-leveraging and reduced liquidity, and the U.S. federal government, state governments and foreign governments took highly significant measures in response to such events, including the enactment of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 in the United States, and may implement other significant responses in the future. Additionally, uncertainty regarding tax policy and government spending in the United States have created an uncertain environment which could reduce demand for our services. Securities and futures markets and the credit markets are subject to comprehensive statutes, regulations and other requirements. The Securities and Exchange Commission (the SEC), other regulators, self-regulatory organizations and exchanges are authorized to take extraordinary actions in the event of market emergencies, and may effect changes in law or interpretations of existing laws. Any changes to securities, tax, environmental, or other laws or regulations, could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition or cash flows, and could cause the market price of our common stock to decline.

Recently, a number of financial institutions have experienced serious financial difficulties and, in some cases, have entered bankruptcy proceedings or are in regulatory enforcement actions. These difficulties resulted, in part, from declining markets for assets held by such institutions, particularly the reduction in the value of their mortgage and asset-backed securities portfolios. These difficulties were compounded by financial turmoil affecting the world's debt, credit and capital markets, and the general decline in the willingness by banks and other financial institutions to extend credit, particularly to the shipping industry due to the historically low vessel earnings and values, and, in part, due to changes in overall banking regulations (for example, Basel III). As a result, the ability of banks and credit institutions to finance new projects, including the acquisition of new vessels in the future, were for a time uncertain. Following the stress tests run by the European Central Bank (the ECB), revised capital ratios have been communicated to European banks. This has reduced the uncertainty following the difficulties of the past several years, but it has also led to changes in each bank's lending policies and ability to provide financing or refinancing. A recurrence of global economic weakness may adversely affect the financial institutions that provide our credit facilities and may impair their ability to continue to perform under their financing obligations to us, which could have an impact on our ability to fund current and future obligations.

Furthermore, we may experience difficulties obtaining financing commitments, including commitments to refinance our existing debt as balloon payments come due under our credit facilities, in the future if lenders are unwilling to extend financing to us or unable to meet their funding obligations due to their own liquidity, capital or solvency issues. Due to the fact that we would possibly cover all or a portion of the cost of any new vessel acquisition with debt financing, such uncertainty, combined with restrictions imposed by our current debt, could hamper our ability to finance vessels or new business acquisitions.

In addition, the economic uncertainty worldwide has markedly reduced demand for shipping services and has decreased shipping rates, which may adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition. Currently, the economies of China, Japan, other Pacific Asian countries and India are the main driving force behind the development in seaborne transportation. Reduced demand from such economies has in the past driven decreased rates and vessel values and could do so in the future.

In addition, as a result of the ongoing political and economic turmoil in Greece resulting from the sovereign debt crisis and the related austerity measures implemented by the Greek government, the operations of our managers located in Greece may be subjected to new regulations and potential shift in government policies that may require us to incur new or additional compliance or other administrative costs and may require that we pay to the Greek government new taxes or other fees. We also face the risk that strikes, work stoppages, civil unrest and violence within Greece may

disrupt the shoreside operations of our managers located in Greece.

We could face risks attendant to changes in economic environments, changes in interest rates, tax policies, and instability in certain securities markets, among other factors. Major market disruptions and the uncertainty in

Table of Contents

market conditions and the regulatory climate in the U.S., Europe and worldwide could adversely affect our business or impair our ability to borrow amounts under any future financial arrangements. The current market conditions may last longer than we anticipate. These recent and developing economic and governmental factors could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition or cash flows.

Because international tank companies often generate most or all of their revenues in U.S. dollars but incur a portion of their expenses in other currencies, exchange rate fluctuations could cause us to suffer exchange rate losses, thereby increasing expenses and reducing income.

We engage in worldwide commerce with a variety of entities. Although our operations may expose us to certain levels of foreign currency risk, our transactions are predominantly U.S. dollar-denominated. Transactions in currencies other than the functional currency are translated at the exchange rate in effect at the date of each transaction. Expenses incurred in foreign currencies against which the U.S. dollar falls in value can increase, decreasing our income. A greater percentage of our transactions and expenses in the future may be denominated in currencies other than the U.S. dollar. As part of our overall risk management policy, we will attempt to hedge these risks in exchange rate fluctuations from time to time. We may not always be successful in such hedging activities and, as a result, our operating results could suffer as a result of un-hedged losses incurred as a result of exchange rate fluctuations. For example, as of December 31, 2016, the value of the U.S. dollar as compared to the Euro increased by approximately 3.6% compared with the respective value as of December 31, 2015. A greater percentage of our transactions and expenses in the future may be denominated in currencies other than the U.S. dollar.

Labor interruptions and problems could disrupt our business.

Certain of our vessels are manned by masters, officers and crews that are employed by third parties. If not resolved in a timely and cost-effective manner, industrial action or other labor unrest could prevent or hinder our operations from being carried out normally and could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flow and financial condition.

Risks Relating to Our VLCC Vessels

The indemnity may be inadequate to cover any damages.

The Securities Purchase Agreement for the VLCC vessels acquired through the VLCC Acquisition has a cap on indemnity obligations, subject to certain exceptions, of \$58.7 million. Although we performed substantial due diligence with respect to the VLCC Acquisition, there can be no assurance that there will not be undisclosed liabilities or other matters not discovered in the course of such due diligence and the \$58.7 million indemnity may be inadequate to cover these or other damages related to breaches of such agreement. In addition, since the return to Navios Acquisition of 217,159 shares on November 4, 2011 in settlement of claims relating to representation and warranties attributable to the sellers and the return of the balance of the escrow shares to the sellers, it may be difficult to enforce an arbitration award for any amount of damages.

Risks Related to Our Relationship with Navios Holdings and Its Affiliates

Navios Holdings has limited experience in the crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors.

Navios Tankers Management Inc. (the **Manager**), a wholly owned subsidiary of Navios Holdings, oversees the commercial and administrative management of our entire fleet and the technical management of a portion of our fleet. Navios Holdings is a vertically-integrated seaborne shipping and logistics company with 60 years of operating history

in the shipping industry that held approximately 43.0% of our shares of common stock as of April 4, 2017. Other than with respect to South American operations, Navios Holdings' experience in the crude oil, chemical and product tanker sectors dates to 2010. Navios Holdings or the Manager may make decisions that a more experienced operator in the sector might not make. If Navios Holdings or the Manager is not able to properly assess or ascertain a particular aspect of the crude oil, product or chemical tanker sectors, it could have a material adverse effect on our operations.

Table of Contents

Navios Holdings may compete directly with us, causing certain officers to have a conflict of interest.

Angeliki Frangou is an officer and director of Navios Holdings, Navios Midstream, Navios Partners and Navios Acquisition. We operate in the crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors of the shipping industry, and although Navios Holdings does not currently have any significant exposure in those sectors, there is no assurance it will not enter them. If it does, we may compete directly with Navios Holdings for business opportunities.

Navios Holdings, Navios Partners, Navios Midstream and Navios Acquisition share certain officers and directors who may not be able to devote sufficient time to our affairs, which may affect our ability to conduct operations and generate revenues.

Angeliki Frangou is an officer and director of Navios Holdings, Navios Midstream and Navios Acquisition, and Ms. Frangou is an officer and director of Navios Partners. As a result, demands for our officers' time and attention as required from Navios Acquisition, Navios Partners, Navios Midstream and Navios Holdings may conflict from time to time and her limited devotion of time and attention to our business may hurt the operation of our business.

The loss of key members of our senior management team could disrupt the management of our business.

We believe that our success depends on the continued contributions of the members of our senior management team, including Angeliki Frangou, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. The loss of the services of Ms. Frangou or one of our other executive officers or senior management members could impair our ability to identify and secure new charter contracts, to maintain good customer relations and to otherwise manage our business, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial performance and our ability to compete.

We are dependent on a subsidiary of Navios Holdings for the commercial and administrative management of our fleet and the technical management of a portion of our fleet, which may create conflicts of interest.

As we subcontract the technical and commercial management of our fleet, including crewing, maintenance and repair, to the Manager, and on an interim basis to other third party managers, the loss of these services or the failure of the Manager to perform these services could materially and adversely affect the results of our operations. Although we may have rights against the Manager if it defaults on its obligations to us, you will have no recourse directly against it. Further, we expect that we will need to seek approval from our respective lenders to change our commercial and technical managers. Navios Holdings has responsibilities and relationships to owners other than Navios Acquisition that could create conflicts of interest between us and Navios Holdings or the Manager. These conflicts may arise in connection with the provision of chartering services to us for our fleet versus carriers managed by Navios Holdings subsidiaries or other companies affiliated with Navios Holdings.

Navios Holdings, our affiliate and a greater than 5% holder of our common stock, Angeliki Frangou, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, and certain of our officers and directors collectively own a substantial interest in us, and, as a result, may influence certain actions requiring stockholder vote.

As of April 4, 2017, Navios Holdings, Angeliki Frangou, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, and certain of our officers and directors beneficially own, in the aggregate, 46.8% of our issued and outstanding shares of common stock, which permits them to influence the outcome of effectively all matters requiring approval by our stockholders at such time, including the election of directors and approval of significant corporate transactions. Furthermore, if Navios Holdings and Ms. Frangou or an affiliate ceases to hold a minimum of 30% of our common stock, then we will be in default under our credit facilities.

Table of Contents

Risks Related to Our Common Stock and Capital Structure

We are incorporated in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, a country that does not have a well-developed body of corporate law, which may negatively affect the ability of public stockholders to protect their interests.

Our corporate affairs are governed by our amended and restated articles of incorporation and bylaws, and by the Marshall Islands Business Corporations Act (the “BCA”). The provisions of the BCA resemble provisions of the corporation laws of a number of states in the United States. However, there have been few judicial cases in the Republic of the Marshall Islands interpreting the BCA. The rights and fiduciary responsibilities of directors under the law of the Republic of the Marshall Islands are not as clearly established as the rights and fiduciary responsibilities of directors under statutes or judicial precedent in existence in certain United States jurisdictions. Stockholder rights may differ as well. While the BCA does specifically incorporate the non-statutory law, or judicial case law, of the State of Delaware and other states with substantially similar legislative provisions, public stockholders may have more difficulty in protecting their interests in the face of actions by the management, directors or controlling stockholders than would stockholders of a corporation incorporated in a United States jurisdiction.

We are incorporated under the laws of the Marshall Islands and our directors and officers are non-U.S. residents, and although you may bring an original action in the courts of the Marshall Islands or obtain a judgment against us, our directors or our management based on U.S. laws in the event you believe your rights as a stockholder have been infringed, it may be difficult to enforce judgments against us, our directors or our management.

We are incorporated under the laws of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and all of our assets are located outside of the United States. Our business will be operated primarily from our offices in Monte Carlo, Monaco. In addition, our directors and officers are non-residents of the United States, and all or a substantial portion of the assets of these nonresidents are located outside the United States. As a result, it may be difficult or impossible for you to bring an action against us or against these individuals in the United States if you believe that your rights have been infringed under securities laws or otherwise. Even if you are successful in bringing an action of this kind, the laws of the Marshall Islands and of other jurisdictions may prevent or restrict you from enforcing a judgment against our assets or the assets of our directors and officers. Although you may bring an original action against us or our affiliates in the courts of the Marshall Islands based on U.S. laws, and the courts of the Marshall Islands may impose civil liability, including monetary damages, against us or our affiliates for a cause of action arising under Marshall Islands law, it may be impracticable for you to do so given the geographic location of the Marshall Islands.

Since we are a foreign private issuer, we are not subject to certain SEC regulations that companies incorporated in the United States would be subject to.

We are a “foreign private issuer” within the meaning of the rules promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”). As such, we are exempt from certain provisions applicable to United States public companies including:

the rules under the Exchange Act requiring the filing with the SEC of quarterly reports on Form 10-Q or current reports on Form 8-K;

the sections of the Exchange Act regulating the solicitation of proxies, consents or authorizations in respect of a security registered under the Exchange Act;

the provisions of Regulation FD of the Exchange Act aimed at preventing issuers from making selective disclosures of material information; and

the sections of the Exchange Act requiring insiders to file public reports of their stock ownership and trading activities and establishing insider liability for profits realized from any short-swing trading transaction (i.e., a purchase and sale, or sale and purchase, of the issuer's equity securities within less than six months).

Table of Contents

Accordingly, investors in our common stock may not be able to obtain all of the information of the type described above, and our stockholders may not be afforded the same protections or information generally available to investors holding shares in public companies in the United States.

Anti-takeover provisions in our amended and restated articles of incorporation could make it difficult for our stockholders to replace or remove our current board of directors or could have the effect of discouraging, delaying or preventing a merger or acquisition, which could adversely affect the market price of our common stock.

Several provisions of our amended and restated articles of incorporation and bylaws could make it difficult for our stockholders to change the composition of our board of directors in any one year, preventing them from changing the composition of our management. In addition, the same provisions may discourage, delay or prevent a merger or acquisition that stockholders may consider favorable. These provisions include those that:

authorize our board of directors to issue blank check preferred stock without stockholder approval;

provide for a classified board of directors with staggered, three-year terms;

require a super-majority vote in order to amend the provisions regarding our classified board of directors with staggered, three-year terms; and

prohibit cumulative voting in the election of directors.

These anti-takeover provisions could substantially impede the ability of stockholders to benefit from a change in control and, as a result, may adversely affect the market price of our common stock and your ability to realize any potential change of control premium.

Registration rights held by our initial stockholders and others may have an adverse effect on the market price of our common stock.

Certain stockholders, which include Navios Holdings and certain members of the management of Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings and Navios Partners, are entitled to demand that we register the resale of their common stock totaling 67,320,507 shares. In addition, one third-party holder has an effective resale registration statement with respect to 1,677,759 shares of common stock. If all of these stockholders exercise their registration rights with respect to all of their shares of common stock, including the effective resale registration statement, there will be an additional 68,998,266 shares of common stock eligible for trading in the public market. The presence of these additional shares may have an adverse effect on the market price of our common stock.

The New York Stock Exchange may delist our securities from quotation on its exchange, which could limit your ability to trade our securities and subject us to additional trading restrictions.

Our securities are listed on the New York Stock Exchange (the NYSE), a national securities exchange. Although we currently satisfy the NYSE minimum listing standards, which only requires that we meet certain requirements relating to stockholders' equity, number of round-lot holders, market capitalization, aggregate market value of publicly held shares and distribution requirements, we cannot assure you that our securities will continue to be listed on NYSE in

the future.

If NYSE delists our securities from trading on its exchange, we could face significant material adverse consequences, including:

a limited availability of market quotations for our securities;

a limited amount of news and analyst coverage for us;

a decreased ability for us to issue additional securities or obtain additional financing in the future;

Table of Contents

limited liquidity for our stockholders due to thin trading; and

loss of our tax exemption under Section 883 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the Code), loss of preferential capital gain tax rates for certain dividends received by certain non-corporate U.S. holders and loss of mark-to-market election by U.S. holders in the event we are treated as a passive foreign investment company (PFIC).

Risks Related to Our Indebtedness

We have substantial indebtedness and may incur substantial additional indebtedness, which could adversely affect our financial health and our ability to obtain financing in the future, react to changes in our business and make debt service payments.

We have substantial indebtedness, and we may also increase the amount of our indebtedness in the future. The terms of our credit facilities and other instruments and agreements governing our indebtedness do not prohibit us from doing so. Our substantial indebtedness could have important consequences for our stockholders.

Because of our substantial indebtedness:

our ability to obtain additional financing for working capital, capital expenditures, debt service requirements, vessel or other acquisitions or general corporate purposes may be impaired in the future;

if new debt is added to our debt levels after the vessel acquisition, the related risks that we now face would increase and we may not be able to meet all of our debt obligations;

a substantial portion of our cash flow from operations must be dedicated to the payment of principal and interest on our indebtedness, thereby reducing the funds available to us for other purposes, and there can be no assurance that our operations will generate sufficient cash flow to service this indebtedness;

we will be exposed to the risk of increased interest rates because our borrowings under the credit facilities will be at variable rates of interest;

it may be more difficult for us to satisfy our obligations to our lenders, resulting in possible defaults on and acceleration of such indebtedness;

we may be more vulnerable to general adverse economic and industry conditions;

we may be at a competitive disadvantage compared to our competitors with less debt or comparable debt at more favorable interest rates and, as a result, we may not be better positioned to withstand economic downturns;

our ability to refinance indebtedness may be limited or the associated costs may increase; and

our flexibility to adjust to changing market conditions and ability to withstand competitive pressures could be limited, or we may be prevented from carrying out capital spending that is necessary or important to our growth strategy and efforts to improve operating margins or our business.

Highly leveraged companies are significantly more vulnerable to unanticipated downturns and setbacks, whether directly related to their business or flowing from a general economic or industry condition, and therefore are more vulnerable to a business failure or bankruptcy.

The agreements and instruments governing our indebtedness and other obligations do or will contain restrictions, limitations and obligations that could significantly impact our ability to operate our business and adversely affect our stockholders.

The agreements and instruments governing our indebtedness and other commitments we enter into, including certain credit lines to our affiliates, impose certain operating and financial restrictions on us.

Table of Contents

Among other restrictions, these restrictions and our other obligations and commitments may limit our ability to:

incur or guarantee additional indebtedness or issue certain preferred stock;

create liens on our assets;

make investments;

engage in mergers and acquisitions or sell all or substantially all of our properties or assets;

redeem or repurchase capital stock, pay dividends or make other restricted payments and investments;

make capital expenditures;

change the management of our vessels or terminate the management agreements we have relating to our vessels;

enter into long-term charter arrangements without the consent of the lender;

transfer or sell any of our vessels;

enter into certain transactions with our affiliates; and

reduce our cash available for growth and other purposes.

Therefore, we will need to seek permission from our lenders in order to engage in some corporate and commercial actions that we believe would be in the best interest of our business, and a denial of permission may make it difficult for us to successfully execute our business strategy or effectively compete with companies that are not similarly restricted. Our lenders' interests may be different from our interests, and we cannot guarantee that we will be able to obtain our lenders' permission when needed. This may prevent us from taking actions that are in our best interest. Any future credit agreement may include similar or more restrictive restrictions.

Additionally, we have entered into an agreement with Navios Holdings, pursuant to which we have provided Navios Holdings with a credit facility of up to \$70.0 million. As of December 31, 2016, the amount drawn under this facility was \$50.0 million. The draw downs on the facility will limit the funds available for other purposes.

Our credit facilities contain requirements that the value of the collateral provided pursuant to the credit facilities must equal or exceed by a certain percentage the amount of outstanding borrowings under the credit facilities and that we maintain a minimum liquidity level. In addition, our credit facilities contain additional restrictive covenants, including a minimum net worth requirement and maximum total net liabilities over net assets requirement. It is an event of default under our credit facilities if such covenants are not complied with or if Navios Holdings, Ms. Angeliki Frangou, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, and their respective affiliates cease to hold a minimum percentage of our issued stock. In addition, the indenture governing the notes also contains certain provisions obligating us in certain instances to make offers to purchase outstanding notes with the net proceeds of certain sales or other dispositions of assets or upon the occurrence of an event of loss with respect to a mortgaged vessel, as defined in the indenture. Our ability to comply with the covenants and restrictions contained in our agreements and instruments governing our indebtedness may be affected by economic, financial and industry conditions and other factors beyond our control. If we are unable to comply with these covenants and restrictions, our indebtedness could be accelerated. If we are unable to repay indebtedness, our lenders could proceed against the collateral securing that indebtedness. In any such case, we may be unable to borrow under our credit facilities and may not be able to repay the amounts due under our agreements and instruments governing our indebtedness. This could have serious consequences on our financial condition and results of operations and could cause us to become bankrupt or insolvent. Our ability to comply with these covenants in future periods will also depend substantially on the value of our assets, our charter rates, our success at keeping our costs low and our ability to successfully implement our overall business strategy. Any future credit agreement or amendment or debt instrument may contain similar or more restrictive covenants.

Table of Contents

Our ability to generate the significant amount of cash needed to service our other indebtedness and our ability to refinance all or a portion of our indebtedness or obtain additional financing depends on many factors beyond our control.

Our ability to make scheduled payments on or to refinance our obligations under, our indebtedness will depend on our financial and operating performance, which, in turn, will be subject to prevailing economic and competitive conditions and to financial and business factors, many of which may be beyond our control.

We will use cash to pay the principal and interest on our indebtedness. These payments limit funds otherwise available for working capital, capital expenditures, vessel acquisitions and other purposes. As a result of these obligations, our current liabilities may exceed our current assets. We may need to take on additional indebtedness as we expand our fleet, which could increase our ratio of indebtedness to equity. The need to service our indebtedness may limit funds available for other purposes and our inability to service indebtedness in the future could lead to acceleration of our indebtedness and foreclosure on our owned vessels.

Our credit facilities mature on various dates through 2022 and our ship mortgage notes mature on November 15, 2021. In addition, borrowings under certain of the credit facilities have amortization requirements prior to final maturity. We cannot assure you that we will be able to refinance any of our indebtedness or obtain additional financing, particularly because of our anticipated high levels of indebtedness and the indebtedness incurrence restrictions imposed by the agreements governing our indebtedness, as well as prevailing market conditions.

We could face substantial liquidity problems and might be required to dispose of material assets or operations to meet our indebtedness service and other obligations. Our credit facilities, the indenture governing our notes and any future indebtedness may restrict our ability to dispose of assets and use the proceeds from any such dispositions. If we do not reinvest the proceeds of asset sales in our business (in the case of asset sales of no collateral with respect to such indebtedness) or in new vessels or other related assets that are mortgaged in favor of the lenders under our credit facilities (in the case of assets sales of collateral securing), we may be required to use the proceeds to repurchase senior indebtedness. We cannot assure you we will be able to consummate any asset sales, or if we do, what the timing of the sales will be or whether the proceeds that we realize will be adequate to meet indebtedness service obligations when due.

Most of our credit facilities require that we maintain loan to collateral value ratios in order to remain in compliance with the covenants set forth therein. If the value of such collateral falls below such required level, we would be required to either prepay the loans or post additional collateral to the extent necessary to bring the value of the collateral as compared to the aggregate principal amount of the loan back to the required level. We cannot assure you that we will have the cash on hand or the financing available to prepay the loans or have any unencumbered assets available to post as additional collateral. In such case, we would be in default under such credit facility and the collateral securing such facility would be subject to foreclosure by the applicable lenders.

An increase or continuing volatility in interest rates would increase the cost of servicing our indebtedness and could reduce our profitability, earnings and cash flow.

Amounts borrowed under our term loan facilities fluctuate with changes in LIBOR. LIBOR has been volatile, with the spread between LIBOR and the prime lending rate widening significantly at times. We may also incur indebtedness in the future with variable interest rates. As a result, an increase in market interest rates would increase the cost of servicing our indebtedness and could materially reduce our profitability, earnings and cash flows. The impact of such an increase would be more significant for us than it would be for some other companies because of our substantial indebtedness. Because the interest rates borne by our outstanding indebtedness may fluctuate with changes in LIBOR,

if this volatility were to continue, it could affect the amount of interest payable on our debt, which in turn, could have an adverse effect on our profitability, earnings and cash flow.

Table of Contents

The international nature of our operations may make the outcome of any bankruptcy proceedings difficult to predict.

We are incorporated under the laws of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and our subsidiaries are also incorporated under the laws of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Cayman Islands, Hong Kong and certain other countries other than the United States, and we conduct operations in countries around the world. Consequently, in the event of any bankruptcy, insolvency or similar proceedings involving us or one of our subsidiaries, bankruptcy laws other than those of the United States could apply. We have limited operations in the United States. If we become a debtor under the United States bankruptcy laws, bankruptcy courts in the United States may seek to assert jurisdiction over all of our assets, wherever located, including property situated in other countries. There can be no assurance, however, that we would become a debtor in the United States or that a United States bankruptcy court would be entitled to, or accept, jurisdiction over such bankruptcy case or that courts in other countries that have jurisdiction over us and our operations would recognize a United States bankruptcy court's jurisdiction if any other bankruptcy court would determine it had jurisdiction.

We may be unable to raise funds necessary to finance the change of control repurchase offer required by the indenture governing our notes.

If we experience specified changes of control, we would be required to make an offer to repurchase all of our outstanding notes (unless otherwise redeemed) at a price equal to 101% of the principal amount thereof plus accrued and unpaid interest, if any, to the repurchase date. The occurrence of specified events that could constitute a change of control will constitute a default under our credit facilities. There are also change of control events that would constitute a default under the credit facilities that would not be a change of control under the indenture. In addition, our credit facilities prohibit the purchase of notes by us in the event of a change of control, unless and until such time as the indebtedness under our credit facilities is repaid in full. As a result, following a change of control event, we would not be able to repurchase notes unless we first repay all indebtedness outstanding under our credit facilities and any of our other indebtedness that contains similar provisions; or obtain a waiver from the holders of such indebtedness to permit us to repurchase the notes. We may be unable to repay all of that indebtedness or obtain a waiver of that type. Any requirement to offer to repurchase outstanding notes may therefore require us to refinance our other outstanding debt, which we may not be able to do on commercially reasonable terms, if at all. In addition, our failure to purchase the notes after a change of control in accordance with the terms of the indenture would constitute an event of default under the indenture, which in turn would result in a default under our credit facilities.

Our inability to repay the indebtedness under our credit facilities will constitute an event of default under the indenture governing our notes, which could have materially adverse consequences to us. In the event of a change of control, we cannot assure you that we would have sufficient assets to satisfy all of our obligations under our credit facilities and the notes. Our future indebtedness may also require such indebtedness to be repurchased upon a change of control.

We may require additional financing to acquire vessels or businesses or to exercise vessel purchase options, to finance any planned growth, and such financing may not be available.

In the future, we may be required to make substantial cash outlays to exercise options or to acquire vessels or business and will need additional financing to cover all or a portion of the purchase prices. We may seek to cover the cost of such items with new debt collateralized by the vessels to be acquired, if applicable, but there can be no assurance that we will generate sufficient cash or that debt financing will be available. Moreover, the covenants in our credit facilities, the indenture or other debt may make it more difficult to obtain such financing by imposing restrictions on what we can offer as collateral.

Table of Contents**Tax Risks*****U.S. tax authorities could treat us as a passive foreign investment company, which could have adverse U.S. federal income tax consequences to U.S. holders.***

We will be treated as a passive foreign investment company, (PFIC), for U.S. federal income tax purposes if either (1) at least 75% of our gross income for any taxable year consists of certain types of passive income or (2) at least 50% of the average value of our assets produce or are held for the production of those types of passive income. For purposes of these tests, passive income includes dividends, interest, and gains from the sale or exchange of investment property and rents and royalties other than rents and royalties that are received from unrelated parties in connection with the active conduct of a trade or business. For purposes of these tests, income derived from the performance of services does not constitute passive income. U.S. stockholders of a PFIC may be subject to a disadvantageous U.S. federal income tax regime with respect to the income derived by the PFIC, the distributions they receive from the PFIC and the gain, if any, they derive from the sale or other disposition of their shares in the PFIC.

Based on our current and projected methods of operations, and an opinion of counsel, we believe that we were not a PFIC for the 2011 through 2016 taxable years (we were treated as a PFIC for the 2008 through 2010 taxable years), and we do not believe that we will be a PFIC for 2017 and subsequent taxable years. For post-2010 taxable years, our U.S. counsel, Thompson Hine LLP, is of the opinion that (1) the income we receive from the time chartering activities and assets engaged in generating such income should not be treated as passive income or assets, respectively, and (2) so long as our income from time charters exceeds 25.0% of our gross income for each taxable year after our 2010 taxable year and the value of our vessels contracted under time charters exceeds 50.0% of the average value of our assets for each taxable year after our 2010 taxable year, we should not be a PFIC for any taxable year after our 2010 taxable year. This opinion is based on representations and projections provided to our counsel by us regarding our assets, income and charters, and its validity is conditioned on the accuracy of such representations and projections.

We may have to pay tax on United States source income, which would reduce our earnings.

Under the Code, 50% of the gross transportation income of a vessel-owning or chartering corporation, such as us and our subsidiaries, that is attributable to transportation that either begins or ends, but that does not both begin and end, in the United States is characterized as U.S. Source International Transportation Income and such U.S. Source International Transportation Income is generally subject to a 4% U.S. federal income tax without allowance for deduction or, if such U.S. Source International Transportation Income is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States, U.S. federal corporate income tax (presently imposed at up to a 35.0% rate) as well as a branch profits tax (presently imposed at a 30.0% rate on effectively connected earnings), unless the non-U.S. corporation qualifies for exemption from tax under Section 883 of the Code and the treasury regulations promulgated thereunder (Treasury Regulations). In general, the exemption from U.S. federal income taxation under Section 883 of the Code provides that if a non-U.S. corporation satisfies the requirements of Section 883 of the Code and the Treasury Regulations, it will not be subject to the net basis and branch profit taxes or the 4% gross basis tax on its U.S. Source International Transportation Income.

We expect that we and each of our vessel-owning subsidiaries have qualified for this statutory tax exemption and we will take this position for U.S. federal income tax return reporting purposes for our 2016 taxable year. However, the delisting of our securities from quotation on the NYSE (or other factual circumstances beyond our control) could cause us to lose the benefit of this tax exemption and thereby become subject to U.S. federal income tax on our U.S. Source International Transportation Income. *See* Risks Related to our Common Stock and Capital Structure The New York Stock Exchange may delist our securities from quotation on its exchange, which could limit your ability to trade our securities and subject us to additional trading restrictions.

If we or our vessel-owning subsidiaries are not entitled to this exemption under Section 883 for any taxable year, we or our subsidiaries would be subject for those years to a 4% U.S. federal income tax (without allowance

Table of Contents

for deduction) on our U.S. Source International Transportation Income. The imposition of this taxation could have a negative effect on our business and would result in decreased earnings.

Other Tax Jurisdictions

In accordance with the currently applicable Greek law, foreign flagged vessels that are managed by Greek or foreign ship management companies having established an office in Greece are subject to duties towards the Greek state which are calculated on the basis of the relevant vessels' tonnage. The payment of said duties exhausts the tax liability of the foreign ship owning company and the relevant manager against any tax, duty, charge or contribution payable on income from the exploitation of the foreign flagged vessel. In case that tonnage tax and/or similar taxes/duties are paid to the vessel's flag state, these are deducted from the amount of the duty to be paid in Greece.

Item 4. Information on the Company

A. History and development of Navios Acquisition

Navios Acquisition was formed on March 14, 2008 under the laws of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and has its principal offices located at 7 Avenue de Grande Bretagne, Office 11B2, Monte Carlo, MC 98000 Monaco. Our agent for service is Trust Company of the Marshall Islands, Inc., located at Trust Company Complex, Ajeltake Island, P.O. Box 1405, Majuro, Marshall Islands MH96960.

Navios Acquisition owns a large fleet of modern crude oil, refined petroleum product and chemical tankers providing world-wide marine transportation services. The Company's strategy is to charter its vessels to international oil companies, refiners and large vessel operators under long, medium and short-term charters. The Company is committed to providing quality transportation services and developing and maintaining long-term relationships with its customers.

On July 1, 2008, Navios Acquisition completed its IPO. On May 28, 2010, Navios Acquisition consummated the vessel acquisition which constituted its initial business combination. Following such transaction, Navios Acquisition commenced its operations as an operating company.

As of December 31, 2016, Navios Holdings had 43.4% of the voting power and 46.1% of the economic interest in Navios Acquisition.

Equity Transactions

Preferred Stock

On March 30, 2011, pursuant to an Exchange Agreement Navios Holdings exchanged 7,676,000 shares of Navios Acquisition's common stock it held for 1,000 non-voting Series C Convertible Preferred Stock of Navios Acquisition. Each holder of shares of Series C Convertible Preferred Stock shall be entitled at their option at any time, after March 31, 2013 to convert all or any of the outstanding shares of Series C Convertible Preferred Stock into a number of fully paid and non-assessable shares of Common Stock determined by multiplying each share of Series C Convertible Preferred Stock to be converted by 7,676, subject to certain limitations. Upon the declaration of a common stock dividend, the holders of the Series C Convertible Preferred Stock are entitled to receive dividends on the Series C Convertible Preferred Stock in an amount equal to the amount that would have been received in the

number of shares of Common Stock into which the Shares of Series C Convertible Preferred Stock held by each holder thereof could be converted. For the purpose of calculating earnings / (loss) per share this preferred stock is treated as in-substance common stock and is allocated income / (losses) and considered in the diluted calculation.

On September 17, 2010, Navios Acquisition issued 3,000 shares of the Company's authorized Series A Convertible Preferred Stock to an independent third party as a consideration for certain consulting and advisory

Table of Contents

fees related to the VLCC acquisition. The preferred stock has no voting rights, is only convertible into shares of common stock and does not participate in dividends until such time as the shares are converted into common stock. The Series A shares of preferred stock were fully converted to common stock that was issued on March 11, 2016.

On October 29, 2010, Navios Acquisition issued 540 shares of the Company's authorized Series B Convertible Preferred Stock to the seller of the two LR1 product tankers. The preferred stock contained a 2% per annum dividend payable quarterly starting on January 1, 2011 and upon declaration by the Company's Board commenced payment on March 31, 2011. The preferred stock did not have any voting rights. On June 30, 2015, 162 shares of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock (being 30% of the 540 shares originally issued), with nominal value of \$10 per share, were mandatorily converted into 64,800 shares of common stock at a conversion ratio of 1:25. On October 27, 2015, the remaining 378 shares of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock (being 70% of the 540 shares originally issued), with nominal value of \$10 per share, were converted into 108,000 shares of common stock at a conversion ratio of 1:35.

The Company was authorized to issue up to 10,000,000 shares of \$0.0001 par value preferred stock in total with such designations, voting and other rights and preferences as may be determined from time to time by the Board of Directors.

As of December 31, 2016, the Company's issued and outstanding preferred stock consisted of the 1,000 Series C Convertible Preferred Stock. As of December 31, 2015, the Company's issued and outstanding preferred stock consisted of the 1,000 Series C Convertible Preferred Stock and the 3,000 Series A Convertible Preferred Stock.

On each of August 31, 2012, October 31, 2012, February 13, 2013 and April 24, 2013, Navios Acquisition issued 300 shares of its authorized Series D Convertible Preferred Stock (nominal and fair value \$3,000) to a shipyard, in partial settlement of the purchase price of each of the newbuilding LR1 product tankers, Nave Cassiopeia, Nave Cetus, Nave Atropos and Nave Rigel. The preferred stock includes a 6% per annum dividend payable quarterly, starting one year after delivery of each vessel. The Series D Convertible Preferred Stock mandatorily converted into shares of common stock 30 months after issuance at a price per share of common stock equal to \$10.00. The holder of the preferred stock shall have the right to convert such shares of preferred stock into common stock prior to the scheduled maturity dates at a price of \$7.00 per share of common stock. The Series D Convertible Preferred Stock does not have any voting rights. Navios Acquisition is obligated to redeem the Series D Convertible Preferred Stock (or converted common shares) at their nominal value of \$10.00 at the holder's option. Beginning 18 months and no later than 60 months after the issuance of the preferred stock, the holder can exercise the option to request the redemption of up to 250 shares of preferred stock (or such number that has been converted to common shares) on a quarterly basis.

The fair value was determined using a combination of the Black-Scholes model and discounted projected cash flows for the conversion option and put, respectively. The model used takes into account the credit spread of Navios Acquisition, the volatility of its stock, as well as the price of its stock at the issuance date. The convertible preferred stock was classified as temporary equity (i.e., apart from permanent equity) as a result of the redemption feature upon exercise of the put option granted to the holder of the preferred stock.

During 2015, Navios Acquisition redeemed, at certain dates through the holder's put option, 400 shares of the Series D Convertible Preferred Stock and paid cash of \$4.0 million in total to the holder upon redemption.

In addition at certain dates in 2015, 800 shares of Series D Convertible Preferred Stock were mandatorily converted into 800,000 shares of common stock. In conjunction with these conversions, the 800,000 shares of common stock were reclassified to puttable common stock within temporary equity, as a result of an embedded put option of the holder for up to 30 months after the conversion date.

Table of Contents

As of each of December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015, no shares of Series D Convertible Preferred Stock were outstanding.

Common Stock and puttable common stock

On February 20, 2014, Navios Acquisition completed the public offering of 14,950,000 shares of its common stock at \$3.85 per share, raising gross proceeds of \$57.6 million. These figures include 1,950,000 shares sold pursuant to the underwriters' option, which was exercised in full. Total net proceeds of the above transactions, net of agents' costs of \$3.0 million and offering costs of \$0.3 million, amounted to \$54.3 million.

On June 30, 2015, 162 shares of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock were converted into 64,800 shares of common stock.

On October 27, 2015, 378 shares of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock were mandatorily converted into 108,000 shares of common stock.

As discussed above, during 2015, 800 shares of Series D Convertible Preferred Stock were mandatorily converted into 800,000 shares of puttable common stock. In addition, in certain dates during 2015, Navios Acquisition redeemed, through the holder's put option, 150,000 shares of the puttable common stock and paid cash of \$1.5 million in total to the holder upon redemption.

Under the share repurchase program, for up to \$50.0 million, approved and authorized by the Board of Directors, Navios Acquisition has repurchased 2,704,752 shares for a total cost of approximately \$9.9 million, as of December 31, 2015. The share repurchase program expired in December 2016.

On March 11, 2016, 1,200,000 shares of common stock were issued subsequent to the conversion of 3,000 shares of Series A Convertible Preferred Stock.

During 2016, Navios Acquisition redeemed, through the holder's put option, 400,000 shares of the puttable common stock and paid cash of \$4.0 million to the holder upon redemption.

As of December 31, 2016, the Company was authorized to issue 250,000,000 shares of \$0.0001 par value common stock of which, 150,582,990 were issued and outstanding. As of December 31, 2016, 250,000 shares of puttable common stock were outstanding.

On January 17, 2017, Navios Acquisition redeemed, through the holder's put option, 100,000 shares of the puttable common stock and paid cash of \$1.0 million to the holder upon redemption.

Vessel Deliveries, Acquisitions and Sales

Acquisition of vessels

2015

On January 8, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Sextans, a newbuilding, 49,999 dwt, MR2 product tanker, from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$33.4 million. Cash paid was \$17.8 million and \$15.6 million was transferred from vessel deposits.

Edgar Filing: Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP - Form 20-F

On February 11, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Velocity, a newbuilding, 49,999 dwt, MR2 product tanker, from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$39.2 million. Cash paid was \$12.6 million and \$26.6 million was transferred from vessel deposits.

On November 6, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Spherical, a 2009-built, 297,188 dwt VLCC, from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$69.2 million.

Table of Contents

On December 2, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Photon, a 2008-built, 297,395 dwt VLCC from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$65.2 million.

Disposal of vessels

2016

On January 27, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Lucida to an unaffiliated third party for net cash proceeds of \$18.4 million. The gain on sale of the vessel, upon write-off of the unamortized dry-docking, was \$2.3 million.

On October 4, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Universe to an unaffiliated third party for net cash proceeds of \$35.8 million. As of June 30, 2016, the vessel was classified as held for sale as the relevant criteria for the classification were met. The gain on sale of the vessel was \$4.8 million.

On November 15, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Constellation to an unaffiliated third party for net cash proceeds of \$35.8 million. As of June 30, 2016, the vessel was classified as held for sale as the relevant criteria for the classification were met. The gain on sale of the vessel was \$4.6 million.

2015

On June 18, 2015, Navios Midstream exercised its option to acquire the shares of the vessel-owning subsidiaries of the Nave Celeste, a 2003-built of 298,717 dwt VLCC, and the C. Dream, a 2000 built VLCC of 298,570 dwt, from Navios Acquisition for an aggregate sale price of \$100.0 million. The sale price consisted of \$73.0 million cash consideration and the issuance of 1,592,920 Subordinated Series A Units to Navios Acquisition.

B. Business Overview

Introduction

Navios Acquisition owns a large fleet of modern crude oil, refined petroleum product and chemical tankers providing worldwide marine transportation services. Our strategy is to charter our vessels to international oil companies, refiners and large vessel operators under long, medium and short-term charters. We are committed to providing quality transportation services and developing and maintaining long-term relationships with our customers. We believe that the Navios brand will allow us to take advantage of increasing global environmental concerns that have created a demand in the petroleum products/crude oil seaborne transportation industry for vessels and operators that are able to conform to the stringent environmental standards currently being imposed throughout the world.

Table of Contents**Navios Acquisition's Fleet**

As of April 4, 2017, our fleet consisted of a total of 36 double-hulled tanker vessels, aggregating approximately 3.9 million deadweight tons, or dwt. The fleet includes eight VLCC tankers (over 200,000 dwt per ship), which transport crude oil, eight Long Range 1 (LR1) product tankers (60,000-79,999 dwt per ship), 18 Medium Range 2 (MR2) product tankers (30,000-59,999 dwt per ship) and two chemical tankers (25,000 dwt per ship), which transport refined petroleum products and bulk liquid chemicals. All our vessels are currently chartered-out to high-quality counterparties, including affiliates of Shell, Navig8 and Mansel, with an average remaining charter period of approximately one year. As of April 4, 2017, we had charters covering 84.3% of available days in 2017 and 23.0% of available days in 2018.

Vessels	Type	Built/ Delivery Date	DWT	Net Charter Rate ⁽¹⁾	Profit Sharing	Expiration Date ⁽²⁾
Owned Vessels						
Nave Polaris	Chemical Tanker	2011	25,145	Floating Rate ⁽⁸⁾	None	June 2017
Nave Cosmos	Chemical Tanker	2010	25,130	Floating Rate ⁽⁸⁾	None	June 2017
Nave Velocity	MR2 Product Tanker	2015	49,999	\$ 13,825	None	July 2017
				\$ 11,850 ⁽¹⁹⁾	50%/50%	July 2018
Nave Sextans	MR2 Product Tanker	2015	49,999	\$ 16,294	None	January 2018
Nave Pyxis	MR2 Product Tanker	2014	49,998	\$ 16,294	None	February 2018
Nave Luminosity	MR2 Product Tanker	2014	49,999	\$ 14,072	50%/50%	September 2017
				\$ 11,850 ⁽¹⁹⁾	50%/50%	September 2018
Nave Jupiter	MR2 Product Tanker	2014	49,999	\$ 15,306	50%/50%	May 2017
				\$ 11,850 ⁽¹⁹⁾	50%/50%	May 2018
Bougainville	MR2 Product Tanker	2013	50,626	\$ 16,296 ⁽⁵⁾	100%	September 2017
Nave Alderamin	MR2 Product Tanker	2013	49,998	\$ 12,675 ⁽¹⁶⁾	None	February 2018
Nave Bellatrix	MR2 Product Tanker	2013	49,999	\$ 12,838 ⁽¹⁷⁾	None	December 2017
Nave Capella	MR2 Product Tanker	2013	49,995	\$ 12,739 ⁽¹¹⁾	None	June 2017
Nave Orion	MR2 Product Tanker	2013	49,999	\$ 12,675 ⁽¹⁸⁾	None	March 2018
Nave Titan	MR2 Product Tanker	2013	49,999	\$ 15,306	50%/50%	June 2017
Nave Aquila	MR2 Product Tanker	2012	49,991	\$ 11,356 ⁽³⁾	None	May 2017
Nave Atria	MR2 Product Tanker	2012	49,992	\$ 14,813	50%/50%	July 2017
Nave Orbit	MR2 Product Tanker	2009	50,470	\$ 17,750 ⁽¹⁴⁾	None	November 2017
Nave Equator	MR2 Product Tanker	2009	50,542	\$ 17,000	None	October 2017
Nave Equinox	MR2 Product Tanker	2007	50,922	\$ 11,603 ⁽¹⁵⁾	ice-transit premium ⁽⁴⁾	November 2017
Nave Pulsar	MR2 Product Tanker	2007	50,922	\$ 15,306	50%/50% and ice-transit premium ⁽⁴⁾	April 2017
				\$ 11,973/	50%/50% and	January 2018/
				\$ 12,344	ice-transit premium ⁽²²⁾	October 2018
Nave Dorado	MR2 Product Tanker	2005	47,999	\$ 12,245 ⁽²⁰⁾	None	January 2018

Edgar Filing: Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP - Form 20-F

Nave Atropos	LR1 Product Tanker	2013	74,695	Floating Rate ⁽¹³⁾	None	October 2019
Nave Rigel	LR1 Product Tanker	2013	74,673	\$ 18,022	50%/50%	August 2019
Nave Cassiopeia	LR1 Product Tanker	2012	74,711	Floating Rate ⁽¹³⁾	None	February 2019
Nave Cetus	LR1 Product Tanker	2012	74,581	\$ 18,022	50%/50%	April 2019
Nave Estella	LR1 Product Tanker	2012	75,000	\$ 13,260 ⁽²¹⁾	None	March 2018
Nave Andromeda	LR1 Product Tanker	2011	75,000	\$ 12,640 ⁽⁶⁾	None	June 2017
Nave Ariadne	LR1 Product Tanker	2007	74,671	\$ 17,775	50%/50%	May 2018
Nave Cielo	LR1 Product Tanker	2007	74,671	\$ 17,775	50%/50%	May 2018
Nave Buena Suerte ⁽¹⁰⁾	VLCC					August 2017
		2011	297,491	Floating Rate ⁽¹²⁾	None	
Nave Quasar	VLCC	2010	297,376	Floating Rate ⁽⁷⁾	None	March 2018
Nave Synergy	VLCC	2010	299,973	Floating Rate ⁽⁷⁾	None	February 2018
Nave Galactic	VLCC	2009	297,168	Floating Rate ⁽⁹⁾	None	September 2017
Nave Spherical	VLCC	2009	297,188	\$ 41,475	None	November 2017
Nave Neutrino ⁽¹⁰⁾	VLCC	2003	298,287	\$ 37,520	None	September 2017
Nave Electron ⁽¹⁰⁾	VLCC	2002	305,178	Floating Rate ⁽⁷⁾	None	December 2017
Nave Photon	VLCC	2008	297,395	\$ 40,488	None	December 2017

Table of Contents

- (1) Net time charter-out rate per day (net of commissions), presented in USD.
- (2) Estimated dates assuming the midpoint of the redelivery period by charterers, including owner's extension options not declared yet.
- (3) Charterer's option to extend the charter for 6 months at \$12,344 net per day.
- (4) Profit sharing based on a formula which incorporates a premium when vessels are trading in ice. The premium for Nave Pulsar is based on pool results. For the Nave Equinox the premium is \$1,481 net per day for the first 12 months and \$1,728 net per day for the six month optional period.
- (5) Rate can reach a maximum of \$21,302 net per day calculated based on a formula. Both rate and ceiling increase by 2% annually.
- (6) Charterer's option to extend the charter for six months at \$13,134 net per day and another six months at \$14,615 net per day.
- (7) Rate based on VLCC pool earnings.
- (8) Rate based on chemical tankers pool earnings.
- (9) Rate is based upon daily BTR TD3. Navios Acquisition will receive 100% of the index rate up to \$41,969 net per day, 90% of the index rate from \$41,969 net per day to \$44,438 net per day and 50% of any amount in excess of \$44,438 net per day. The contract provides for a minimum rate of \$29,625 net per day and \$27,156 net per day for the last nine months of the contract.
- (10) Navios Acquisition has granted an option to Navios Midstream to purchase the vessel from Navios Acquisition at fair market value. The options are extended for an additional two-year period expiring on November 18, 2018.
- (11) Charterer's option to extend for six months at \$13,825 net per day.
- (12) Rate is based upon daily BTR TD3. Navios Acquisition will receive 100% of the index rate up to \$41,969 net per day, 90% up until \$44,438 net per day and 50% of any amount in excess of \$44,438 net per day. The contract provides a minimum rate of \$19,750 net per day.
- (13) Rate based on LR1 pool earnings.
- (14) Charterer's option to extend for two years at \$20,500 net per day.
- (15) Charterer's option to extend for six months at \$13,084 net per day.
- (16) Charterer's option to extend the charter for one year at \$13,650 net per day.
- (17) Charterer's option to extend the charter for one year at \$14,319 net per day.
- (18) Charterer's option to extend the charter for one year at \$13,894 net per day.
- (19) Charterer's option to extend the charter for one year at \$13,331 net per day.
- (20) Charterer's option to extend the charter for six months at \$13,529 net per day.
- (21) Charterer's option to extend the charter for one year at \$14,625 net per day.
- (22) The premium for Nave Pulsar when vessel is trading on ice is \$1,975 net per day. Charterer's option to extend the charter for one year at \$13,455 net per day.

Competitive Strengths

We believe that the following strengths will allow us to maintain a competitive advantage within the international shipping market:

Modern, High Quality Fleet. We own a large fleet of modern, high quality double hull tankers that are designed for enhanced safety and low operating costs. We believe that the increased enforcement of stringent environmental standards currently being imposed throughout the world has resulted in a shift in major charterers' preference towards greater use of modern double hull vessels. We also have a large proportion of young product and chemical tankers in our fleet. Since our inception, we have committed to and have fully

financed investments of over \$2.1 billion, including investments of approximately \$0.8 billion in newbuilding constructions. As of April 4, 2017, our fleet had an average age of approximately 6.2 years. We believe that owning and maintaining a modern, high quality fleet reduces off hire time and operating costs, improves safety and environmental performance and provides us with a competitive advantage in securing employment for our vessels.

Table of Contents

Operating Visibility Through Contracted Revenues. All of the vessels that we have taken delivery of as of April 4, 2017, are chartered out with an average remaining charter period of approximately one year, and we believe our existing charter coverage provides us with predictable, contracted revenues and operating visibility. As of April 4, 2017, we had charters covering 84.3% of available days in 2017 and 23.0% of available days in 2018. The charter arrangements for our eight VLCC tankers, eight contracted LR1 tankers, 18 MR2 product tankers and two chemical tankers are expected to generate \$159.1 million in 2017, and \$32.5 million in 2018 of aggregate contracted net charter revenue, exclusive of any profit sharing.

Diversified Fleet. Our diversified fleet, which includes VLCC, product and chemical tankers, allows us to serve our customers' international crude oil, petroleum product and liquid bulk chemical transportation needs. VLCC tankers transport crude oil and operate on primarily long haul trades from the Arabian Gulf or West Africa to the Far East, North America and Europe. Product tankers transport a large number of different refined oil products, such as naphtha, gasoline, kerosene, jetfuel and gasoil, and principally operate on short to medium haul routes. Chemical tankers transport primarily organic and inorganic chemicals, vegetable oils and animal fats. We believe that our fleet of vessels servicing the crude oil, product and chemical tanker transportation sectors provides us with more balanced exposure to oil and commodities and more diverse opportunities to generate revenues than would a focus on any single shipping sector.

High Quality Counterparties. Our strategy is to charter our vessels to international oil companies, refiners and large vessel operators under long, medium and short term charters. We are committed to providing safe and quality transportation services and developing and maintaining long term relationships with our customers, and we believe that our modern fleet will allow us to charter out our vessels to what management views as high quality counterparties and for long periods of time. Our current charterers include: Shell, one of the largest global groups of energy and petrochemical companies, operating in over 90 countries; Navig8, a company that controls a substantial fleet of product tankers; Vitol, a major oil trader, trading over 5 million barrels of crude and product per day, Chevron, one of the world's leading integrated energy companies and Saudi Aramco, the state owned oil company of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

An Experienced Management Team and a Strong Brand. We have an experienced management team that we believe is well regarded in the shipping industry. The members of our management team have considerable experience in the shipping and financial industries. We also believe that we will be able to leverage the management structure at our affiliate, Navios Holdings, which benefits from a reputation for reliability and performance and operational experience in both the tanker and drybulk markets. Our management team is led by Angeliki Frangou, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, who has over 25 years of experience in the shipping industry. Ms. Frangou is also the Chairman & Chief Executive Officer of Navios Holdings, Navios Partners and Navios Midstream and has been a Chief Executive Officer of various shipping and finance companies in the past. Ms. Frangou is a member of a number of recognized shipping committees. We believe that our well respected management team and strong brand may present us with market opportunities not afforded to other industry participants.

Business Strategy

We seek to generate predictable and growing cash flow through the following:

Strategically Manage Sector Exposure. We operate a fleet of crude carriers and product and chemical tankers, which we believe provides us with diverse opportunities with a range of producers and consumers. As we grow our fleet, we expect to adjust our relative emphasis among the crude oil, product and chemical tanker sectors according to our view of the relative opportunities in these sectors. We believe that having a mixed fleet of tankers provides the flexibility to adapt to changing market conditions and will allow us to capitalize on sector specific opportunities through varying economic cycles.

Table of Contents

Enhance Operating Visibility With Charter-Out Strategy. We believe that we are a safe, cost-efficient operator of modern and well-maintained tankers. We also believe that these attributes, together with our strategy of proactively working towards meeting our customers' chartering needs, will contribute to our ability to attract leading charterers as customers and to our success in obtaining attractive long-term charters. We will also seek profit sharing arrangements in our time charters, to provide us with potential incremental revenue above the contracted minimum charter rates. Depending on the then applicable market conditions, we intend to deploy our vessels to leading charterers on a mix of long, medium and short-term time charters, with a greater emphasis on long-term charters and profit sharing. We believe that this chartering strategy will afford us opportunities to capture increased profits during strong charter markets, while benefiting from the relatively stable cash flows and high utilization rates associated with longer-term time charters. As of April 4, 2017, we had charters covering 84.3% of available days in 2017 and 23.0% of available days in 2018.

Actively Manage our Fleet to Maximize Return on Capital over Market Cycles. We plan to actively manage the size and composition of our fleet through opportunistic acquisitions and dispositions as part of our effort to achieve above-market returns on capital for our vessel assets. Using Navios Holdings' global network of relationships and extensive experience in the maritime transportation industry, coupled with its commercial, financial and operational expertise, we plan to opportunistically grow our fleet through the timely and selective acquisition of high-quality newbuilding or secondhand vessels when we believe those acquisitions will result in attractive returns on invested capital and increased cash flow. We also intend to engage in opportunistic dispositions where we can achieve attractive values for our vessels as we assess the market cycle. We believe our diverse and versatile fleet, combined with the experience and long-standing relationships of Navios Holdings with participants in the maritime transportation industry, position us to identify and take advantage of attractive acquisition opportunities.

Leverage the Experience, Brand, Network and Relationships of Navios Holdings. We intend to capitalize on the global network of relationships that Navios Holdings has developed during its long history of investing and operating in the marine transportation industry. This includes decades-long relationships with leading charterers, financing sources and key shipping industry players. When charter markets and vessel prices are depressed and vessel financing is difficult to obtain we believe the relationships and experience of Navios Holdings and its management enhances our ability to acquire young, technically advanced vessels at cyclically low prices and employ them under attractive charters with leading charterers. Navios Holdings' long involvement and reputation for reliability in the Asia Pacific region have also allowed it to develop privileged relationships with many of the largest institutions in Asia. Through its established reputation and relationships, Navios Holdings has had access to opportunities not readily available to most other industry participants that lack Navios Holdings' brand recognition, credibility and track record.

Benefit from Navios Holdings' Risk Management Practices and Corporate Managerial Support. Risk management requires the balancing of a number of factors in a cyclical and potentially volatile environment. In part, this requires a view of the overall health of the market, as well as an understanding of capital costs and returns. Navios Holdings actively engages in assessing financial and other risks associated with fluctuating market rates, fuel prices, credit risks, interest rates and foreign exchange rates. Navios Holdings closely monitors credit exposure to charterers and other counterparties and has established policies designed to ensure that contracts are entered into with counterparties that have appropriate credit history. Navios Holdings has strict guidelines and policies that are designed to evaluate credit exposure. We believe that

Navios Acquisition benefits from these established policies.

Sustain a Competitive Cost Structure. Pursuant to our management agreement with the Manager, a wholly owned subsidiary of Navios Holdings, the Manager coordinates and oversees the commercial, technical and administrative management of our fleet. The current technical managers of some of the VLCC vessels, affiliates of the seller of the vessels acquired as part of the VLCC Acquisition are

Table of Contents

technical ship management companies that have provided technical management to the VLCC vessels acquired during the VLCC Acquisition prior to the consummation of the acquisition thereof. These technical managers will continue to provide such services for an interim period, after which the technical management of our fleet is expected to be provided solely by the Manager. We believe that the Manager will be able to do so at rates competitive with those that would be available to us through independent vessel management companies. For example, pursuant to our amended management agreement with Navios Holdings, management fees of our vessels are fixed through May 2018. We believe this external management arrangement will enhance the scalability of our business by allowing us to grow our fleet without incurring significant additional overhead costs. We believe that we will be able to leverage the economies of scale of Navios Holdings and manage operating, maintenance and corporate costs. At the same time, we believe the young age and high-quality of the vessels in our fleet, coupled with Navios Holdings' safety and environmental record, will position us favorably within the crude oil, product and chemical tanker transportation sectors with our customers and for future business opportunities.

Our Customers

We provide or will provide seaborne shipping services under charters with customers that we believe are creditworthy.

Our major customers during 2016 were: Navig8, Shell and Mansel. For the year ended December 31, 2016, these three customers accounted for 33.0%, 20.0% and 14.7%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition's revenue.

Our major customers during 2015 were: Navig8, Shell and Mansel. For the year ended December 31, 2015, these three customers accounted for 35.2%, 13.6% and 10.8%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition's revenue.

Our major customers during 2014 were: Dalian Ocean Shipping Co. (DOSCO) and Navig8. For the year ended December 31, 2014, these two customers accounted for 22.4% and 28.8%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition's revenue.

Although we believe that if any one of our charters were terminated we could re-charter the related vessel at the prevailing market rate relatively quickly, the permanent loss of a significant customer or a substantial decline in the amount of services requested by a significant customer could harm our business, financial condition and results of operations if we were unable to re-charter our vessel on a favorable basis due to then-current market conditions, or otherwise.

Competition

The market for international seaborne crude oil transportation services is fragmented and highly competitive. Seaborne crude oil transportation services generally are provided by two main types of operators: major oil company captive fleets (both private and state-owned) and independent ship owner fleets. In addition, several owners and operators pool their vessels together on an ongoing basis, and such pools are available to customers to the same extent as independently owned and operated fleets. Many major oil companies and other oil trading companies also operate their own vessels and use such vessels not only to transport their own crude oil but also to transport crude oil for third party charterers in direct competition with independent owners and operators in the tanker charter market. Competition for charters is intense and is based upon price, location, size, age, condition and acceptability of the vessel and its manager. Due in part to the fragmented tanker market, competitors with greater resources could enter the tanker market and operate larger fleets through acquisitions or consolidations and may be willing or able to accept lower prices than us, which could result in our achieving lower revenues from our vessels. See Risk Factors Our growth depends on our ability to obtain customers, for which we face substantial competition. In the highly competitive tanker industry, we may not be able to compete for charters with new entrants or established companies

with greater resources, which may adversely affect our results of operations.

Table of Contents

Time Charters

A time charter is a contract for the use of a vessel for a fixed period of time at a specified daily rate. Under a time charter, the vessel owner provides crewing and other services related to the vessel's operation, the cost of which is included in the daily rate and the customer is responsible for substantially all of the vessel voyage costs. Most of the vessels in our fleet are hired out under time charters, and we intend to continue to hire out our vessels under time charters. The following discussion describes the material terms common to all of our time charters.

Base Hire Rate

Base hire rate refers to the basic payment from the customer for the use of the vessel. The hire rate is generally payable monthly, in advance on the first day of each month, in U.S. Dollars as specified in the charter.

Off-hire

When the vessel is off-hire, the charterer generally is not required to pay the base hire rate, and we are responsible for all costs. Prolonged off-hire may lead to vessel substitution or termination of the time charter. A vessel generally will be deemed off-hire if there is a loss of time due to, among other things:

operational deficiencies; drydocking for repairs, maintenance or inspection; equipment breakdowns; or delays due to accidents, crewing strikes, certain vessel detentions or similar problems; or

the shipowner's failure to maintain the vessel in compliance with its specifications and contractual standards or to provide the required crew.

Under some of our charters, the charterer is permitted to terminate the time charter if the vessel is off-hire for an extended period, which is generally defined as a period of 90 or more consecutive off-hire days.

Termination

We are generally entitled to suspend performance under the time charters covering our vessels if the customer defaults in its payment obligations. Under some of our time charters, either party may terminate the charter in the event of war in specified countries or in locations that would significantly disrupt the free trade of the vessel. Some of our time charters covering our vessels require us to return to the charterer, upon the loss of the vessel, all advances paid by the charterer but not earned by us.

Pooling Arrangements

For vessels operating in pooling arrangements, the Company earns a portion of total revenues generated by the pool, net of expenses incurred by the pool. The amount allocated to each pool participant vessel, including the Company's vessels, is determined in accordance with an agreed-upon formula, which is determined by the margins awarded to each vessel in the pool based on the vessel's age, design and other performance characteristics. Revenue under pooling arrangements is accounted for on the accrual basis and is recognized when an agreement with the pool exists, price is fixed, service is provided and the collectability is reasonably assured.

Expenses

Management fees: Pursuant to the Management Agreement dated May 28, 2010 and as amended in May 2012 and May 2014, the Manager provided commercial and technical management services to Navios Acquisition's vessels for a fixed daily fee of: (a) \$6,000 per MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel; (b) \$7,000 per LR1 product tanker vessel; and (c) \$9,500 per VLCC, through May 2016.

Table of Contents

Pursuant to an amendment to the Management Agreement dated as of May 19, 2016, Navios Acquisition fixed the fees for commercial and technical ship management services of its fleet for two additional years from May 29, 2016, through May 2018, at a daily fee of: (a) \$6,350 per MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel; (b) \$7,150 per LR1 product tanker vessel; and (c) \$9,500 per VLCC.

Dry docking expenses are reimbursed by Navios Acquisition at cost.

Total management fees for each of the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014 amounted to \$97.9 million, \$95.3 million and \$95.8 million, respectively.

General and administrative expenses: On May 28, 2010, Navios Acquisition entered into an Administrative Services Agreement with Navios Holdings, pursuant to which Navios Holdings provides certain administrative management services to Navios Acquisition which include: bookkeeping, audit and accounting services, legal and insurance services, administrative and clerical services, banking and financial services, advisory services, client and investor relations and other services. Navios Holdings is reimbursed for reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the provision of these services. In May 2014, Navios Acquisition extended the duration of its existing Administrative Services Agreement with Navios Holdings, until May 2020.

For each of the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014 the expense arising from administrative services rendered by Navios Holdings amounted to \$9.4 million, \$7.6 million and \$7.3 million, respectively.

Management of Ship Operations, Administration and Safety

Navios Holdings provides, through a wholly owned subsidiary, expertise in various functions critical to our operations. Pursuant to the Management Agreement and an Administrative Services Agreement with Navios Holdings, we have access to human resources, financial and other administrative functions, including:

bookkeeping, audit and accounting services;

administrative and clerical services;

banking and financial services; and

client and investor relations.

Technical management services are also provided, including:

commercial management of the vessel;

vessel maintenance and crewing;

purchasing and insurance; and

shipyard supervision.

For more information on the Management Agreement and the Administrative Services Agreement we have with Navios Holdings, please read Item 7. Major Stockholders and Related Party Transactions .

Oil Company Tanker Vetting Process

Traditionally there have been relatively few charterers in the oil transportation business and that part of the industry has been undergoing consolidation. The so called oil majors, such as Exxon Mobil, BP p.l.c., Royal Dutch Shell plc., Chevron, ConocoPhillips and Total S.A., together with a few smaller companies, represent a significant percentage of the production, trading and, especially, seaborne transportation of crude oil and refined petroleum products worldwide. Concerns about the environment have led oil majors to develop and implement a strict due diligence process, known as vetting, when selecting vessels and considering their managers. Vetting

Table of Contents

has evolved into a sophisticated and comprehensive assessment of both the vessel and the vessel manager. While numerous factors are considered and evaluated prior to a commercial decision, the oil majors, through their association, Oil Companies International Marine Forum (OCIMF), have developed two basic tools: the Ship Inspection Report program, which is known as SIRE, and the Tanker Management & Self Assessment program, which is known as TMSA. The former is a physical ship inspection based upon a thorough vessel inspection questionnaire and performed by accredited OCIMF inspectors, resulting in a report being logged on SIRE, while the latter is a recent addition to the risk assessment tools used by the oil majors. Based upon commercial risk, there are three levels of assessment used by oil majors:

terminal use, which clears a vessel to call at one of the oil major's terminals;

voyage charter, which clears the vessel for a single voyage; and

period charter, which clears the vessel for use for an extended period of time.

The depth and complexity of each of these levels of assessment varies. Each charter agreement for our vessels requires that the applicable vessel have a valid SIRE report (less than six months old) in the OCIMF website as recommended by OCIMF. In addition, under the terms of the charter agreements, the charterers require that our vessels and their technical managers be vetted and approved to transport crude oil or refined petroleum products (as applicable). The technical manager is responsible for obtaining and maintaining the vetting approvals required to successfully charter our vessels.

Governmental and Other Regulations

Sources of applicable rules and standards

Shipping is one of the world's most heavily regulated industries, and, in addition, it is subject to many industry standards. Government regulation significantly affects the ownership and operation of vessels. These regulations consist mainly of rules and standards established by international conventions, but they also include national, state, and local laws and regulations in force in jurisdictions where vessels may operate or are registered, and which are commonly more stringent than international rules and standards. This is the case particularly in the United States and, increasingly, in Europe.

A variety of governmental and private entities subject vessels to both scheduled and unscheduled inspections. These entities include local port authorities (the U.S. Coast Guard, harbor masters or equivalent entities), classification societies, flag state administration (country vessel of registry), and charterers, particularly terminal operators. Certain of these entities require vessel owners to obtain permits, licenses, and certificates for the operation of their vessels. Failure to maintain necessary permits or approvals could require a vessel owner to incur substantial costs or temporarily suspend operation of one or more of its vessels.

Heightened levels of environmental and quality concerns among insurance underwriters, regulators, and charterers continue to lead to greater inspection and safety requirements on all vessels and may accelerate the scrapping of older vessels throughout the industry. Increasing environmental concerns have created a demand for vessels that conform to stricter environmental standards. Vessel owners are required to maintain operating standards for all vessels that will emphasize operational safety, quality maintenance, continuous training of officers and crews and compliance with

U.S. and international regulations.

Ship safety regulation

The International Maritime Organization, or IMO, has adopted a number of international conventions concerned with ship safety and with preventing, reducing or controlling pollution from ships. These fall into two main categories, consisting firstly of those concerned generally with ship safety standards, and secondly of those specifically concerned with measures to prevent pollution.

Table of Contents

In the former category the primary international instrument is the Safety of Life at Sea Convention of 1974, as amended, or SOLAS, together with the regulations and codes of practice that form part of its regime. Much of SOLAS is not directly concerned with preventing pollution, but some of its safety provisions are intended to prevent pollution as well as promote safety of life and preservation of property. These regulations have been and continue to be regularly amended as new and higher safety standards are introduced with which we are required to comply.

An amendment of SOLAS introduced the International Safety Management (ISM) Code, which has been effective since July 1998. Under the ISM Code the party with operational control of a vessel is required to develop an extensive safety management system that includes, among other things, the adoption of a safety and environmental protection policy setting forth instructions and procedures for operating its vessels safely and describing procedures for responding to emergencies. The ISM Code requires that vessel operators obtain a safety management certificate for each vessel they operate. This certificate evidences compliance by a vessel's management with code requirements for a safety management system. No vessel can obtain a certificate unless its manager has been awarded a document of compliance, issued by the flag state for the vessel, under the ISM Code. Noncompliance with the ISM Code and other IMO regulations, such as the mandatory ship energy efficiency management plan (SEEMP) which is akin to a safety management plan and came into effect on January 1, 2013, may subject a ship owner to increased liability, may lead to decreases in available insurance coverage for affected vessels, and may result in the denial of access to, or detention in, some ports. For example, the United States Coast Guard and European Union authorities have indicated that vessels not in compliance with the ISM Code will be prohibited from trading in ports in the United States and European Union. Each vessel's certificate evidencing compliance with the ISM Code and the ISPS Code, described below, must be periodically renewed and compliance must be periodically verified.

Security Regulations

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, there have been a variety of initiatives intended to enhance vessel security. In 2002, Marine Transportation Security Act (MTSA) came into effect. To implement certain portions of the MTSA, in 2003, the U.S. Coast Guard issued regulations requiring the implementation of certain security requirements aboard vessels operating in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Similarly, in 2002, amendments to SOLAS imposed various detailed security obligations on vessels and port authorities, most of which are contained in the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (ISPS Code). Among the various requirements are:

on-board installation of automatic information systems to enhance vessel-to-vessel and vessel-to-shore communications;

on-board installation of ship security alert systems;

the development of vessel security plans; and

compliance with flag state security certification requirements.

The U.S. Coast Guard regulations, intended to be aligned with international maritime security standards, exempt non-U.S. vessels from MTSA vessel security measures, provided such vessels had on board, by July 1, 2004, a valid International Ship Security Certificate (ISSC) that attests to the vessel's compliance with SOLAS security

requirements and the ISPS Code.

International regulations to prevent pollution from ships

In the second main category of international regulation, the primary instrument is the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, or MARPOL, which imposes environmental standards on the shipping industry set out in Annexes I-VI of MARPOL. These contain regulations for the prevention of pollution by oil (Annex I), by noxious liquid substances in bulk (Annex II), by harmful substances in packaged

Table of Contents

forms within the scope of the International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code (Annex III), by sewage (Annex IV), by garbage (Annex V), and by air emissions (Annex VI).

These regulations have been and continue to be regularly amended as new and more stringent standards of pollution prevention are introduced with which we are required to comply. For example, MARPOL Annex VI, together with the NOx Technical Code established thereunder, sets limits on sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from ship exhausts and prohibits deliberate emissions of ozone depleting substances, such as chlorofluorocarbons. It also includes a global cap on the sulfur content of fuel oil and allows for special areas to be established with more stringent controls on emissions. Originally adopted in September 1997, Annex VI came into force in May 2005 and was amended in October 2008 (as was the NOx Technical Code) to provide for progressively more stringent limits on such emissions from 2010 onwards. The revised Annex VI provides, in particular, for a reduction of the global sulfur cap. After considering the issue for many years, the IMO announced on October 27, 2016 that it was proceeding with a requirement for 0.5% m/m sulfur content in marine fuel (down from current levels of 3.5%) outside the ECAs starting on January 1, 2020. Under Annex VI, the 2020 date was subject to review as to the availability of the required fuel oil. Annex VI required the fuel availability review to be completed by 2018 but was ultimately completed in 2016. Therefore, by 2020, ships will be required to remove sulfur from emissions through the use of emission control equipment, or purchase marine fuel with 0.5% sulfur content, which may see increased demand and higher prices due to supply constraints. Installing pollution control equipment or using lower sulfur fuel could result in significantly increased costs to our company. Similarly Annex VI requires Tier III standards for NOx emissions to be applied to ships constructed and engines installed in ships operating in NOx ECAs from January 1, 2016. We anticipate incurring costs to comply with these more stringent standards by implementing measures such as fuel switching, vessel modification adding distillate fuel storage capacity, or addition of exhaust gas cleaning scrubbers, and may require installation and operation of further control equipment at significantly increased cost.

The revised Annex VI further allows for designation, in response to proposals from member parties, of Emission Control Areas (ECAs) that impose accelerated and/or more stringent requirements for control of sulfur oxide, particulate matter, and nitrogen oxide emissions. Thus far, ECAs have been formally adopted for the Baltic Sea area (limits SOx emissions only); the North Sea area including the English Channel (limiting SOx emissions only) and the North American ECA (which came into effect from August 1, 2012 limiting SOx, NOx and particulate matter emissions). In October 2016, the IMO approved the designation of the North Sea and Baltic Sea as ECAs for NOx under Annex VI as well, which is scheduled for adoption in 2017 and would take effect in January 2021. The United States Caribbean Sea ECA entered into force on January 1, 2013 and has been effective since January 1, 2014, limiting SOx, NOx and particulate matter emissions. For the currently-designated ECAs, much lower sulfur limits on fuel oil content are being phased in (0.1% from January 1, 2015).

At its 66th Session, the IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee (the MEPC) adopted amendments (effective September 2015) to Annex VI, regulation 13, regarding NOx and the date for the implementation of the Tier III standards within ECAs. These amendments provide, inter alia, that such standards, applicable on January 1, 2016, apply to marine diesel engines installed on ships which operate in the North American ECA or the U.S. Caribbean Sea ECA and to installed marine diesel engines which operate in other ECAs which might be designated in the future for Tier III NOx control. At MEPC 69, Annex VI was also amended to require recordkeeping requirements to demonstrate compliance with the NOx Tier III ECA.

At its 64th session (2012), the MEPC indicated that 2015 was the target year for member states to identify market-based measures for international shipping. At its 66th session (2014), the MEPC continued its work on developing technical and operational measures relating to energy-efficiency measures for ships, following the entry into force of the mandatory efficiency measures on January 1, 2013. It adopted the 2014 Guidelines on the Method of Calculation of the Attained EEDI, applicable to new ships. It further adopted amendments to MARPOL Annex VI

concerning the extension of the scope of application of the EEDI to Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) carriers, ro-ro cargo ships (vehicle carriers), ro-ro cargo ships, ro-ro passenger ships and cruise passenger ships with nonconventional propulsion. At its 67th session (2014), the MEPC adopted the 2014

Table of Contents

Guidelines on survey and certification of the EEDI, updating the previous version to reference ships fitted with dual-fuel engines using LNG and liquid fuel oil. The MEPC also adopted amendments to the 2013 Interim Guidelines for determining minimum propulsion power to maintain the maneuverability of ships in adverse conditions, to make the guidelines applicable to phase 1 (starting January 1, 2015) of the EEDI requirements. At its 68th session (2015), the MEPC amended the 2014 Guidelines on EEDI survey and certification as well as the method of calculating of EEDI for new ships, the latter of which was again amended at the 70th session (2016). At its 70th session, the MEPC adopted mandatory requirements for ships of 5,000 gross tonnage or greater to collect fuel consumption data for each type of fuel used, and report the data to the flag State after the end of each calendar year.

The revised Annex I to the MARPOL Convention entered into force in January 2007. It incorporates various amendments to the MARPOL Convention and imposes construction requirements for oil tankers delivered on or after January 1, 2010. On August 1, 2007, Regulation 12A (an amendment to Annex I) came into force imposing performance standards for accidental oil fuel outflow and requiring oil fuel tanks to be located inside the double-hull in all ships with an aggregate oil fuel capacity of 600 cubic meters and above, and which are delivered on or after August 1, 2010, including ships for which the building contract is entered into on or after August 1, 2007 or, in the absence of a contract, for which keel is laid on or after February 1, 2008. We intend that all of our newbuild tanker vessels, if any, will comply with Regulation 12A.

Greenhouse gas emissions

In February 2005, the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change entered into force. Pursuant to the Kyoto Protocol, adopting countries are required to implement national programs to reduce emissions of certain gases, generally referred to as greenhouse gases, which are suspected of contributing to global warming. Currently, the greenhouse gas emissions from international shipping do not come under the Kyoto Protocol.

In December 2011, UN climate change talks took place in Durban and concluded with an agreement referred to as the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. In preparation for the Durban Conference, the International Chamber of Shipping (ICS) produced a briefing document, confirming the shipping industry's commitment to cut shipping emissions by 20% by 2020, with significant further reductions thereafter. The ICS called on the participants in the Durban Conference to give the IMO a clear mandate to deliver emissions reductions through market-based measures, for example a shipping industry environmental compensation fund. Notwithstanding the ICS's request for global regulation of the shipping industry, the Durban Conference did not result in any proposals specifically addressing the shipping industry's role in climate change.

Although regulation of greenhouse gas emissions in the shipping industry was discussed during the 2015 UN Climate Change Conference in Paris (the Paris Conference), the agreement reached among the 195 nations did not expressly reference the shipping industry. Following the Paris Conference, the IMO announced it would continue its efforts on this issue at the MEPC, and at its 70th session, the MEPC approved a Roadmap for developing a comprehensive GHG emissions reduction strategy for ships, which includes the goal of adopting an initial strategy and emission reduction commitments in 2018. The Roadmap also provides for additional studies and further intersessional work, to be continued at the 71st session in 2017, with a goal of adopting a revised strategy in 2023 to include short-, mid- and long-term reduction measures and schedules for implementation.

The E.U. announced in April 2007 that it planned to expand the European Union emissions trading scheme by adding vessels, and a proposal from the European Commission was expected if no global regime for reduction of seaborne emissions had been agreed by the end of 2011. As of January 31, 2013, the Commission stopped short of proposing that emissions from ships be included in the EU's emissions-trading scheme (ETS). However, on October 1, 2012, it announced that it would propose measures to monitor, verify and report on greenhouse gas emissions from the

shipping sector.

Table of Contents

On June 28, 2013, the EC adopted a communication setting out a strategy for progressively including greenhouse gas emissions from maritime transport in the EU's policy for reducing its overall GHG emissions. The first step proposed by the EC was an EU Regulation to an EU-wide system for the monitoring, reporting and verification of carbon dioxide emissions from large ships starting in 2018. The Regulation was adopted on April 29, 2015 and took effect on July 1, 2015, with monitoring, reporting and verification requirements beginning on January 1, 2018. This Regulation may be seen as indicative of an intention to maintain pressure on the international negotiating process.

Other international regulations to prevent pollution

In addition to MARPOL, other more specialized international instruments have been adopted to prevent different types of pollution or environmental harm from ships. In February 2004, the IMO adopted an International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments, or the BWM Convention. The BWM Convention's implementing regulations call for a phased introduction of mandatory ballast water exchange requirements, to be replaced in time with mandatory concentration limits, as well as other obligations including recordkeeping requirements and implementation of a Ballast Water and Sediments Management Plan.

The BWM Convention stipulates that it will enter into force twelve months after it has been adopted by at least 30 states, the combined merchant fleets of which represent at least 35% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant shipping. With Finland's accession to the Agreement on September 8, 2016, the 35% threshold was reached, and the BWM convention will enter into force on September 8, 2017. Thereafter, on October 19, 2016, Panama also acceded to the BWM convention, adding its 18.02% of world gross tonnage. As of March 14, 2017, the BWM Convention had 54 contracting states for 53.41% of world gross tonnage. The BWM Convention requires ships to manage ballast water in a manner that removes, renders harmless or avoids the uptake or discharge of aquatic organisms and pathogens within ballast water and sediment. Recently updated Ballast Water and Sediment Management Plan guidance includes more robust testing and performance specifications. The entry of the BWM Convention and revised guidance will likely result in additional compliance costs.

European regulations

European regulations in the maritime sector are in general based on international law. However, since the *Erika* incident in 1999, the European Community has become increasingly active in the field of regulation of maritime safety and protection of the environment. It has been the driving force behind a number of amendments of MARPOL (including, for example, changes to accelerate the time-table for the phase-out of single hull tankers, and to prohibit the carriage in such tankers of heavy grades of oil), and if dissatisfied either with the extent of such amendments or with the time-table for their introduction it has been prepared to legislate on a unilateral basis. It should be noted, for instance, that the EU has its own regime as far as ship emissions are concerned and whilst it does in some respects reflect the IMO regime, this is not always the case. As far as sulfur dioxide emissions are concerned, for example, the EU regulation has not just caught up with the IMO limits for sulfur in ECAs, but it continues to have certain elements that exceed IMO regulations (e.g., as of January 1, 2015, EU Member States must ensure that ships in the Baltic, the North Sea and the English Channel are using gas oils with a sulfur content of no more than 0.10%).

In some instances where it has done so, international regulations have subsequently been amended to the same level of stringency as that introduced in Europe, but the risk is well established that EU regulations may from time to time impose burdens and costs on shipowners and operators which are additional to those involved in complying with international rules and standards. In December 2016, the EU signed into law the National Emissions Ceiling (NEC) Directive, which entered into force on December 31, 2016. The NEC must be implemented by individual member states through particular laws in each state by June 30, 2018. The NEC aims to set stricter emissions limits on SO₂, ammonia, non-methane volatile organic compounds, NO_x and fine particulate (PM_{2.5}) by setting new upper limits for

emissions of these pollutants, starting in 2020. While the

Table of Contents

NEC is not specifically directed toward the shipping industry, the EU specifically mentions the shipping industry in its announcement of the NEC as a contributor to emissions of PM2.5, SO2 and NOx. Implementation of new laws by member states to reduce emissions may ultimately result in increased costs to us to comply with the more stringent standards.

In some areas of regulation the EU has introduced new laws without attempting to procure a corresponding amendment of international law. Notably, it adopted in 2005 a directive on ship-source pollution, imposing criminal sanctions for pollution not only where this is caused by intent or recklessness (which would be an offense under MARPOL), but also where it is caused by serious negligence. The directive could therefore result in criminal liability being incurred in circumstances where it would not be incurred under international law. Experience has shown that in the emotive atmosphere often associated with pollution incidents, retributive attitudes towards ship interests have found expression in negligence being alleged by prosecutors and found by courts. Moreover, there is skepticism that the notion of serious negligence is likely to prove any narrower in practice than ordinary negligence. Criminal liability for a pollution incident could not only result in us incurring substantial penalties or fines but may also, in some jurisdictions, facilitate civil liability claims for greater compensation than would otherwise have been payable.

United States environmental regulations and laws governing civil liability for pollution

Environmental legislation in the United States merits particular mention as it is in many respects more onerous than international laws, representing a high-water mark of regulation with which shipowners and operators must comply, and of liability likely to be incurred in the event of non-compliance or an incident causing pollution.

U.S. federal legislation, including notably the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, or OPA, establishes an extensive regulatory and liability regime for the protection and cleanup of the environment from oil spills, including cargo or bunker oil spills from tankers. OPA affects all owners and operators whose vessels trade in the United States, its territories and possessions or whose vessels operate in United States waters, which includes the United States territorial sea and its 200 nautical mile exclusive economic zone. Under OPA, vessel owners, operators and bareboat charterers are responsible parties and are jointly, severally and strictly liable (unless the spill results solely from the act or omission of a third party, an act of God or an act of war) for all containment and clean-up costs and other damages arising from discharges or substantial threats of discharges, of oil from their vessels. In addition to potential liability under OPA as the relevant federal legislation, vessel owners may in some instances incur liability on an even more stringent basis under state law in the particular state where the spillage occurred.

Title VII of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004, or the CGMTA, amended OPA to require the owner or operator of any non-tank vessel of 400 gross tons or more, that carries oil of any kind as a fuel for main propulsion, including bunkers, to prepare and submit a response plan for each vessel on or before August 8, 2005. The implementing regulations took effect on October 30, 2013. The vessel response plans must include detailed information on actions to be taken by vessel personnel to prevent or mitigate any discharge or substantial threat of such a discharge of ore from the vessel due to operational activities or casualties.

OPA liability limits are periodically adjusted for inflation, and the U.S. Coast Guard issued a final rule on November 19, 2015 to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index. With this adjustment, OPA currently limits liability of the responsible party for single-hull tank vessels over 3,000 gross tons to the greater of \$3,500 per gross ton or \$25.846 million (this amount is reduced to \$7.05 million if the vessel is less than 3,000 gross tons). For tank vessels over 3,000 gross tons, other than a single-hull vessel, liability is limited to \$2,200 per gross ton or \$18.8 million (or \$4.7 million for a vessel less than 3,000 gross tons), whichever is greater. Under the OPA, these liability limits do not apply if an incident was directly caused by violation of applicable United States federal safety, construction or operating regulations or by a responsible party's gross negligence or willful misconduct, or if the

responsible party fails or refuses to report the incident or to cooperate and assist in connection with oil removal activities.

Table of Contents

In response to the Deepwater Horizon incident in the Gulf of Mexico, in 2010 the U.S. Congress proposed, but did not formally adopt, legislation to amend OPA to mandate stronger safety standards and increased liability and financial responsibility for offshore drilling operations. While Congressional activity on this topic is expected to continue to focus on offshore facilities rather than on vessels generally, it cannot be known with certainty what form any such new legislative initiatives may take.

In addition, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or CERCLA, which applies to the discharge of hazardous substances (other than oil) whether on land or at sea, contains a similar liability regime and provides for cleanup, removal and natural resource damages. Liability under CERCLA is limited to the greater of \$300 per gross ton, or \$5.0 million for vessels carrying any hazardous substances as cargo, or \$0.5 million for vessels not carrying hazardous substances as cargo or residue, unless the incident is caused by gross negligence, willful misconduct, or a violation of certain regulations, in which case liability is unlimited.

Similarly, in response to the Deepwater Horizon incident, the European Union has issued Directive 2013/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of June 12, 2013 on safety of offshore oil and gas operations. The objective of this Directive is to reduce as far as possible the occurrence of major accidents relating to offshore oil and gas operations and to limit their consequences, thus increasing the protection of the marine environment and coastal economies against pollution, establishing minimum conditions for safe offshore exploration and exploitation of oil and gas and limiting possible disruptions to Union indigenous energy production, and to improve the response mechanisms in case of an accident. Member states must implement the Directive by July 19, 2015. As far as the environment is concerned, the UK has various new or amended regulations such as: the Offshore Petroleum Activities (Offshore Safety Directive) (Environmental Functions) Regulations 2015 (OSDEF), the 2015 amendments to the Merchant Shipping (Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation Convention) Regulations 1998 (OPRC 1998) and other environmental Directive requirements, specifically the Environmental Management System. The Offshore Petroleum Licensing (Offshore Safety Directive) Regulations 2015 will implement the licensing Directive requirements.

We currently maintain, for each of our owned vessels, insurance coverage against pollution liability risks in the amount of \$1.0 billion per incident. The insured risks include penalties and fines as well as civil liabilities and expenses resulting from accidental pollution. However, this insurance coverage is subject to exclusions, deductibles and other terms and conditions. If any liabilities or expenses fall within an exclusion from coverage, or if damages from a catastrophic incident exceed the \$1.0 billion limitation of coverage per incident, our cash flow, profitability and financial position could be adversely impacted.

Under OPA, an owner or operator of a fleet of vessels is required only to demonstrate evidence of financial responsibility in an amount sufficient to cover the vessel in the fleet having the greatest maximum liability under OPA. Under the self-insurance provisions, the shipowner or operator must have a net worth and working capital, measured in assets located in the United States against liabilities located anywhere in the world, that exceeds the applicable amount of financial responsibility. We have complied with the U.S. Coast Guard regulations by providing a certificate of responsibility from third party entities that are acceptable to the U.S. Coast Guard evidencing sufficient self-insurance.

The U.S. Coast Guard's regulations concerning certificates of financial responsibility provide, in accordance with OPA, that claimants may bring suit directly against an insurer or guarantor that furnishes certificates of financial responsibility. In the event that such insurer or guarantor is sued directly, it is prohibited from asserting any contractual defense that it may have had against the responsible party and is limited to asserting those defenses available to the responsible party and the defense that the incident was caused by the willful misconduct of the responsible party. Certain organizations, which had typically provided certificates of financial responsibility under

pre-OPA laws, including the major protection and indemnity organizations, have declined to furnish evidence of insurance for vessel owners and operators if they are subject to direct actions or required to waive insurance policy defenses. This requirement may have the effect of limiting the availability of the type of

Table of Contents

coverage required by the Coast Guard and could increase our costs of obtaining this insurance as well as the costs of our competitors that also require such coverage.

OPA specifically permits individual states to impose their own liability regimes with regard to oil pollution incidents occurring within their boundaries, and some states' environmental laws impose unlimited liability for oil spills. In some cases, states which have enacted such legislation have not yet issued implementing regulations defining vessels owners' responsibilities under these laws.

The United States Clean Water Act (CWA) prohibits the discharge of oil or hazardous substances in U.S. navigable waters and imposes strict liability in the form of penalties for unauthorized discharges. The CWA also imposes substantial liability for the costs of removal, remediation and damages and complements the remedies available under CERCLA. The EPA regulates the discharge of ballast water and other substances incidental to the normal operation of vessels in U.S. waters using a Vessel General Permit (VGP) system pursuant to the CWA, in order to combat the risk of harmful organisms that can travel in ballast water carried from foreign ports and to minimize the risk of water pollution through numerous specified effluent streams incidental to the normal operation of vessels. Compliance with the conditions of the VGP is required for commercial vessels 79 feet in length or longer (other than commercial fishing vessels.) On March 28, 2013 the EPA adopted the 2013 VGP which took effect on December 19, 2013. The 2013 VGP is valid for five years. This new 2013 VGP imposes a numeric standard to control the release of non-indigenous invasive species in ballast water discharges. On October 5, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit found the EPA was arbitrary and capricious in issuing the ballast water provisions of the VGP, finding the EPA failed to adequately explain why stricter technology-based effluent standards should not be applied. The court instructed the EPA to reconsider these issues but held the 2013 VGP remains in effect until the EPA addresses the issues. If the EPA establishes more stringent numeric standards for ballast water discharges, we may incur costs to modify our vessels to comply with new standards. In addition, through the CWA certification provisions that allow U.S. states to place additional conditions on use of the VGP within state waters, a number of states have proposed or implemented a variety of stricter ballast water requirements including, in some states, specific treatment standards.

Compliance with new U.S. federal and state requirements could require the installation of equipment on our vessels to treat ballast water before it is discharged or the implementation of other port facility disposal arrangements or procedures at potentially substantial cost, and/or otherwise restrict our vessels from entering U.S. waters. Coast Guard regulations require commercial ships operating in U.S. waters to manage ballast water by meeting certain requirements, which include using a U.S. type-approved Ballast Water Management System (BWMS), temporarily using a foreign-type BWMS that has been accepted by the Coast Guard, using ballast water obtained from a U.S. Public Water System, discharge ballast water into a shore-side facility or not discharge ballast water within 12 nautical miles. Vessel owners/operators may request an extension to the compliance deadline by showing that, despite all efforts, it cannot comply with one of the approved systems or compliance methods. There are numerous foreign-approved Ballast Water Treatment Systems (BWTS) in the Coast Guard's list of approved Alternate Management Systems. Importantly, on December 2, 2016, the Marine Safety Center issued the first Coast Guard type approved Ballast Water Management System (BWMS), called the Optimarin Ballast System (there are currently type-approved BWTS from three manufacturers). With this issuance, it may become more difficult to receive compliance extensions and thus could result in significant costs to install an approved BWTS; however, existing extensions will continue to be honored through the stated extension date. Failure to comply with U.S. ballast water regulations, including installation of BWTS by September 8, 2017, could result in civil or criminal fines or penalties.

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA to promulgate standards applicable to emissions of volatile organic compounds and other air contaminants. Our vessels are subject to CAA vapor control and recovery standards (VCS) for cleaning fuel tanks and conducting other operations in regulated port areas, and to CAA emissions standards for so-called Category 3 marine diesel engines operating in U.S. waters. In April 2010, EPA adopted

regulations implementing the provision of MARPOL Annex VI regarding emissions from Category 3 marine diesel engines. Under these regulations, both U.S. and foreign-flagged ships must comply

Table of Contents

with the applicable engine and fuel standards of Annex VI, including the stricter North America ECA standards which took effect in August 2012, when they enter U.S. ports or operate in most internal U.S. waters including the Great Lakes. Annex VI requirements are discussed in greater detail above under International regulations to prevent pollution from ships. We may incur costs to install control equipment on our vessels to comply with the new standards.

Also under the CAA, since 1990 the U.S. Coast Guard has regulated the safety of VCSs that are required under EPA and state rules. Our vessels operating in regulated port areas have installed VCSs that are compliant with EPA, state and U.S. Coast Guard requirements. On July 16, 2013, the U.S. Coast Guard adopted regulations that made its VCS requirements more compatible with new EPA and State regulations, reflected changes in VCS technology, and codified existing U.S. Coast Guard guidelines. We intend to comply with all applicable state and U.S. federal regulations in the ports where our vessels call.

International laws governing civil liability to pay compensation or damages

We operate a fleet of crude, product and chemical tankers that are subject to national and international laws governing pollution from such vessels. Several international conventions impose and limit pollution liability from vessels. An owner of a tanker vessel carrying a cargo of persistent oil as defined by the International Convention for Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage (the CLC) is subject under the convention to strict liability for any pollution damage caused in a contracting state by an escape or discharge from cargo or bunker tanks. This liability is subject to a financial limit calculated by reference to the tonnage of the ship, and the right to limit liability may be lost if the spill is caused by the shipowner's intentional or reckless conduct. Liability may also be incurred under the CLC for a bunker spill from the vessel even when she is not carrying such cargo, but is in ballast.

When a tanker is carrying clean oil products that do not constitute persistent oil that would be covered under the CLC, liability for any pollution damage will generally fall outside the CLC and will depend on other international conventions or domestic laws in the jurisdiction where the spillage occurs. The same principle applies to any pollution from the vessel in a jurisdiction which is not a party to the CLC. The CLC applies in over 100 jurisdictions around the world, but it does not apply in the United States, where the corresponding liability laws such as the OPA discussed above, are particularly stringent.

In 2001, the IMO adopted the International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage, or the Bunker Convention, which imposes strict liability on shipowners for pollution damage in jurisdictional waters of ratifying states caused by discharges of bunker oil. The Bunker Convention defines bunker oil as any hydrocarbon mineral oil, including lubricating oil, used or intended to be used for the operation or propulsion of the ship, and any residues of such oil. The Bunker Convention also requires registered owners of ships over a certain size to maintain insurance for pollution damage in an amount equal to the limits of liability under the applicable national or international limitation regime (but not exceeding the amount calculated in accordance with the Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims of 1976, as amended, or the 1976 Convention). The Bunker Convention entered into force on November 21, 2008, and as of March 8, 2016, had 82 contracting states. In other jurisdictions liability for spills or releases of oil from ships' bunkers continues to be determined by the national or other domestic laws in the jurisdiction where the events or damages occur.

Outside the United States, national laws generally provide for the owner to bear strict liability for pollution, subject to a right to limit liability under applicable national or international regimes for limitation of liability. The most widely applicable international regime limiting maritime pollution liability is the 1976 Convention. Rights to limit liability under the 1976 Convention are forfeited where a spill is caused by a shipowner's intentional or reckless conduct. Some states have ratified the 1996 LLMC Protocol to the 1976 Convention, which provides for liability limits substantially

higher than those set forth in the 1976 Convention to apply in such states. Finally, some jurisdictions are not a party to either the 1976 Convention or the 1996 LLMC Protocol, and, therefore, shipowners' rights to limit liability for maritime pollution in such jurisdictions may be uncertain.

Table of Contents*Inspection by Classification Societies*

Every sea going vessel must be classed by a classification society. The classification society certifies that the vessel is in class, signifying that the vessel has been built and maintained in accordance with the rules of the classification society and complies with applicable rules and regulations of the vessel's country of registry and the international conventions of which that country is a member. In addition, where surveys are required by international conventions and corresponding laws and ordinances of a flag state, the classification society will undertake them on application or by official order, acting on behalf of the authorities concerned. The classification society also undertakes, on request, other surveys and checks that are required by regulations and requirements of the flag state or port authority. These surveys are subject to agreements made in each individual case or to the regulations of the country concerned. For maintenance of the class, regular and extraordinary surveys of hull, machinery (including the electrical plant) and any special equipment classed are required to be performed as follows:

Annual Surveys: For ocean-going ships, annual surveys are conducted for the hull and the machinery (including the electrical plant) and, where applicable, for special equipment classed, at intervals of 12 months from the date of commencement of the class period indicated in the certificate.

Intermediate Surveys: Extended annual surveys are referred to as intermediate surveys and typically are conducted two and a half years after commissioning and each class renewal. Intermediate surveys may be carried out on the occasion of the second or third annual survey.

Class Renewal Surveys: Class renewal surveys, also known as special surveys, are carried out for the ship's hull, machinery (including the electrical plant), and for any special equipment classed, at the intervals indicated by the character of classification for the hull. At the special survey, the vessel is thoroughly examined, including audio-gauging, to determine the thickness of its steel structure. Should the thickness be found to be less than class requirements, the classification society would prescribe steel renewals. The classification society may grant a one year grace period for completion of the special survey under certain conditions. Substantial amounts of money may have to be spent for steel renewals to pass a special survey if the vessel experiences excessive wear and tear. In lieu of the special survey every four or five years, depending on whether a grace period was granted, a shipowner has the option of arranging with the classification society for the vessel's integrated hull or machinery to be on a continuous survey cycle, in which every part of the vessel would be surveyed within a five-year cycle.

Risk of Loss and Liability Insurance*General*

The operation of any cargo vessel includes risks such as mechanical failure, physical damage, collision, property loss, and cargo loss or damage and business interruption due to political circumstances in foreign countries, hostilities and labor strikes. In addition, there is always an inherent possibility of marine disaster, including oil spills and other environmental mishaps, and the liabilities arising from owning and operating vessels in international trade. The OPA, which imposes virtually unlimited liability upon owners, operators and demise charterers of any vessel trading in the United States exclusive economic zone for certain oil pollution accidents in the United States, has made liability insurance more expensive for ship owners and operators trading in the United States market. While we believe that our present insurance coverage is adequate, not all risks can be insured, and there can be no guarantee that any specific

claim will be paid, or that we will always be able to obtain adequate insurance coverage at reasonable rates.

Hull and Machinery Insurance

We have obtained marine hull and machinery and war risk insurance, which include coverage of the risk of actual or constructive total loss, for all of our owned vessels. Each of the owned vessels is covered for up to at

Table of Contents

least fair market value, with deductibles of \$0.1 million per Handymax and Panamax tanker vessel and \$0.25 million per VLCC tanker. We have also extended our war risk insurance to include war loss of hire for any loss of time to the vessel, including for physical repairs, caused by a warlike incident and piracy seizure for up to 270 days of detention / loss of time. There are no deductibles for the war risk insurance or the war loss of hire cover.

We have arranged, as necessary, increased value insurance for our vessels. With the increased value insurance, in case of total loss of the vessel, we will be able to recover the sum insured under the increased value policy in addition to the sum insured under the hull and machinery policy. Increased value insurance also covers excess liabilities that are not recoverable in full by the hull and machinery policies by reason of underinsurance. We do not expect to maintain loss of hire insurance for our vessels. Loss of hire insurance covers business interruptions that result in the loss of use of a vessel.

Protection and Indemnity Insurance

Protection and indemnity insurance is expected to be provided by mutual protection and indemnity associations, or P&I Associations, who indemnify members in respect of discharging their tortious, contractual or statutory third-party legal liabilities arising from the operation of an entered ship. Such liabilities include but are not limited to third-party liability and other related expenses from injury or death of crew, passengers and other third parties, loss or damage to cargo, claims arising from collisions with other vessels, damage to other third-party property, pollution arising from oil or other substances, and salvage, towing and other related costs, including wreck removal. Protection and indemnity insurance is a form of mutual indemnity insurance, extended by protection and indemnity mutual associations and always provided in accordance with the applicable associations' rules and members' agreed upon terms and conditions.

Navios Acquisition's fleet is currently entered for protection and indemnity insurance with International Group associations where, in line with all International Group Clubs, coverage for oil pollution is limited to \$1.0 billion per event. The 13 P&I Associations that comprise the International Group insure approximately 95% of the world's commercial tonnage and have entered into a pooling agreement to collectively reinsure each association's liabilities. Each vessel that Navios Acquisition acquires will be entered with P&I Associations of the International Group. Under the International Group reinsurance program for the current policy year, each P&I club in the International Group is responsible for the first \$10.0 million of every claim. In every claim the amount in excess of \$10.0 million and up to \$80.0 million is shared by the clubs under the pooling agreement. Any claim in excess of \$80.0 million is reinsured by the International Group in the international reinsurance market under the General Excess of Loss Reinsurance Contract. This policy currently provides an additional \$2.0 billion of coverage for non-oil pollution claims. Further to this, an additional reinsurance layer has been placed by the International Group for claims up to \$1.0 billion in excess of \$2.08 billion, i.e., \$3.08 billion in total. For passengers and crew claims the overall limit is \$3.0 billion for any one event with any one vessel with a sub-limit of \$2.0 billion for passengers. With the exception of pollution, passenger or crew claims, should any other P&I claim exceed Group reinsurance limits, the provisions of all International Group Club's overspill claim rules will operate and members of any International Group Club will be liable for additional contributions in accordance with such rules. To date, there has never been an overspill claim, or one even nearing this level.

As a member of a P&I Association, which is a member of the International Group, Navios Acquisition will be subject to calls payable to the associations based on the individual fleet record, the associations' overall claim records as well as the claim records of all other members of the individual associations, and members of the pool of P&I Associations comprising the International Group. The P&I Associations' policy year commences on February 20th. Calls are levied by means of Estimated Total Premiums (ETP) and the amount of the final installment of the ETP varies according to the actual total premium ultimately required by the club for a particular policy year. Members have a liability to pay

supplementary calls which might be levied by the board of directors of the club if the ETP is insufficient to cover amounts paid out by the club.

Table of Contents

Should a member leave or entry cease with any of the associations, at the Club's Managers discretion, they may be also be liable to pay release calls or provide adequate security for the same amount. Such calls are levied in respect of potential outstanding Club/Member liabilities on open policy years and include but are not limited to liabilities for deferred calls and supplementary calls.

Uninsured Risks

Not all risks are insured and not all risks are insurable. The principal insurable risks which nonetheless remain uninsured across our fleet are loss of hire and strikes, except in cases of loss of hire due to war or a piracy event. Specifically, Navios Acquisition does not insure these risks because the costs are regarded as disproportionate. These insurances provide, subject to a deductible, a limited indemnity for hire that would not be receivable by the shipowner for reasons set forth in the policy. Should a vessel on time charter, where the vessel is paid a fixed hire day by day, suffer a serious mechanical breakdown, the daily hire will no longer be payable by the charterer. Under some circumstances, an event of force majeure may also permit the charterer to terminate the time charter or suspend payment of charter hire. The purpose of the loss of hire insurance is to secure the loss of hire during such periods. In the case of strikes insurance, if a vessel is being paid a fixed sum to perform a voyage and the ship becomes strike bound at a loading or discharging port, the insurance covers the loss of earnings during such periods.

Exchange Controls

Under Marshall Islands law, there are currently no restrictions on the export or import of capital, including foreign exchange controls or restrictions that affect the remittance of dividends, interest or other payments to non-resident holders of Navios Acquisition's securities.

Facilities

We have offices at 7 Avenue de Grande Bretagne, Office 11B2, Monte Carlo, MC 98000 Monaco. We believe that our office facilities are suitable and adequate for our business as it is presently conducted. We presently occupy office space provided by Navios Holdings. Navios Holdings has agreed that it will make such office space, as well as certain office and secretarial services, available to us, as may be required by us from time to time.

Crewing and Staff

The Manager crews its vessels primarily with Greek, Filipino, Romanian, Russian and Ukrainian officers and Filipino seamen. The Manager is responsible for selecting its Greek officers. For other nationalities, officers and seamen are referred to us by local crewing agencies. Navios Acquisition requires that all of its seamen have the qualifications and licenses required to comply with international regulations and shipping conventions.

Administrative Services

On May 28, 2010, Navios Acquisition entered into an Administrative Services Agreement with Navios Holdings, initially set to expire on May 28, 2015 that has been extended to May 2020, pursuant to which Navios Holdings provides certain administrative management services to Navios Acquisition which include: bookkeeping, audit and accounting services, legal and insurance services, administrative and clerical services, banking and financial services, advisory services, client and investor relations and other services. Navios Holdings is reimbursed for reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the provision of these services. See Item 7B-Related Party Transactions the Administrative Services Agreement.

Legal Proceedings

The Company is involved in various disputes and arbitration proceedings arising in the ordinary course of business. Provisions have been recognized in the financial statements for all such proceedings where the

Table of Contents

Company believes that a liability may be probable, and for which the amounts are reasonably estimable, based upon facts known at the date of the financial statements were prepared. In the opinion of the management, the ultimate disposition of these matters individually and in aggregate will not materially affect the Company's financial position, results of operations or liquidity.

On April 1, 2016, Navios Holdings was named as a defendant in a putative shareholder derivative lawsuit brought by two alleged shareholders of Navios Acquisition purportedly on behalf of nominal defendant, Navios Acquisition, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, captioned *Metropolitan Capital Advisors International Ltd., et al. v. Navios Maritime Holdings, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:16-cv-02437. The lawsuit challenged the March 9, 2016 loan agreement between Navios Holdings and Navios Acquisition pursuant to which Navios Acquisition agreed to provide a \$50.0 million credit facility (the "Revolver") to Navios Holdings.

On April 14, 2016, Navios Holdings and Navios Acquisition announced that the Revolver had been cancelled, and that no borrowings had been made under the Revolver. In June 2016, the parties reached an agreement resolving the plaintiffs' application for attorneys' fees and expenses which was approved by an order of the Court. The litigation was dismissed upon notice of the order being provided to Navios Acquisition's shareholders via the inclusion of the order as an attachment to a Navios Acquisition Form 6-K and the payment of \$0.8 million by Navios Acquisition in satisfaction of the plaintiffs' request for attorneys' fees and expenses. A copy of the order was provided as an exhibit to Navios Acquisition's Form 6-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on June 9, 2016.

Table of Contents**C. Organizational Structure**

The table below lists the Company's wholly-owned subsidiaries as of December 31, 2016.

Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation

and Subsidiaries: Company Name	Nature	Country of Incorporation
Aegean Sea Maritime Holdings Inc.	Sub-Holding Company	Marshall Is.
Amorgos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Andros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Antikithira Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Antiparos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Amindra Navigation Co.	Sub-Holding Company	Marshall Is.
Crete Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Folegandros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Ikaria Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Ios Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Cayman Is.
Kithira Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Kos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Mytilene Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation	Holding Company	Marshall Is.
Navios Acquisition Finance (U.S.) Inc.	Co-Issuer	Delaware
Rhodes Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Serifos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Shinyo Dream Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Hong Kong
Shinyo Kannika Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Hong Kong
Shinyo Kieran Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	British Virgin Is
Shinyo Loyalty Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽¹⁾	Hong Kong
Shinyo Navigator Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽²⁾	Hong Kong
Shinyo Ocean Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Hong Kong
Shinyo Saowalak Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	British Virgin Is.
Sifnos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Skiathos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Skopelos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Cayman Is.
Syros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Thera Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Tinos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Oinousses Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Psara Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Antipsara Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Samothrace Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Thasos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Limnos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Skyros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Alonnisos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁴⁾	Marshall Is.
Makronisos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁴⁾	Marshall Is.

Edgar Filing: Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP - Form 20-F

Iraklia Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Paxos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁵⁾	Marshall Is.
Antipaxos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Donoussa Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁶⁾	Marshall Is.
Schinoussa Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁷⁾	Marshall Is.
Navios Acquisition Europe Finance Inc	Sub-Holding Company	Marshall Is.
Sikinos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Marshall Is.
Kerkyra Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Lefkada Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Zakynthos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Leros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Kimolos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Samos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Tilos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Delos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.
Navios Maritime Midstream Partners GP LLC	Holding Company	Marshall Is.

Table of Contents

- (1) Former vessel-owner of the Shinyo Splendor which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on May 6, 2014.
- (2) Former vessel-owner of the Shinyo Navigator which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on December 6, 2013.
- (3) Navios Midstream acquired all of the outstanding shares of capital stock of the vessel-owning subsidiary.
- (4) Each company had the rights over a shipbuilding contract of an MR2 product tanker vessel. In February 2015, these shipbuilding contracts were terminated, with no exposure to Navios Acquisition, due to the shipyard's inability to issue a refund guarantee.
- (5) Former vessel-owner of the Nave Lucida which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on January 27, 2016.
- (6) Former vessel-owner of the Nave Universe which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on October 4, 2016
- (7) Former vessel-owner of the Nave Constellation which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on November 15, 2016

Affiliates included in the financial statements accounted for under the equity method:

In the consolidated financial statements of Navios Acquisition, Navios Europe I Inc. (Navios Europe I) with ownership interest of 47.5% and Navios Europe II Inc. (Navios Europe II) with ownership interest of 47.5% are included as affiliates and are accounted for under the equity method, for such periods during which the entities were affiliates of Navios Acquisition. See Note 8 to the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements, included elsewhere within this Annual Report.

As of December 31, 2016, Navios Acquisition owns the 2% general partner interest in Navios Midstream totaling 420,641 general partner units, as well as a 57.9% limited partner interest, which represents 1,242,692 common units (5.9%), 9,342,692 subordinated units (44.4%) and 1,592,920 Subordinated Series A Units (7.6%). In the consolidated financial statements of Navios Acquisition, Navios Midstream with ownership interest of 59.9% is included as an affiliate. The Company analyzed its investments in Navios Midstream and concluded that it has the ability to exercise significant influence over the operating and financial policies of Navios Midstream and, therefore all classes of units i.e., common units, the subordinated units, the subordinated Series A units and the general partner units of Navios Midstream are accounted for under the equity method.

D. Property, plants and equipment

Other than our vessels, we do not have any other material property, plants or equipment.

Item 4A. Unresolved Staff Comments

None.

Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects

Overview

We are an owner and operator of tanker vessels focusing in the transportation of petroleum products (clean and dirty) and bulk liquid chemicals and we are incorporated in the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

On May 25, 2010, we consummated the Product and Chemical Tanker Acquisition, the acquisition of 13 vessels (11 product tankers and two chemical tankers), for an aggregate purchase price of \$457.7 million, including amounts to be paid for future contracted vessels to be delivered. On September 10, 2010, we consummated the VLCC Acquisition, for an aggregate purchase price of \$587.0 million.

On October 9, 2013, Navios Holdings, Navios Acquisition and Navios Partners established Navios Europe I and have economic interests of 47.5%, 47.5% and 5.0%, respectively. Navios Europe I is engaged in the marine transportation industry through the ownership of five tankers and five container vessels. Effective November

Table of Contents

2014, Navios Holdings, Navios Acquisition and Navios Partners have voting interest of 50%, 50% and 0%, respectively. On February 21, 2017, Navios Holdings agreed to transfer to Navios Partners its participation in Navios Revolving Loans I and Navios Term Loans I, both relating to Navios Europe I, for a consideration of \$4.1 million in cash and 13,076,923 newly issued common units of Navios Partners.

On October 13, 2014, Navios Acquisition formed Navios Midstream under the laws of the Marshall Islands. Navios Maritime Midstream Partners GP LLC, or the general partner, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Navios Acquisition, was also formed on that date to act as the general partner of Navios Midstream and received a 2.0% general partner interest in Navios Midstream. Navios Partners is an affiliate and not consolidated under Navios Holdings.

On February 18, 2015, Navios Holdings, Navios Acquisition and Navios Partners established Navios Europe II and have economic interests of 47.5%, 47.5% and 5.0%, respectively and voting interests of 50%, 50% and 0%, respectively. Navios Europe II is engaged in the marine transportation industry through the ownership of seven dry bulk and seven container vessels.

Fleet Development

Acquisition of vessels

2015

On January 8, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Sextans, a newbuilding, 49,999 dwt, MR2 product tanker, from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$33.4 million. Cash paid was \$17.8 million and \$15.6 million was transferred from vessel deposits.

On February 11, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Velocity, a newbuilding, 49,999 dwt, MR2 product tanker, from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$39.2 million. Cash paid was \$12.6 million and \$26.6 million was transferred from vessel deposits.

On November 6, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Spherical, a 2009-built, 297,188 dwt VLCC, from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$69.2 million.

On December 2, 2015, Navios Acquisition took delivery of the Nave Photon, a 2008-built, 297,395 dwt VLCC from an unaffiliated third party for a total cost of \$65.2 million.

Disposal of vessels

2016

On January 27, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Lucida to an unaffiliated third party for net cash proceeds of \$18.4 million. The gain on sale of the vessel, upon write-off of the unamortized dry-docking, was \$2.3 million.

On October 4, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Universe to an unaffiliated third party for net cash proceeds of \$35.8 million. As of June 30, 2016, the vessel was classified as held for sale as the relevant criteria for the classification were met. The gain on sale of the vessel was \$4.8 million.

On November 15, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Constellation to an unaffiliated third party for net cash proceeds of \$35.8 million. As of June 30, 2016, the vessel was classified as held for sale as the relevant criteria for the

classification were met. The gain on sale of the vessel was \$4.6 million.

Table of Contents**2015**

On June 18, 2015, Navios Midstream exercised its option to acquire the shares of the vessel-owning subsidiaries of the Nave Celeste, a 2003-built of 298,717 dwt VLCC, and the C. Dream, a 2000 built VLCC of 298,570 dwt, from Navios Acquisition for an aggregate sale price of \$100.0 million. The sale price consisted of \$73.0 million cash consideration and the issuance of 1,592,920 Subordinated Series A Units to Navios Acquisition.

Navios Maritime Acquisition		Country of			
Corporation and Subsidiaries:	Nature	Incorporation	2016	2015	2014
Company Name					
Aegean Sea Maritime Holdings Inc.	Sub-Holding Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Amorgos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Andros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Antikithira Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Antiparos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Amindra Navigation Co.	Sub-Holding Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Crete Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Folegandros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Ikaria Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Ios Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Cayman Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Kithira Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Kos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Mytilene Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation	Holding Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Navios Acquisition Finance (U.S.) Inc.	Co-Issuer	Delaware	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Rhodes Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Serifos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Shinyo Dream Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Hong Kong		1/1 - 6/17	1/1 - 12/31
Shinyo Kannika Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Hong Kong			1/1 - 11/17
Shinyo Kieran Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	British Virgin Is			1/1 - 11/17
Shinyo Loyalty Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽¹⁾	Hong Kong	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Shinyo Navigator Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽²⁾	Hong Kong	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Shinyo Ocean Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Hong Kong			1/1 - 11/17
Shinyo Saowalak Limited	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	British Virgin Is.			1/1 - 11/17
Sifnos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Skiathos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Skopelos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Cayman Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Syros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Thera Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Tinos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31

Edgar Filing: Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP - Form 20-F

Oinousses Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Psara Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Antipsara Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Samothrace Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Thasos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Limnos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Skyros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Alonnisos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁴⁾	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Makronisos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁴⁾	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Iraklia Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Paxos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁵⁾	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Antipaxos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Donoussa Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁶⁾	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Schinousa Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽⁷⁾	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Navios Acquisition Europe Finance Inc	Sub-Holding Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Sikinos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company ⁽³⁾	Marshall Is.		1/1 - 6/17	1/1 - 12/31
Kerkyra Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Lefkada Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Zakynthos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31
Leros Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	4/4 - 12/31
Kimolos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	4/29 - 12/31
Samos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	9/15 - 12/31
Tilos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	10/9 - 12/31	
Delos Shipping Corporation	Vessel-Owning Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	10/9 - 12/31	
Navios Maritime Midstream Partners GP LLC	Holding Company	Marshall Is.	1/1 - 12/31	1/1 - 12/31	10/13 - 12/31

- (1) Former vessel-owner of the Shinyo Splendor which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on May 6, 2014.
- (2) Former vessel-owner of the Shinyo Navigator which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on December 6, 2013.
- (3) Navios Midstream acquired all of the outstanding shares of capital stock of the vessel-owning subsidiary.
- (4) Each company had the rights over a shipbuilding contract of an MR2 product tanker vessel. In February 2015, these shipbuilding contracts were terminated, with no exposure to Navios Acquisition, due to the shipyard's inability to issue a refund guarantee.

Table of Contents

- (5) Former vessel-owner of the Nave Lucida which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on January 27, 2016.
- (6) Former vessel-owner of the Nave Universe which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on October 4, 2016
- (7) Former vessel-owner of the Nave Constellation which was sold to an unaffiliated third party on November 15, 2016

Our Charters

Our major customers during 2016 were: Navig8, Shell and Mansel. For the year ended December 31, 2016, these three customers accounted for 33.0%, 20.0% and 14.7%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition's revenue.

Our major customers during 2015 were: Navig8, Shell and Mansel. For the year ended December 31, 2015, these three customers accounted for 35.2%, 13.6% and 10.8%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition's revenue.

Our major customers during 2014 were: DOSCO and Navig8. For the year ended December 31, 2014, these two customers accounted for 22.4% and 28.8%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition's revenue.

No other customers accounted for 10% or more of total revenue for any of the years presented.

Our revenues are driven by the number of vessels in the fleet, the number of days during which the vessels operate and our charter hire rates, which, in turn, are affected by a number of factors, including:

the duration of the charters;

the level of spot and long-term market rates at the time of charter;

decisions relating to vessel acquisitions and disposals;

the amount of time spent positioning vessels;

the amount of time that vessels spend undergoing repairs and upgrades in drydock;

the age, condition and specifications of the vessels; and

the aggregate level of supply and demand in the tanker shipping industry.

Time charters are available for varying periods, ranging from a single trip (spot charter) to long-term which may be any number of years. In general, a long-term time charter assures the vessel owner of a consistent stream of revenue. Operating the vessel in the spot market affords the owner greater spot market opportunity, which may result in high rates when vessels are in high demand or low rates when vessel availability exceeds demand. We intend to operate our vessels in a mix of short-term and long-term charter markets. Vessel charter rates are affected by world economics, international events, weather conditions, strikes, governmental policies, supply and demand and many other factors that might be beyond our control.

We could lose a customer or the benefits of a charter if:

the customer fails to make charter payments because of its financial inability, disagreements with us or otherwise;

the customer exercises certain rights to terminate the charter of the vessel;

the customer terminates the charter because we fail to deliver the vessel within a fixed period of time, the vessel is lost or damaged beyond repair, there are serious deficiencies in the vessel or prolonged periods of off-hire, or we default under the charter; or

a prolonged force majeure event affecting the customer, including damage to or destruction of relevant production facilities, war or political unrest prevents us from performing services for that customer.

If we lose a charter, we may be unable to re-deploy the related vessel on terms as favorable to us due to the long-term nature of most charters and the cyclical nature of the industry or we may be forced to charter the vessel on the spot market at then market rates which may be less favorable than the charter that has been terminated. The loss of any of our customers, time charters or vessels, or a decline in payments under our charters, could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition and our ability to make cash distributions in the event we are unable to replace such customer, time charter or vessel.

Table of Contents

Under some of our time charters, either party may terminate the charter contract in the event of war in specified countries or in locations that would significantly disrupt the free trade of the vessel. Some of the time charters covering our vessels require us to return to the charterer, upon the loss of the vessel, all advances paid by the charterer but not earned by us.

Vessels Operations

Under our charters, our vessel manager is generally responsible for commercial, technical, health and safety and other management services related to the vessels' operation, and the charterer is responsible for bunkering and substantially all of the vessel voyage costs, including canal tolls and port charges.

Pursuant to the Management Agreement dated May 28, 2010 and as amended in May 2012 and May 2014, the Manager provided commercial and technical management services to Navios Acquisition's vessels for a fixed daily fee of: (a) \$6,000 per MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel; (b) \$7,000 per LR1 product tanker vessel; and (c) \$9,500 per VLCC, through May 2016.

Pursuant to an amendment to the Management Agreement dated as of May 19, 2016, Navios Acquisition fixed the fees for commercial and technical ship management services of its fleet for two additional years from May 29, 2016, through May 2018, at a daily fee of: (a) \$6,350 per MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel; (b) \$7,150 per LR1 product tanker vessel; and (c) \$9,500 per VLCC.

Extraordinary costs and expenses include fees and costs resulting from:

time spent on insurance and salvage claims;

time spent vetting and pre-vetting the vessels by any charterers in excess of 10 days per vessel per year;

the deductible of any insurance claims relating to the vessels or for any claims that are within such deductible range;

the significant increase in insurance premiums which are due to factors such as acts of God outside the control of the Manager;

repairs, refurbishment or modifications, including those not covered by the guarantee of the shipbuilder or by the insurance covering the vessels, resulting from maritime accidents, collisions, other accidental damage or unforeseen events (except to the extent that such accidents, collisions, damage or events are due to the fraud, gross negligence or willful misconduct of the Manager, its employees or its agents, unless and to the extent otherwise covered by insurance);

expenses imposed due to any improvement, upgrade or modification to, structural changes with respect to the installation of new equipment aboard any vessel that results from a change in, an introduction of new, or

a change in the interpretation of, applicable laws, at the recommendation of the classification society for that vessel or otherwise;

costs associated with increases in crew employment expenses resulting from an introduction of new, or a change in the interpretation of, applicable laws or resulting from the early termination of the charter of any vessel;

any taxes, dues or fines imposed on the vessels or the Manager due to the operation of the vessels;

expenses incurred in connection with the sale or acquisition of a vessel such as inspections and technical assistance; and

any similar costs, liabilities and expenses that were not reasonably contemplated by us and the Manager as being encompassed by or a component of the fixed daily fees at the time the fixed daily fees were determined.

Table of Contents

Payment of any extraordinary fees or expenses to the Manager could significantly increase our vessel operating expenses and impact our results of operations.

During the remaining term of the Management Agreement, we expect that we will reimburse the Manager for all of the actual operating costs and expenses it incurs in connection with the management of our fleet.

Administrative Services

On May 28, 2010, Navios Acquisition entered into the Administrative Services Agreement with Navios Holdings, initially set to expire on May 28, 2015, pursuant to which Navios Holdings provides certain administrative management services to Navios Acquisition which include: bookkeeping, audit and accounting services, legal and insurance services, administrative and clerical services, banking and financial services, advisory services, client and investor relations and other services. Navios Holdings is reimbursed for reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the provision of these services.

In May 2014, Navios Acquisition extended the duration of its existing Administrative Services Agreement with Navios Holdings, until May 2020 pursuant to its existing terms.

A. Operating results

Trends and Factors Affecting Our Future Results of Operations

We believe the principal factors that will affect our future results of operations are the economic, regulatory, political and governmental conditions that affect the shipping industry generally and that affect conditions in countries and markets in which our vessels engage in business. Other key factors that will be fundamental to our business, future financial condition and results of operations include:

the demand for seaborne transportation services;

the ability of Navios Holdings' commercial and chartering operations to successfully employ our vessels at economically attractive rates, particularly as our fleet expands and our charters expire;

the effective and efficient technical management of our vessels;

Navios Holdings' ability to satisfy technical, health, safety and compliance standards of major commodity traders; and

the strength of and growth in the number of our customer relationships, especially with major commodity traders.

In addition to the factors discussed above, we believe certain specific factors will impact our combined and consolidated results of operations. These factors include:

the charter hire earned by our vessels under our charters;

our access to capital required to acquire additional vessels and/or to implement our business strategy;

our ability to sell vessels at prices we deem satisfactory;

our level of debt and the related interest expense and amortization of principal; and

the level of any dividend to our stockholders.

Table of Contents**Period over Period Comparisons****Year Ended December 31, 2016 Compared to the Year Ended December 31, 2015**

The following table presents consolidated revenue and expense information for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015. This information was derived from the audited consolidated financial statements of Navios Acquisition for the respective periods.

(in thousands of U.S. dollars)	Year ended December 31, 2016	Year ended December 31, 2015
Revenue	\$ 290,245	\$ 313,396
Time charter and voyage expenses	(4,980)	(4,492)
Direct vessel expenses	(3,567)	(1,532)
Management fees (entirely through related party transactions)	(97,866)	(95,336)
General and administrative expenses	(17,057)	(15,532)
Depreciation and amortization	(57,617)	(57,623)
Interest income	4,767	1,683
Interest expenses and finance cost	(75,987)	(73,561)
Gain on sale of vessels	11,749	5,771
Equity in net earnings of affiliated companies	15,499	18,436
Other income	377	41
Other expense	(2,685)	(1,514)
Net income	\$ 62,878	\$ 89,737

Set forth below are selected historical and statistical data for Navios Acquisition for each of the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 that we believe may be useful in better understanding Navios Acquisition's financial position and results of operations.

	Year ended December 31, 2016	Year ended December 31, 2015
FLEET DATA		
Available days ⁽¹⁾	13,753	13,743
Operating days ⁽²⁾	13,716	13,707
Fleet utilization ⁽³⁾	99.7%	99.7%
Vessels operating at period end	36	39
AVERAGE DAILY RESULTS		
Time Charter Equivalent (TCE) Rate per day	\$ 20,742	\$ 22,477

(1) **Available days:** Available days for the fleet are total calendar days the vessels were in Navios Acquisition's possession for the relevant period after subtracting off-hire days associated with major repairs, drydocking or

special surveys. The shipping industry uses available days to measure the number of days in a relevant period during which vessels should be capable of generating revenues.

- (2) **Operating days:** Operating days are the number of available days in the relevant period less the aggregate number of days that the vessels are off-hire due to any reason, including unforeseen circumstances. The shipping industry uses operating days to measure the aggregate number of days in a relevant period during which vessels actually generate revenues.
- (3) **Fleet utilization:** Fleet utilization is the percentage of time that Navios Acquisition's vessels were available for generating revenue, and is determined by dividing the number of operating days during a relevant period by the number of available days during that period. The shipping industry uses fleet utilization to measure a company's efficiency in finding suitable employment for its vessels and minimizing the amount of days that its vessels are off hire for reasons other than scheduled repairs, dry dockings or special surveys.
- (4) **TCE Rate:** Time Charter Equivalent Rate per day is defined as voyage and time charter revenues less voyage expenses during a period divided by the number of available days during the period. The TCE Rate

Table of Contents

per day is a standard shipping industry performance measure used primarily to present the actual daily earnings generated by vessels of various types of charter contracts for the number of available days of the fleet. For the year ended December 31, 2016, Navios Acquisition had 13,753 available days, after it took delivery of four MR2 product tankers in 2015. The effect was partially mitigated by: (i) the sale of the outstanding shares of capital stock of two of its vessel-owning subsidiaries (Nave Celeste and C. Dream) to Navios Midstream (see Note 1) on June 18, 2015; and (ii) the sale of one MR2 product tanker and two chemical tankers in 2016.

There were 13,743 available days in the comparative period in 2015.

Revenue: Revenue for the year ended December 31, 2016 decreased by \$23.2 million, or 7.4%, to \$290.2 million, as compared to \$313.4 million for 2015. The decrease was mainly attributable to: (i) the decrease in revenue by \$18.6 million due to the sale of two VLCCs in June 2015, one MR2 product tanker in January 2016 and two chemical tankers in October and November 2016; and (ii) the decrease in profit sharing by \$24.5 million. The decrease was partially mitigated by the increase in revenue following deliveries of four vessels during 2015. Available days of the fleet increased to 13,753 days for the year ended December 31, 2016, as compared to 13,743 days for the year ended December 31, 2015. The TCE Rate decreased to \$20,742 for the year ended December 31, 2016, from \$22,477 for the year ended December 31, 2015.

Time charter and voyage expenses: Time charter and voyage expenses for the year ended December 31, 2016 increased by approximately \$0.5 million to \$5.0 million, as compared to \$4.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. The increase was attributable to a \$1.1 million increase in bunkers and other voyage expenses and was partially mitigated by a \$0.5 million decrease in broker commission costs.

Direct vessel expenses: Direct vessel expenses for the year ended December 31, 2016 increased by approximately \$2.0 million to \$3.6 million as compared to \$1.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. The increase was attributable to a: (i) \$1.3 million increase in amortization of dry dock and special survey cost; and (ii) \$0.7 million increase in expenses incurred in connection with specialized work performed on certain vessels of our fleet.

Management fees: Management fees for the year ended December 31, 2016 increased by approximately \$2.5 million to \$97.9 million, as compared to \$95.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. The increase was mainly attributable to the increased number of vessels and the increase in the management fees with effect as of May 29, 2016, described below. Pursuant to the Management Agreement, the Manager provided commercial and technical management services to Navios Acquisition's vessels for a daily fee of: (a) \$6,000 per MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel; (b) \$7,000 per LR1 product tanker vessel; and (c) \$9,500 per VLCC, through May 2016. Navios Acquisition fixed the fees for commercial and technical ship management services of its fleet for two additional years from May 29, 2016, through May 2018, at a daily fee of: (a) \$6,350 per MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel; (b) \$7,150 per LR1 product tanker vessel; and (c) \$9,500 per VLCC.

Dry docking expenses are reimbursed by Navios Acquisition, at cost.

General and administrative expenses: Total general and administrative expenses for the year ended December 31, 2016 increased by approximately \$1.5 million to \$17.1 million compared to \$15.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2015.

The increase was mainly attributable to a \$1.8 million increase in administrative expenses paid to Navios Holdings mainly due to the increased number of vessels in Navios Acquisition's fleet, partially mitigated by: (i) a \$0.2 million decrease in compensation to the directors and/or officers of the Company; and (ii) a \$0.2 million decrease in other general and administrative expenses, including professional, other fees and travel expenses.

Table of Contents

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015, the expenses charged by Navios Holdings for administrative services were \$9.4 million and \$7.6 million, respectively. The remaining balance of \$7.6 million and \$7.9 million of general and administrative expenses for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively, related to stock based compensation and compensation expense, as well as legal, consulting, travel and professional fees including audit fees.

Depreciation and amortization: Depreciation and amortization amounted to \$57.6 million for each of the years ended December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015. Depreciation of a vessel is calculated using an estimated useful life of 25 years from the date the vessel was originally delivered from the shipyard.

Interest income: Interest income for year ended December 31, 2016 increased by \$3.1 million to \$4.8 million compared to \$1.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. The increase is mainly attributable to the increase of the interest income accrued under the revolving loans granted to Navios Holdings, Navios Europe I and Navios Europe II.

Interest expense and finance cost: Interest expense and finance cost for the year ended December 31, 2016 increased by \$2.4 million to \$76.0 million, as compared to \$73.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. The increase was mainly due to the increase in the average outstanding balance of our borrowings, which amounted to \$503.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2016 as compared to \$487.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. The weighted average interest rate for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015 was 6.0%. As of December 31, 2016 and 2015, the outstanding balance under Navios Acquisition's total borrowings was \$1,111.2 million and \$1,216.6 million, respectively.

Gain on sale of vessels: The gain on sale of vessels for the year ended December 31, 2016 increased by approximately \$6.0 million to \$11.7 million, as compared to \$5.8 million.

During 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Constellation, the Nave Universe and the Nave Lucida to unaffiliated third parties for total net cash proceeds of \$90.0 million. As of June 30, 2016, the Nave Constellation and the Nave Universe were classified as vessels held for sale.

The gain on sale of vessels for the year ended December 31, 2015, was \$5.8 million and resulted from the sale of the Nave Celeste and the C. Dream to Navios Midstream for a total sale price of \$100.0 million, of which \$73.0 million was paid in cash and \$27.0 million was paid in a new class of units designated as Subordinated Series A Units of Navios Midstream.

Equity in net earnings of affiliated companies: Equity in net earnings of affiliated companies decreased by \$2.9 million to \$15.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2016, as compared to \$18.4 million for the same period in 2015. The decrease resulted from the decrease in equity in earnings of Navios Midstream which amounted to \$1.6 million and of Navios Europe I and of Navios Europe II which amounted to \$1.3 million.

Other income: Other income amounted to \$0.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2016 compared to \$0.04 million for the year ended December 31, 2015.

Other expense: Other expense increased by \$1.2 million to \$2.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2016, as compared to \$1.5 million for the same period in 2015.

Table of Contents**Year Ended December 31, 2015 Compared to the Year Ended December 31, 2014**

The following table presents consolidated revenue and expense information for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. This information was derived from the audited consolidated financial statements of Navios Acquisition for the respective periods.

(in thousands of U.S. dollars)	Year ended December 31, 2015	Year ended December 31, 2014
Revenue	\$ 313,396	\$ 264,877
Time charter and voyage expenses	(4,492)	(5,187)
Direct vessel expenses	(1,532)	(1,979)
Management fees (entirely through related party transactions)	(95,336)	(95,827)
General and administrative expenses	(15,532)	(14,588)
Depreciation and amortization	(57,623)	(67,718)
Interest income	1,683	720
Interest expenses and finance cost	(73,561)	(78,610)
Impairment loss		(11,690)
Gain on sale of vessels	5,771	22,599
Change in fair value of other assets		(1,188)
Equity in net earnings of affiliated companies	18,436	2,000
Other income	41	280
Other expense	(1,514)	(642)
Net income	\$ 89,737	\$ 13,047

Set forth below are selected historical and statistical data for Navios Acquisition for each of the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 that we believe may be useful in better understanding Navios Acquisition's financial position and results of operations.

	Year Ended December 31, 2015	Year Ended December 31, 2014
FLEET DATA		
Available days ⁽¹⁾	13,743	13,227
Operating days ⁽²⁾	13,707	13,193
Fleet utilization ⁽³⁾	99.7%	99.7%
Vessels operating at period end	39	37
AVERAGE DAILY RESULTS		
Time Charter Equivalent (TCE) Rate per day ⁽⁴⁾	\$ 22,477	\$ 19,633

(1) **Available days:** Available days for the fleet are total calendar days the vessels were in Navios Acquisition's possession for the relevant period after subtracting off-hire days associated with major repairs, drydocking or

special surveys. The shipping industry uses available days to measure the number of days in a relevant period during which vessels should be capable of generating revenues.

- (2) **Operating days:** Operating days are the number of available days in the relevant period less the aggregate number of days that the vessels are off-hire due to any reason, including unforeseen circumstances. The shipping industry uses operating days to measure the aggregate number of days in a relevant period during which vessels actually generate revenues.
- (3) **Fleet utilization:** Fleet utilization is the percentage of time that Navios Acquisition's vessels were available for generating revenue, and is determined by dividing the number of operating days during a relevant period by the number of available days during that period. The shipping industry uses fleet utilization to measure a company's efficiency in finding suitable employment for its vessels and minimizing the amount of days that its vessels are off hire for reasons other than scheduled repairs, dry dockings or special surveys.
- (4) **TCE Rate:** Time Charter Equivalent Rate per day is defined as voyage and time charter revenues less voyage expenses during a period divided by the number of available days during the period. The TCE Rate

Table of Contents

per day is a standard shipping industry performance measure used primarily to present the actual daily earnings generated by vessels of various types of charter contracts for the number of available days of the fleet. For the year ended December 31, 2015, Navios Acquisition had 13,743 available days, after it took delivery of five MR2 product tankers and eight VLCCs during the period from January 1, 2014 until December 31, 2015. The effect was partially mitigated by; (i) the sale of the outstanding shares of capital stock of two of its vessel-owning subsidiaries (Nave Celeste and C. Dream) to Navios Midstream (see Note 1) on June 18, 2015; (ii) the sale of the Shinyo Splendor on May 6, 2014 to an unaffiliated third party; and (iii) the sale of the outstanding shares of capital stock of four of its vessel-owning subsidiaries (Shinyo Ocean Limited, Shinyo Kannika Limited, Shinyo Kieran Limited and Shinyo Saowalak Limited) to Navios Midstream (see Note 1) on November 18, 2014.

There were 13,227 available days in the comparative period in 2014.

Revenue: Revenue for the year ended December 31, 2015 increased by \$48.5 million or 18.3% to \$313.4 million, as compared to \$264.9 million for the same period in 2014. The increase was mainly attributable to: (i) the increase in revenue following deliveries of the vessels discussed above and was partially mitigated by \$73.7 million due to the sale of five VLCCs in 2014 and two VLCCs in June 2015; and (ii) the profit sharing increase by \$25.4 million to \$32.1 million recognized in the year ended December 31, 2015, as compared to \$6.7 million for the same period in 2014. Available days of the fleet increased to 13,743 days for the year ended December 31, 2015, as compared to 13,227 days for the year ended December 31, 2014. The TCE Rate increased to \$22,477 for the year ended December 31, 2015, from \$19,633 for the year ended December 31, 2014.

Time charter and voyage expenses: Time charter and voyage expenses for the year ended December 31, 2015 decreased by approximately \$0.7 million to \$4.5 million, as compared to \$5.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The decrease was attributable to: a (a) \$1.3 million decrease in bunkers; and (b) \$0.1 million decrease in voyage expenses. The decrease was partially mitigated by a \$0.6 million increase in broker commission costs.

Direct vessel expenses: Direct vessel expenses, comprised of the amortization of dry dock and special survey costs, of certain vessels of our fleet amounted to \$1.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2015, as compared to \$2.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2014.

Management fees: Management fees for the year ended December 31, 2015 decreased by \$0.5 million to \$95.3 million, as compared to \$95.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The decrease was attributable to: (i) the decrease of \$17.6 million due to the sale of five VLCCs in 2014 and two VLCCs in June 2015, partially mitigated by the increase incurred as a result of the 13 vessels delivered since January 2014.

General and administrative expenses: Total general and administrative expenses for the year ended December 31, 2015 increased by approximately \$0.9 million or 6.5% to \$15.5 million compared to \$14.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The increase was mainly attributable to a: (a) \$2.8 million of cash payment authorized by the Compensation Committee of the Company; (b) \$0.3 million increase in administrative expenses paid to the Manager due to the increased number of vessels in Navios Acquisition's fleet; (c) \$0.4 million increase in other expenses, including travelling expenses; and (d) \$0.4 million increase in professional and other fees; partially mitigated by \$2.9 million decrease of the stock based compensation.

For the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, the expenses charged by Navios Holdings for administrative services were \$7.6 million and \$7.3 million, respectively. The remaining balance of \$7.9 million and \$7.3 million of general and administrative expenses for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively, related to stock based compensation and compensation expense, as well as legal, consulting, travel and professional fees including

audit fees.

Table of Contents

Depreciation and amortization: Depreciation and amortization decreased by approximately \$10.1 million to \$57.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 as compared to \$67.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The decrease of \$10.1 million was mainly attributable to a: (i) decrease in depreciation expense of \$17.8 million due to the sale of five VLCCs in 2014 and two VLCCs in June 2015; and (ii) decrease in amortization of favorable and unfavorable lease terms of \$3.6 million, mainly due to the sale of the time charter-out contracts attached to the six VLCCs sold to Navios Midstream. The decrease was partially mitigated by approximately \$11.3 million due to the acquisition of the thirteen vessels discussed above. Depreciation of a vessel is calculated using an estimated useful life of 25 years from the date the vessel was originally delivered from the shipyard.

Interest income: Interest income for year ended December 31, 2015 increased by \$1.0 million to \$1.7 million compared to \$0.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The increase was mainly attributable to the increase of the interest income accrued under the revolving loans granted to Navios Europe I and Navios Europe II.

Interest expense and finance cost: Interest expense and finance cost for the year ended December 31, 2015 decreased by \$5.0 million to \$73.6 million, as compared to \$78.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The decrease was due to the decrease in the average outstanding balance of our borrowings, which amounted to \$487.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 as compared to \$575.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The decrease was partially mitigated by the increase of the weighted average interest rate for the year ended December 31, 2015 to 6.0% from 5.73%, during the year ended December 31, 2014. As of December 31, 2015 and 2014, the outstanding balance under Navios Acquisition's total borrowings was \$1,216.6 million and \$1,162.5 million, respectively.

Impairment loss: As of March 31, 2014, an impairment loss of \$10.7 million related to the sale of Shinyo Splendor had been recognized under the line item Impairment Loss. As of March 31, 2014, the Company had a current expectation that, more likely than not, the Shinyo Splendor would be sold before the end of its previously estimated useful life, and as a result performed an impairment test of the specific asset group. The carrying amount of the asset group was more than its undiscounted future cash flows which resulted in an impairment loss. In addition, as of March 31, 2014, management reassessed the recoverable amount of a receivable and recognized an impairment loss of \$1.0 million.

Gain on sale of vessels: The gain on sale of vessels for year ended December 31, 2015, was \$5.8 million and resulted from the sale of the Nave Celeste and the C. Dream to Navios Midstream for a total sale price of \$100.0 million, of which \$73.0 million was paid in cash and \$27.0 million was paid in a new class of units designated as Subordinated Series A Units of Navios Midstream.

On November 18, 2014, Navios Acquisition sold all of the outstanding shares of capital stock of four of its vessel-owning subsidiaries (Shinyo Ocean Limited, Shinyo Kannika Limited, Shinyo Kieran Limited and Shinyo Saowalak Limited) to Navios Midstream (see Note 5), resulting in a gain on disposal of \$23.5 million.

On May 6, 2014, Navios Acquisition sold the Shinyo Splendor to an unaffiliated third party for an aggregate sale price of \$20.0 million and recognized a loss on sale of \$0.9 million.

Change in fair value of other assets: As of March 31, 2014, management revalued its derivative asset at \$2.3 million using publicly available trading data and recognized a fair value loss of \$1.2 million in the consolidated statements of income. The derivative was sold in the second quarter of 2014.

Equity in net earnings of affiliated companies: Equity in net earnings of affiliated companies increased by \$16.4 million to \$18.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2015, as compared to \$2.0 million for the same period

in 2014. The increase resulted from the equity in earnings of Navios Midstream which amounted to \$14.7 million and from the equity in earnings of Navios Europe I of \$0.5 million and Navios Europe II of \$1.3 million.

Table of Contents

Other income: Other income amounted to \$0.04 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to \$0.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2014.

Other expense: Other expense increased by \$0.9 million to \$1.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2015, as compared to \$0.6 million for the same period in 2014.

B. Liquidity and Capital Resources and Uses

Our primary short-term liquidity needs are to fund general working capital requirements, drydocking expenditures, minimum cash balance maintenance as per our credit facility agreements and debt repayment, while our long-term liquidity needs primarily relate to expansion and investment capital expenditures and other maintenance capital expenditures and debt repayment. Expansion capital expenditures are primarily for the purchase or construction of vessels to the extent the expenditures increase the operating capacity of or revenue generated by our fleet, while maintenance capital expenditures primarily consist of drydocking expenditures and expenditures to replace vessels in order to maintain the operating capacity of or revenue generated by our fleet. We anticipate that our primary sources of funds for our short-term liquidity needs will be cash flows from operations, proceeds from asset sales and bank borrowings which we believe that will be sufficient to meet our existing short-term liquidity needs for at least the next 12 months. Generally, our long-term sources of funds will be from cash from operations, long-term bank borrowings and other debt or equity financings. We expect that we will rely upon cash from operations and upon external financing sources, including bank borrowings, to fund acquisitions, expansion and investment capital expenditures and other commitments we have entered into. We cannot assure you that we will be able to secure adequate financing or obtaining additional funds on favorable terms, to meet our liquidity needs. Please also refer to Item 3.D. Risk Factors – Risks Related to Our Indebtedness.

Navios Acquisition finances its capital requirements with cash flows from operations, equity contributions from stockholders, bank loans and the issuance of the 2021 Notes. The main uses of funds have been capital expenditures for the acquisition of new vessels, expenditures incurred in connection with ensuring that the owned vessels comply with international and regulatory standards, repayments of bank loans and payments of dividends.

Navios Acquisition may use funds to repurchase its outstanding capital stock and/or indebtedness from time to time. Repurchases may be made in the open market, or through privately negotiated transactions or otherwise, in compliance with applicable laws, rules and regulations, at prices and on terms Navios Acquisition deems appropriate and subject to its cash requirements for other purposes, compliance with the covenants under Navios Acquisition's debt agreements, and other factors management deems relevant.

Under its share repurchase program, expired in December 2016, Navios Acquisition was authorized to repurchase up to \$50.0 million of its common stock, over a two-year period.

Cash flows for the year ended December 31, 2016 compared to the year ended December 31, 2015:

The following table presents cash flow information for the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015. This information was derived from the audited consolidated statement of cash flows of Navios Acquisition for the respective periods.

(Expressed in thousands of U.S. dollars)

	Year Ended December 31, 2016	Year Ended December 31, 2015
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 92,945	\$ 119,636
Net cash provided by/ (used in) investing activities	43,505	(104,510)
Net cash used in financing activities	(141,963)	(14,814)
Change in cash and cash equivalents	\$ (5,513)	\$ 312

Table of Contents

Cash provided by operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2016 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2015:

Net cash provided by operating activities decreased by \$26.7 million to \$92.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2016 as compared to net cash provided by operating activities of \$119.6 million for the same period in 2015. The decrease is analyzed as follows:

The net income for the year ended December 31, 2016 was \$62.9 million compared to \$89.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. In determining net cash provided by operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2016, the net income was adjusted for the effect of depreciation and amortization of \$57.6 million, \$11.7 million gain on sale of vessels, \$3.7 million for amortization and write-off of deferred finance fees and bond premium, \$2.8 million for the amortization of dry dock and special survey costs, \$1.4 million for earnings in affiliates, net of dividend received, \$0.9 million stock based compensation and \$0.4 million gain on debt repayment.

Amounts due from related parties, short-term, increased by \$7.2 million to \$25.0 million at December 31, 2016 from \$17.8 million at December 31, 2015. The increase mainly related to payment of management fees for our vessels. Please refer to the relevant discussion below, under **Related Party Transactions** .

Payment for dry dock and special survey costs incurred in the years ended December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015 was \$3.8 million and \$6.6 million, respectively, and related to drydock and special survey costs incurred for certain vessels of the fleet.

Accounts receivable increased by \$6.7 million from \$14.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2015, to \$20.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2016. The increase was attributed to the increase in receivables due from charterers.

Restricted cash from operating activities decreased by approximately \$0.2 million from \$1.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 to \$1.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2016 and related to the cash held in retention accounts for the payment of interest under our credit facilities.

Amounts due from related parties, long-term, excluding the amounts related to the Navios Holdings Credit Facility, increased by \$12.9 million from \$16.5 million for the period ended December 31, 2015, to \$29.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2016, which mainly related to payment of special survey and dry docking expenses for certain vessels of our fleet and the increase of \$4.3 million loan granted to Navios Europe II, classified under **Cash provided by /(used in) investing activities** . Please refer to the relevant discussion below, under **Related Party Transactions** .

Accounts payable increased by \$2.1 million to \$4.9 million at December 31, 2016 from \$2.8 million at December 31, 2015.

Prepaid expenses and other current assets increased to \$4.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2016 from \$3.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2015, mainly due to reclassification of working capital advances required under certain charter contracts, under the long-term assets.

Other long-term assets decreased by \$1.0 million to \$0.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2016 from \$1.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2015, due to \$1.0 million of working capital reclassified to current assets.

Accrued expenses increased by \$1.2 million to \$11.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2016, from \$9.8 million on December 31, 2015. The increase was mainly attributable to the increase of accrued voyage and other expenses.

Table of Contents

Deferred revenue primarily relates to cash received from charterers prior to it being earned and also includes the current portion of deferred gain on sale of the Nave Celeste and the C. Dream to Navios Midstream. Deferred revenue relating to cash received from charterers was recognized as revenue over the voyage or charter period. Deferred revenue increased by \$0.9 million to \$8.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2016 from \$7.6 million on December 31, 2015.

Cash provided by/ (used in) investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2016 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2015:

Net cash provided by investing activities increased by \$148.0 million to \$43.5 million inflow at December 31, 2016 from \$104.5 million outflow at December 31, 2015.

Net cash provided by investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2016, resulted from: (i) \$90.0 million net proceeds from sale of vessels; and (ii) \$7.2 million from dividends received from affiliates. The increase was mitigated by a: (i) \$49.3 million loan granted to Navios Holdings, net of issuance fees and costs; (ii) a \$4.3 million loan granted to Navios Europe II (Navios Revolving Loans II); and (iii) a \$0.1 million investment in Navios Midstream in order to maintain the 2% general partner interest.

Net cash used in investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2015, resulted from: (i) \$71.2 million net proceeds from sale of vessel; and (ii) \$2.6 million from dividends received from affiliates. The \$73.8 million increase was mitigated by: (a) \$163.8 million paid for the acquisition of vessels; (b) \$7.2 million paid for investments in affiliates (from which \$6.7 million related to the investment in Navios Europe II and approximately \$0.6 million was paid to Navios Midstream to acquire 32,509 general partner units in order for Navios Acquisition to maintain its 2.0% general partnership interest); and (c) a \$7.3 million loan granted to Navios Europe II.

Cash used in financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2016 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2015:

Net cash used in financing activities increased by \$127.1 million to a \$142.0 million outflow at December 31, 2016 from a \$14.8 million outflow in the year ended December 31, 2015.

Net cash used in financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2016, resulted from: (i) \$105.5 million of loan repayments; (ii) \$31.7 million of dividends paid; (iii) a \$4.0 million for the redemption of puttable common stock; and (iv) a \$0.8 million increase in restricted cash.

Net cash used in financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2015, resulted from: (i) \$140.9 million of loan repayments; (ii) \$40.1 million of dividends paid; (iii) a \$11.3 million payment to a related party with respect to capitalized expenses of certain of the Company's vessels, while these were under construction; (iv) \$5.5 million for the redemption of convertible shares; (v) \$9.9 million for the acquisition of treasury stock, which was partially offset by \$192.9 million loan proceeds net of deferred finance fees; and a \$0.1 million increase in restricted cash.

Table of Contents***Cash flows for the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to the year ended December 31, 2014:***

The following table presents cash flow information for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. This information was derived from the audited consolidated statement of cash flows of Navios Acquisition for the respective periods.

(Expressed in thousands of U.S. dollars)	Year Ended December 31, 2015	Year Ended December 31, 2014
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 119,636	\$ 75,985
Net cash used in investing activities	(104,510)	(145,729)
Net cash (used in)/ provided by financing activities	(14,814)	41,402
Change in cash and cash equivalents	\$ 312	\$ (28,342)

Cash provided by operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2015 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2014:

Net cash provided by operating activities increased by \$43.7 million to \$119.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 as compared to net cash provided by operating activities of \$76.0 million for the same period in 2014. The increase is analyzed as follows:

The net income for the year ended December 31, 2015 was \$89.7 million compared to \$13.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. In determining net cash provided by operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2015, the net income was adjusted for the effect of depreciation and amortization of \$57.6 million, \$5.8 million gain on sale of vessels, \$3.5 million for amortization and write-off of deferred finance fees and bond premium, \$1.5 million for the amortization of dry dock and special survey costs, \$2.4 million stock based compensation and \$3.8 million for earnings in affiliates, net of dividend received.

Amounts due to related parties decreased by \$28.1 million from \$28.1 million at December 31, 2014 to \$0 at December 31, 2015. The decrease of approximately \$28.1 million primarily resulted from a \$17.8 million payment relating to operating activities, i.e., management fees and other expenses, and a \$10.4 million payment related to financing activities, i.e., capitalized expenses of certain of the Company's vessels, while these were under construction.

Amounts due from related parties increased by \$16.5 million to \$17.8 million at December 31, 2015 from \$1.4 million at December 31, 2014. The increase mainly related to management fees and other expenses.

Payment for dry dock and special survey costs incurred in the years ended December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 was \$6.6 million and \$5.7 million, respectively.

Accounts receivable decreased by \$4.1 million from \$18.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2014, to \$14.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2015. The decrease was attributed to the decrease in receivables due from charterers.

Restricted cash from operating activities increased by \$0.04 million from \$1.31 million for the year ended December 31, 2014 to \$1.35 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 and related to the cash held in retention accounts for the payment of interest under our credit facilities.

Accounts payable increased by \$1.2 million to \$2.8 million at December 31, 2015 from \$1.6 million at December 31, 2014.

Prepaid expenses and other current assets decreased by \$5.1 million to \$3.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 from \$8.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2014. The total decrease in prepaid expenses and other current assets primarily resulted from: (i) a \$4.5 million decrease in working capital advances required under certain charter contracts; and (ii) a \$1.0 million decrease in inventory. The decrease of \$5.5 million was partially mitigated by a \$0.4 million increase in other prepaid expenses.

Table of Contents

Other long-term assets increased by \$1.2 million to \$1.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 from \$0.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2014, due to \$1.2 million representing advances to certain counterparties for working capital purposes reclassified from the caption Prepaid expenses and other current assets.

Accrued expenses decreased by \$0.5 million to \$9.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2015, from \$10.3 million on December 31, 2014. The decrease was attributable to a \$0.5 million decrease in accrued professional fees and expenses, \$0.1 million decrease in accrued voyage expenses partially mitigated by a \$0.1 million increase in accrued interest.

Deferred voyage revenue primarily relates to cash received from charterers prior to it being earned. These amounts are recognized as revenue over the voyage or charter period. Deferred voyage revenue increased by \$6.2 million to \$7.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2015 from \$1.4 million on December 31, 2014.

Cash used in investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2015 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2014:

Net cash used in investing activities decreased by \$41.2 million to \$104.5 million at December 31, 2015 from \$145.7 million at December 31, 2014.

Net cash used in investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2015, resulted from: (i) \$71.2 million net proceeds from sale of vessels; and (ii) \$2.6 million from dividends received from affiliates. The \$73.8 million increase was mitigated by: (a) \$163.8 million paid for the acquisition of vessels; (b) \$7.2 million paid for investments in affiliates (from which \$6.7 million relates to the investment in Navios Europe II and approximately \$0.6 million was paid to Navios Midstream to acquire 32,509 general partner units in order for Navios Acquisition to maintain its 2.0% general partnership interest); and (c) a \$7.3 million loan granted to Navios Europe II.

Net cash used in investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2014 resulted from: (a) \$362.3 million paid for acquisitions of vessels; (b) \$11.9 million paid as deposits for the acquisition of the vessels that were delivered to Navios Acquisition at various dates through February 2015; and (c) \$4.5 million from a loan granted to Navios Europe I. The \$378.7 million was partially mitigated by the receipt of \$233.0 million of net proceeds from the sales of the Shinyo Splendor in May 2014 and the four VLCCs in November 2014.

Cash (used in)/ provided by financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2015 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2014:

Net cash used in financing activities decreased by \$56.2 million to a \$14.8 million outflow at December 31, 2015 from a \$41.4 million inflow in the year ended December 31, 2014.

Net cash used in financing activities resulted from: (i) \$140.9 million of loan repayments; (ii) \$40.1 million of dividends paid; (iii) a \$11.3 million payment to a related party with respect to capitalized expenses of certain of the Company's vessels, while these were under construction; (iv) \$5.5 million for the redemption of convertible shares; and (v) \$9.9 million for the acquisition of treasury stock, and was partially offset by \$192.9 million loan proceeds net of deferred finance fees and a \$0.1 million increase in restricted cash.

Net cash provided by financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2014 was \$41.4 million. Net cash provided by financing activities resulted from a \$161.9 million loan proceeds net of deferred finance fees, \$165.7 million loan proceeds from a related party, net of deferred finance cost, \$59.6 million proceeds from issuance of ship mortgage and senior notes, net of debt issuance costs, \$54.3 million from net proceeds from equity offerings and a \$17.7 million

increase in restricted cash. This increase was partially offset by: (a) \$216.2 million of loan repayments; (b) a \$169.7 million repayment of a loan from a related party; and (c) dividends paid of \$31.9 million.

Table of Contents**Reconciliation of EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA to Net Cash from Operating Activities**

	Year Ended December 31, 2016	Year Ended December 31, 2015	Year Ended December 31, 2014
Expressed in thousands of U.S. dollars			
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 92,945	\$ 119,636	\$ 75,985
Net increase in operating assets	24,642	14,911	17,375
Net (increase)/ decrease in operating liabilities	(3,272)	10,610	(7,972)
Net interest cost	71,220	71,878	77,890
Amortization and write-off of deferred finance fees and bond premium	(3,656)	(3,495)	(9,111)
Gain on debt repayment	350		
Earnings in affiliates, net of dividends received	1,438	3,821	2,000
Stock based compensation	(864)	(2,362)	(5,254)
Gain on sale of vessels	11,749	5,771	22,599
Impairment loss			(11,690)
Change in fair value of other assets			(1,188)
EBITDA	194,552	220,770	160,634
Stock based compensation	864	2,362	5,254
Gain on sale of vessels	(11,749)	(5,771)	(22,599)
Impairment loss			11,690
Change in fair value of other assets			1,188
Gain on debt repayment	(350)		
Adjusted EBITDA	\$ 183,317	\$ 217,361	\$ 156,167

	Year Ended December 31, 2016	Year Ended December 31, 2015	Year Ended December 31, 2014
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 92,945	\$ 119,636	\$ 75,985
Net cash provided by/ (used in) investing activities	\$ 43,505	\$ (104,510)	\$ (145,729)
Net cash (used in)/ provided by financing activities	\$ (141,963)	\$ (14,814)	\$ 41,402

EBITDA in this document represents net income plus interest and finance costs plus depreciation and amortization and income taxes less interest income. Adjusted EBITDA in this document represents EBITDA before stock-based compensation; gain on sale of vessels, impairment loss, gain on debt repayment and before change in fair value of other assets.

We use Adjusted EBITDA as liquidity measure and reconcile Adjusted EBITDA to net cash provided by/ (used in) operating activities, the most comparable U.S. GAAP liquidity measure. Adjusted EBITDA in this document is calculated as follows: net cash provided by/(used in) operating activities adding back, when applicable and as the case may be, the effect of: (i) net increase/(decrease) in operating assets; (ii) net (increase)/decrease in operating liabilities; (iii) net interest cost; (iv) amortization of deferred finance cost and other related expenses; (v) provision for losses on

accounts receivable; (vi) equity in net earnings of affiliated companies, net of dividends received; (vii) payments for dry dock and special survey costs; (viii) gain/(loss) on sale of assets/subsidiaries; (ix) stock based compensation; (x) gain/(loss) on debt repayment; and (xi) impairment charges. Navios Acquisition believes that Adjusted EBITDA is the basis upon which liquidity can be assessed and present useful information to investors regarding Navios Acquisition's ability to service and/or incur indebtedness, pay capital expenditures, meet working capital requirements and pay dividends. Navios Acquisition also believes that Adjusted EBITDA is used: (i) by potential lenders to evaluate potential transactions; (ii) to evaluate and price potential acquisition candidates; and (iii) by securities analysts, investors and other interested parties in the evaluation of companies in our industry.

Table of Contents

Adjusted EBITDA has limitations as analytical tool, and should not be considered in isolation or as a substitute for the analysis of Navios Acquisition's results as reported under U.S. GAAP. Some of these limitations are: (i) Adjusted EBITDA does not reflect changes in, or cash requirements for, working capital needs; and (ii) although depreciation and amortization are non-cash charges, the assets being depreciated and amortized may have to be replaced in the future. Adjusted EBITDA does not reflect any cash requirements for such capital expenditures. Because of these limitations, Adjusted EBITDA should not be considered as a principal indicator of Navios Acquisition's performance. Furthermore, our calculation of Adjusted EBITDA may not be comparable to that reported by other companies due to differences in methods of calculation.

Adjusted EBITDA for the year ended December 31, 2016 decreased by approximately \$34.0 million to \$183.3 million from \$217.4 million in the same period of 2015. The decrease in Adjusted EBITDA was mainly due to a: (a) \$23.2 million decrease in revenue; (b) \$2.9 million decrease in equity in net earnings of affiliated companies; (c) \$2.5 million increase in management fees mainly due to the increased number of vessels and the increase in the management fees with effect as of May 29, 2016; (d) \$3.0 million increase in general and administrative expenses (excluding stock based compensation); (e) \$1.2 million increase in other expense; (f) \$0.7 million increase in direct vessel expenses (excluding amortization of dry dock and special survey costs); and (g) \$0.5 million increase in time charter expenses.

Adjusted EBITDA for the year ended December 31, 2015 increased by \$61.2 million to \$217.4 million from \$156.2 million in the year ended December 31, 2014. The increase in Adjusted EBITDA was due to a: (a) \$48.5 million increase in revenue; (b) \$16.4 million increase in equity in net earnings of affiliated companies; (c) \$0.7 million decrease in time charter expenses; and (d) \$0.5 million decrease in management fees; partially mitigated by a: (i) \$3.8 million increase in general and administrative expenses; (ii) \$0.2 million decrease in other income; and (iii) \$0.9 million increase in other expense.

Long-Term Debt Obligations and Credit Arrangements**Ship Mortgage Notes:**

8 1/8% First Priority Ship Mortgages: On November 13, 2013, the Company and its wholly owned subsidiary, Navios Acquisition Finance (US) Inc. (Navios Acquisition Finance and together with the Company, the 2021 Co-Issuers) issued \$610.0 million in first priority ship mortgage notes (the Existing Notes) due on November 15, 2021 at a fixed rate of 8.125%.

On March 31, 2014, the Company completed a sale of \$60.0 million of its first priority ship mortgage notes due in 2021 (the Additional Notes, and together with the Existing Notes, the 2021 Notes). The terms of the Additional Notes are identical to the Existing Notes and were issued at 103.25% plus accrued interest from November 13, 2013. The net cash received amounted to \$59.6 million.

The 2021 Co-Issuers have the option to redeem the 2021 Notes in whole or in part, at any time: (i) before November 15, 2016, at a redemption price equal to 100% of the principal amount, plus a make-whole premium, plus accrued and unpaid interest, if any; and (ii) on or after November 15, 2016, at a fixed price of 106.094% of the principal amount, which price declines ratably until it reaches par in 2019, plus accrued and unpaid interest, if any.

At any time before November 15, 2016, the 2021 Co-Issuers could have redeemed up to 35% of the aggregate principal amount of the 2021 Notes with the net proceeds of an equity offering at 108.125% of the principal amount of the 2021 Notes, plus accrued and unpaid interest, if any, so long as at least 65% of the aggregate principal amount of the Existing Notes remained outstanding after such redemption. No redemption took place.

In addition, upon the occurrence of certain change of control events, the holders of the 2021 Notes will have the right to require the 2021 Co-Issuers to repurchase some or all of the 2021 Notes at 101% of their face amount, plus accrued and unpaid interest to the repurchase date.

Table of Contents

The 2021 Notes contain covenants which, among other things, limit the incurrence of additional indebtedness, issuance of certain preferred stock, the payment of dividends, redemption or repurchase of capital stock or making restricted payments and investments, creation of certain liens, transfer or sale of assets, entering in transactions with affiliates, merging or consolidating or selling all or substantially all of the 2021 Co-Issuers' properties and assets and creation or designation of restricted subsidiaries. The 2021 Co-Issuers were in compliance with the covenants as of December 31, 2016.

The Existing Notes and the Additional Notes are treated as a single class for all purposes under the indenture including, without limitation, waivers, amendments, redemptions and other offers to purchase and the Additional Notes rank evenly with the Existing Notes. The Additional Notes and the Existing Notes have the same CUSIP number.

Guarantees

The Company's 2021 Notes are fully and unconditionally guaranteed on a joint and several basis by all of the Company's subsidiaries with the exception of Navios Acquisition Finance (a co-issuer of the 2021 notes). The Company's 2021 Notes are unregistered. The guarantees of our subsidiaries that own mortgaged vessels are senior secured guarantees and the guarantees of our subsidiaries that do not own mortgaged vessels are senior unsecured guarantees. All subsidiaries, including Navios Acquisition Finance, are 100% owned. Navios Acquisition does not have any independent assets or operations. Navios Acquisition does not have any subsidiaries that are not guarantors of the 2021 Notes.

Credit Facilities

Commerzbank AG, Alpha Bank A.E., and Credit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank: Navios Acquisition assumed a loan agreement dated April 7, 2010, with Commerzbank AG, Alpha Bank A.E. and Credit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank of up to \$150.0 million (divided in six equal tranches of \$25.0 million each) to partially finance the construction of two chemical tankers and four product tankers. Each tranche of the facility is repayable in 12 equal semi-annual installments of \$0.75 million each with a final balloon payment of \$16.0 million to be repaid on the last repayment date. The repayment of each tranche started six months after the delivery date of the respective vessel which that tranche financed. It bears interest at a rate of LIBOR plus 250 bps. The loan also requires compliance with certain financial covenants. On October 27, 2016, Navios Acquisition reduced the facility by \$16.0 million through payment of \$15.7 million in cash being the balloon instalment for one of the six tranches, achieving a nominal benefit amount of \$0.4 million. As of December 31, 2016, the amount of \$94.3 million was outstanding. On January 27, 2017, Navios Acquisition repaid \$16.0 million being the balloon instalment for another of the remaining five tranches.

BNP Paribas S.A. Bank and DVB Bank S.E.: Navios Acquisition assumed a loan agreement dated April 8, 2010, of up to \$75.0 million (divided in three equal tranches of \$25.0 million each) to partially finance the purchase price of three product tankers. Each of the tranches is repayable in 12 equal semi-annual installments of \$0.75 million each with a final balloon payment of \$16.0 million to be repaid on the last repayment date. The repayment date of each tranche started six months after the delivery date of the respective vessel which that tranche finances. It bears interest at a rate of LIBOR plus 250 bps. The loan also requires compliance with certain financial covenants. As of December 31, 2016, an amount of \$60.8 million was outstanding.

DVB Bank S.E. and ABN AMRO Bank N.V.: On May 28, 2010, Navios Acquisition entered into a loan agreement with DVB Bank S.E. and ABN AMRO BANK N.V. of up to \$52.0 million (divided into two tranches of \$26.0 million each) to partially finance the acquisition costs of two product tanker vessels. The repayment of each tranche started

three months after the delivery date of the respective vessel and bore interest at a rate of LIBOR plus 275 bps. The loan also required compliance with certain financial covenants. After various amendments, on November 13, 2014, the Company prepaid an amount of \$18.4 million which was the entire amount outstanding under one of the two tranches using a portion of the proceeds received from Navios

Table of Contents

Midstream's IPO. In June 2015, the Company fully prepaid the outstanding balance under this loan facility. The repayment of the loan agreement was accounted for as a debt extinguishment in accordance with ASC470 Debt and the remaining unamortized balance of \$0.1 million was written-off from the deferred finance fees.

Eurobank Ergasias S.A.: On October 26, 2010, Navios Acquisition entered into a loan agreement with Eurobank Ergasias S.A. of up to \$52.2 million, of which \$51.6 million has been drawn (divided into two tranches of \$26.1 million and \$25.5 million, respectively) to partially finance the acquisition costs of two LR1 product tanker vessels. Each tranche of the facility is repayable in 32 quarterly installments of \$0.35 million and \$0.34 million, respectively, with a final balloon payment of \$15.1 million and \$14.7 million, respectively, to be repaid on the last repayment date. The repayment of each tranche started three months after the delivery date of the respective vessel. The loan bears interest at a rate of LIBOR plus (i) 250 bps for the period prior to the delivery date in respect of the vessel being financed, and (ii) thereafter 275 bps. The loan also requires compliance with certain financial covenants. The amount of \$38.3 million was outstanding as of December 31, 2016, under this facility.

Eurobank Ergasias S.A.: On December 6, 2010, Navios Acquisition entered into a loan agreement with Eurobank Ergasias S.A. of up to \$52.0 million out of which \$46.2 million has been drawn (divided into two tranches of \$23.1 million each) to partially finance the acquisition costs of two LR1 product tanker vessels. Each tranche of the facility is repayable in 32 equal quarterly installments of \$0.31 million each with a final balloon payment of \$13.3 million, to be repaid on the last repayment date. The repayment of each tranche started three months after the delivery date of the respective vessel. It bears interest at a rate of LIBOR plus 300 bps. The loan also requires compliance with certain financial covenants. The amount of \$36.1 million was outstanding as of December 31, 2016, under this facility.

Norddeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale: On December 29, 2011, Navios Acquisition entered into a loan agreement with Norddeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale of up to \$28.1 million to partially finance the purchase price of one MR2 product tanker vessel. The facility is repayable in 32 quarterly installments of \$0.39 million each with a final balloon payment of \$15.6 million to be repaid on the last repayment date. The repayment started three months after the delivery of the vessel and bears interest at a rate of LIBOR plus: (a) up to but not including the drawdown date of, 175 bps per annum; (b) thereafter until, but not including, the tenth repayment date, 250 bps per annum; and (c) thereafter 300 bps per annum. The loan also requires compliance with certain financial covenants. During the first quarter of 2015, the facility was fully drawn and as of December 31, 2016, an amount of \$25.4 million was outstanding under this loan agreement.

DVB Bank S.E. and Credit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank: On December 29, 2011, Navios Acquisition entered into a loan agreement with DVB Bank SE and Investment Bank of up to \$56.3 million (divided into two tranches of \$28.1 million each) to partially finance the purchase price of two MR2 product tanker vessels. Each tranche of the facility is repayable in 32 quarterly installments of \$0.39 million each with a final balloon payment of \$15.6 million to be repaid on the last repayment date. The repayment started three months after the delivery of the respective vessel and bears interest at a rate of LIBOR plus: (a) up to but not including the drawdown date of, 175 bps per annum; (b) thereafter until, but not including, the tenth repayment date, 250 bps per annum; and (c) thereafter 300 bps per annum. The loan also requires compliance with certain financial covenants. As of December 31, 2016, an amount of \$48.8 million was outstanding.

Deutsche Bank AG Filiale Deutschlandgeschäft and Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken AB: In November 2015, Navios Acquisition, entered into a term loan facility of up to \$125.0 million (divided into five tranches) with Deutsche Bank AG Filiale Deutschlandgeschäft and Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken AB for the: (i) financing of the purchase price of the Nave Spherical; and (ii) the refinancing of the existing facility with Deutsche Bank AG Filiale Deutschlandgeschäft and Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken AB, dated July 18, 2014. Four of the five tranches of the facility are repayable in

20 quarterly installments of between approximately \$0.44 million and \$1.9 million, each with a final balloon repayment to be made on the last repayment date. The

Table of Contents

fifth tranche is repayable in 16 quarterly installments of between approximately \$0.7 million and \$0.8 million, each. The maturity date of the loan is in the fourth quarter of 2020. The credit facility bears interest at LIBOR plus 295 bps per annum.

On January 27, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Lucida to an unaffiliated third party for net cash proceeds of \$18.4 million. Navios Acquisition prepaid \$12.1 million being the respective tranche of the Deutsche Bank AG Filiale Deutschlandgeschäft and Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken AB facility that was drawn to finance the Nave Lucida. Following the prepayment in January 2016, an amount of \$0.2 million was written-off from the deferred financing cost. As of December 31, 2016, an amount of \$97.6 million was outstanding under this facility.

The Navios Holdings Credit Facilities: On November 11, 2014, Navios Acquisition entered into a short term credit facility with Navios Holdings pursuant to which Navios Acquisition may borrow up to \$200.0 million for general corporate purposes. The loan provided for an arrangement fee of \$4.0 million and bore a fixed interest of 600 bps. On November 13, 2014, the Company drew an amount of \$169.7 million from the facility. The facility matured and was fully repaid by December 29, 2014.

HSH Nordbank AG: On August 20, 2013, Navios Acquisition entered into a loan agreement with HSH Nordbank AG of up to \$40.3 million (divided in two tranches of \$20.2 million each), to partially finance the acquisition of two chemical tanker vessels. Each tranche of the facility was repayable in 28 quarterly installments of \$0.32 million with a final balloon payment of \$11.3 million to be paid on the last repayment date. The facility bore interest at a rate of LIBOR plus 320 bps. The loan also required compliance with certain financial covenants. On October 4, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Universe to an unaffiliated third party and prepaid \$16.4 million being the respective tranche of the HSH Nordbank AG facility that was drawn to finance the acquisition of the Nave Universe. On November 15, 2016, Navios Acquisition sold the Nave Constellation to an unaffiliated third party and prepaid \$16.4 million being the respective tranche of the HSH Nordbank AG facility that was drawn to finance the acquisition of the Nave Constellation. Following these prepayments in 2016, an amount of \$0.2 million was written-off from the deferred financing cost. As of December 31, 2016, no amount was outstanding.

BNP Paribas S.A. Bank: On December 18, 2015, Navios Acquisition, through certain of its wholly owned subsidiaries, entered into a term loan facility agreement of up to \$44.0 million with BNP Paribas, as agent and the lenders named therein, for the partial post-delivery financing of a LR1 product tanker and a MR2 product tanker. The facility is repayable in 12 equal consecutive semi-annual installments in the amount of \$2.0 million in aggregate, with a final balloon payment of \$20.0 million to be repaid on the last repayment date. The maturity date of the loan is in December 2021. The loan bears interest at LIBOR plus 230 bps per annum. As of December 31, 2016, an amount of \$40.0 million was outstanding under this facility.

ABN AMRO Bank N.V.: In February 2017, the Company drew \$26.7 million under this new credit facility with ABN AMRO Bank N.V. which is secured with its two chemical tankers, following the full repayment of the previous financing arrangements. The facility is repayable in four equal consecutive quarterly installments of \$0.7 million each, with a final balloon payment of the balance to be repaid on the last repayment date. The maturity date of the loan is in February 2018. The loan bears interest at LIBOR plus 400 bps per annum.

The loan facilities include, among other things, compliance with loan to value ratios and certain financial covenants: (i) minimum liquidity higher of \$40.0 million or \$1.0 million per vessel; (ii) net worth ranging from \$50.0 million to \$135.0 million; and (iii) total liabilities divided by total assets, adjusted for market values to be lower than 75%. It is an event of default under the credit facilities if such covenants are not complied with, including the loan to value ratios for which the Company may provide sufficient additional security to prevent such an event.

Table of Contents

As of December 31, 2016, the Company was in compliance with its covenants.

Amounts drawn under the facilities are secured by first preferred mortgages on Navios Acquisition's vessels and other collateral and are guaranteed by each vessel-owning subsidiary. The credit facilities contain a number of restrictive covenants that prohibit or limit Navios Acquisition from, among other things: incurring or guaranteeing indebtedness; entering into affiliate transactions; changing the flag, class, management or ownership of Navios Acquisition's vessels; changing the commercial and technical management of Navios Acquisition's vessels; selling Navios Acquisition's vessels; and subordinating the obligations under each credit facility to any general and administrative costs relating to the vessels, including the fixed daily fee payable under the management agreement. The credit facilities also require Navios Acquisition to comply with the ISM Code and ISPS Code and to maintain valid safety management certificates and documents of compliance at all times.

C. Research and development, patents and licenses, etc.

Not applicable.

D. Trend information

Our results of operations depend primarily on the charter hire rates that we are able to realize for our vessels, which depend on the demand and supply dynamics characterizing the tanker market at any given time. For other trends affecting our business, please see other discussions in Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects.

E. Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

Charter hire payments to third parties for chartered-in vessels are treated as operating leases for accounting purposes. As of December 31, 2016, Navios Acquisition was contingently liable to charter-in certain vessels from Navios Midstream. Please see discussion in Item 5F. Contractual Obligations and Contingencies.

F. Contractual Obligations and Contingencies

The following table summarizes our long-term contractual obligations as of December 31, 2016:

(In thousands of U.S. dollars)	Payments due by period (Unaudited) ⁽¹⁾				Total
	Less than 1 year	1-3 years	3-5 years	More than 5 years	
Long-term debt obligations ⁽¹⁾	\$ 56,402	\$ 194,198	\$ 809,852	\$ 50,781	\$ 1,111,233
Total contractual obligations	\$ 56,402	\$ 194,198	\$ 809,852	\$ 50,781	\$ 1,111,233

(1) The amount identified does not include interest costs associated with the outstanding credit facilities, which are based on LIBOR, plus the costs of complying with any applicable regulatory requirements and a margin ranging from 250 bps to 325 bps per annum or the \$670.0 million 2021 Notes which have a fixed rate of 8.125%.

Navios Holdings, Navios Acquisition and Navios Partners have made available to Navios Europe I revolving loans up to \$24.1 million to fund working capital requirements (collectively, the Navios Revolving Loans I). As of December 31, 2016, the amount undrawn under the Navios Revolving Loans I was \$9.1 million, of which Navios Acquisition was committed to fund \$4.3 million. See Note 8 for the Investment in Navios Europe I.

Navios Holdings, Navios Acquisition and Navios Partners have made available to Navios Europe II revolving loans up to \$43.5 million to fund working capital requirements (collectively, the Navios Revolving

Table of Contents

Loans II). As of December 31, 2016, the amount undrawn under the Navios Revolving Loans II was \$19.1 million, of which Navios Acquisition was committed to fund \$9.1 million. In March 2017 the availability under the Navios Revolving Loans II was increased by \$14.0 million. See Note 8 for the Investment in Navios Europe II.

On November 18, 2014, Navios Acquisition entered into backstop agreements with Navios Midstream. In accordance with the terms of the backstop agreements, Navios Acquisition has provided backstop commitments for a two-year period as of the redelivery of each of the Nave Celeste, the Shinyo Ocean and the Shinyo Kannika from their original charters, at a net rate of \$35,000, \$38,400 and \$38,025, respectively. Navios Midstream has currently entered into new charter contracts for the above vessels with third parties upon their redelivery in first quarter of 2017. Those contracts provide for index linked charter rates or pool earnings as the case may be. Backstop commitments will be triggered if the actual rates achieved are below the backstop rates.

On September 19, 2016, Navios Acquisition entered into a \$70.0 million secured loan facility with Navios Holdings. Please refer to the relevant discussion below, under Related Party Transactions .

Critical Accounting Policies

Our consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with U.S. GAAP. The preparation of these financial statements requires us to make estimates in the application of our accounting policies based on the best assumptions, judgments and opinions of management. Following is a discussion of the accounting policies that involve a higher degree of judgment and the methods of their application that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities, revenues and expenses and related disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of our financial statements. Actual results may differ from these estimates under different assumptions or conditions.

Critical accounting policies are those that reflect significant judgments or uncertainties, and potentially result in materially different results under different assumptions and conditions. For a description of all of our significant accounting policies, see Note 2 to the Consolidated Financial Statements, included herein.

Fair Value of Vessels: As of December 31, 2016, Navios Acquisition owned and operated a fleet of 36 vessels, with an aggregate carrying value of \$1,317.1 million, including the unamortized portion of deferred drydock and special survey costs related to the vessel. On a vessel-by-vessel basis, as of December 31, 2016, the carrying value of 32 of Navios Acquisition's vessels (including the unamortized portion of deferred drydock and special survey costs related to the vessel) exceeds the estimated fair value of those same vessels by approximately \$211.9 million in the aggregate (the unrealized loss).

As of December 31, 2015, Navios Acquisition owned and operated a fleet of 39 vessels, with an aggregate carrying value of \$1,452.0 million, including the unamortized portion of deferred drydock and special survey costs related to the vessel. On a vessel-by-vessel basis, as of December 31, 2015, the carrying value of 14 of Navios Acquisition's vessels (including the unamortized portion of deferred drydock and special survey costs related to the vessel) exceeded the estimated fair value of those same vessels by approximately \$37.1 million in the aggregate (the unrealized loss).

Table of Contents

A vessel-by-vessel summary as of December 31, 2016 follows (with an * indicating those individual vessels whose carrying value exceeds its estimated fair value, including the related time charter, if any):

Vessel name	Date of Acquisition	Purchase Price	Carrying Value as of December 31, 2016
	(In millions of U.S. dollars)		
Nave Cielo	6/29/2010	\$ 44.2	\$ 32.2*
Nave Ariadne	7/2/2010	\$ 44.1	\$ 32.1*
Nave Cosmos	10/27/2010	\$ 31.8	\$ 25.5*
Nave Polaris	1/27/2011	\$ 31.8	\$ 25.9*
Nave Orbit	7/12/2011	\$ 37.3	\$ 29.8*
Nave Equator	7/18/2011	\$ 37.3	\$ 30.0*
Nave Andromeda	11/14/2011	\$ 44.3	\$ 37.4*
Nave Estella	1/20/2012	\$ 44.6	\$ 36.8*
Nave Atria	7/31/2012	\$ 37.6	\$ 31.6*
Nave Cassiopeia	8/31/2012	\$ 43.8	\$ 37.1*
Nave Cetus	10/31/2012	\$ 44.0	\$ 37.5*
Nave Aquila	11/9/2012	\$ 37.8	\$ 32.2*
Nave Bellatrix	1/24/2013	\$ 38.0	\$ 32.7*
Nave Orion	3/22/2013	\$ 38.1	\$ 32.9*
Nave Rigel	2/13/2013	\$ 47.9	\$ 41.2*
Nave Atropos	4/24/2013	\$ 48.2	\$ 41.9*
Nave Titan	6/10/2013	\$ 37.1	\$ 32.4*
Nave Capella	7/9/2013	\$ 37.2	\$ 32.5*
Nave Alderamin	9/3/2013	\$ 37.3	\$ 32.9*
Nave Equinox	6/26/2013	\$ 23.5	\$ 19.9*
Nave Pulsar	7/9/2013	\$ 23.6	\$ 20.1*
Bougainville	9/30/2013	\$ 35.6	\$ 31.4*
Nave Dorado	9/24/2013	\$ 16.8	\$ 15.1*
Nave Jupiter	5/7/2014	\$ 39.6	\$ 35.9*
Nave Luminosity	9/19/2014	\$ 39.6	\$ 36.4*
Nave Pyxis	11/20/2014	\$ 33.4	\$ 30.9*
Nave Galactic	2/4/2014	\$ 53.5	\$ 47.5
Nave Quasar	2/12/2014	\$ 54.7	\$ 50.6
Nave Buena Suerte	3/10/2014	\$ 57.2	\$ 53.8
Nave Neutrino	6/16/2014	\$ 43.7	\$ 38.4*
Nave Synergy	12/09/2014	\$ 76.9	\$ 70.2*
Nave Electron	7/21/2014	\$ 41.2	\$ 36.7*
Nave Sextans	1/8/2015	\$ 33.4	\$ 31.1
Nave Velocity	2/11/2015	\$ 39.2	\$ 36.6*
Nave Spherical	11/6/2015	\$ 69.2	\$ 65.8*
Nave Photon	12/2/2015	\$ 65.2	\$ 62.1*
		\$ 1,508.7	\$ 1,317.1

Although the aforementioned excess of carrying value over fair value represents an estimate of the loss that Navios Acquisition would sustain on a hypothetical disposition of those vessels as of December 31, 2016, the recognition of the unrealized loss absent a disposition (i.e., as an impairment) would require, among other things, that a triggering event had occurred and that the undiscounted cash flows attributable to the vessel are also less than the carrying value of the vessel (including the unamortized portion of deferred drydock and special survey costs related to the vessel).

Table of Contents

Use of Estimates: The preparation of consolidated financial statements in conformity with U.S. GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and the disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities as of the dates of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting periods. On an on-going basis, management evaluates the estimates and judgments, including those related to uncompleted voyages, future drydock dates, the selection of useful lives for tangible assets and scrap value expected future cash flows from long-lived assets to support impairment tests, provisions necessary for accounts receivable, provisions for legal disputes, and contingencies and the valuation estimates inherent in the deconsolidation gain. Management bases its estimates and judgments on historical experience and on various other factors that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances, the results of which form the basis for making judgments about the carrying values of assets and liabilities that are not readily apparent from other sources. Actual results could differ from those estimates under different assumptions and/or conditions.

Vessels, Net: Vessels are stated at historical cost, which consists of the contract price, delivery and acquisition expenses and capitalized interest costs while under construction. Vessels acquired in an asset acquisition or in a business combination are recorded at fair value. Subsequent expenditures for major improvements and upgrading are capitalized, provided they appreciably extend the life, increase the earning capacity or improve the efficiency or safety of the vessels. Expenditures for routine maintenance and repairs are expensed as incurred.

Depreciation is computed using the straight line method over the useful life of the vessels, after considering the estimated residual value. Management estimates the residual values of our tanker vessels based on a scrap value cost of steel times the weight of the ship noted in lightweight ton (LWT). Residual values are periodically reviewed and revised to recognize changes in conditions, new regulations or other reasons. Revisions of residual values affect the depreciable amount of the vessels and affects depreciation expense in the period of the revision and future periods. The management after considering current market trends for scrap rates and 10-year average historical scrap rates of the residual values of the Company's vessels, estimates scrap value at a rate of \$360 per LWT. Management estimates the useful life of our vessels to be 25 years from the vessel's original construction. However, when regulations place limitations over the ability of a vessel to trade on a worldwide basis, its useful life is re-estimated to end at the date such regulations become effective.

Impairment of long-lived Asset Group: Vessels, other fixed assets and other long-lived assets held and used by Navios Acquisition are reviewed periodically for potential impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of a particular asset may not be fully recoverable. Navios Acquisition's management evaluates the carrying amounts and periods over which long-lived assets are depreciated to determine if events or changes in circumstances have occurred that would require modification to their carrying values or useful lives. In evaluating useful lives and carrying values of long-lived assets, certain indicators of potential impairment are reviewed such as, undiscounted projected operating cash flows, vessel sales and purchases, business plans and overall market conditions.

Undiscounted projected net operating cash flows are determined for each asset group (consisting of the individual vessel and the intangible, if any, with respect to the time charter agreement attached to that vessel) and compared to the vessel carrying value and related carrying value of the intangible with respect to the time charter agreement attached to that vessel or the carrying value of deposits for newbuildings; if any. Within the shipping industry, vessels are often bought and sold with a charter attached. The value of the charter may be favorable or unfavorable when comparing the charter rate to then current market rates. The loss recognized either on impairment (or on disposition) will reflect the excess of carrying value over fair value (selling price) for the vessel individual asset group.

As of March 31, 2014, the Company had a current expectation that, more likely than not, the Shinyo Splendor would be sold before the end of its previously estimated useful life, and, as a result, performed an impairment test of the

specific asset group. The recoverability test was based on undiscounted cash flows

Table of Contents

expected to result from the entity's use and eventual disposition of the asset. The significant factors and assumptions used in the undiscounted projected net operating cash flow analysis included determining the net operating cash flows by considering the charter revenues from the existing time charter until its expiration, net of brokerage and address commissions and management fees and an estimate of sale proceeds from its disposal based on market valuations for such vessel. The carrying amount of the asset group was more than its undiscounted future cash flows. As a result, the entity failed the recoverability test (step one) of the impairment test and proceeded with step two of the impairment analysis. An impairment loss in the amount of \$10.7 million was recognized on this asset group as the carrying amount of the asset group was not recoverable and exceeded its fair value as of March 31, 2014. The Shinyo Splendor was sold on May 6, 2014 to an unaffiliated third party for a net cash consideration of \$18.3 million (refer to Note 5 Vessels, Net).

During the fourth quarter of fiscal 2016, management concluded that, although market rates were at healthy levels during the year, however, events occurred and circumstances had changed, over previous years, which indicated the potential impairment of Navios Acquisition's long-lived assets may exist. These indicators included continued volatility in the charter market and the related impact of the tanker sector has on management's expectation for future revenues. As a result, an impairment assessment of long-lived assets or identified asset groups was performed.

The Company determined undiscounted projected net operating cash flows for each vessel and compared it to the vessel's carrying value together with the carrying value of the related intangible. The significant factors and assumptions used in the undiscounted projected net operating cash flow analysis included: determining the projected net operating cash flows by considering the charter revenues from existing time charters for the fixed fleet days (Company's remaining charter agreement rates) and an estimated daily time charter equivalent for the unfixed days (based on the 10-year average historical one year time charter rates) over the remaining economic life of each vessel, net of brokerage and address commissions, excluding days of scheduled off-hires, management fees fixed until May 2018 and thereafter assuming an annual increase of 3.0% and utilization rate of 99.7% based on the fleets historical performance.

We determine projected cash flows for unfixed days using an estimated daily time charter rate based on the 10-year historical average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels or the 10-year average spot rate for chemical tankers since the 10-year average rates of a one-year time charter are not available for chemical tankers). We consider this approach to be reasonable and appropriate. However, for the purposes of presenting our investors with additional information to determine how the Company's future results of operations may be impacted, we set forth below an analysis that shows the five-year, three-year and one-year historical averages (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels or the average spot rate for chemical tankers) in lieu of the 10-year historical average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels or the average spot rate for chemical tankers) and the effect the use of each of these rates would have on the Company's impairment analysis.

	December 31, 2016		December 31, 2015	
	Number of	Amount (U.S.	Number of	Amount (U.S.
	vessels ^(*)	millions) ^(**)	vessels ^(*)	millions) ^(**)
5-year historical average rate				
3-year historical average rate				
1-year historical average rate				

(*) Number of vessels the carrying value of which would not have been recovered.

(**) Aggregate carrying value that exceeds the estimated fair value (the unrealized loss).

In connection with its impairment testing on its vessels as of December 31, 2016, the Company performed sensitivity analysis on the most sensitive and/or subjective assumptions that have the potential to affect the outcome of the test, principally the projected charter rate used to forecast future cash flow for unfixed days. In that regard, there would continue to be no impairment required to be recognized on any of the Company's vessels when

Table of Contents

assuming a decline in the 10-year average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels), which is the rate that the Group uses to forecast future cash flows for unfixed days, ranging from 18.0% to 53.0% (depending on the vessel).

In addition, the Company compared the 10-year historical average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels) with the five-year historical average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels), three-year historical average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels), and one-year average (for similar vessels). A comparison of the 10-year historical average and the rates for five-year, three-year and one-year historical average follows (as of December 31, 2016):

	Historical Average of One-year Charter Rates (over Various Periods) vs. the 10-year Historical Average (of the One-Year Charter Rate)		
	5-Year Average	3-Year Average	1-Year Average
	(% above/ (below/ or above) the 10-year average)		
Chemicals	(1.5%)	1.3%	(28.7%)
MR2s	(9.6%)	(5.1%)	(9.5%)
LR1s	(12.1%)	(1.5%)	(7.0%)
VLCCs	(19.7%)	(2.4%)	(5.3%)

As disclosed elsewhere, the fleet includes 32 vessels for which the carrying value exceeds the estimated fair value of those same vessels by approximately \$211.9 million in the aggregate (the unrealized loss). If testing for impairment using historical rates for five-year, three-year historical average of the one-year charter rate (for similar vessels), and one-year charters historical average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels) in lieu of the 10-year historical average (of the one-year charter rate for similar vessels), the Company estimates that none of its vessels, respectively, would have carrying values in excess of their projected undiscounted future cash flows.

The assessment concluded that step two of the impairment analysis was not required and no impairment of vessels, existed as of December 31, 2016, as the undiscounted projected net operating cash flows exceeded the carrying value.

In the event that impairment would occur, the fair value of the related asset would be determined and a charge would be recognized in the statements of income calculated by comparing the asset's carrying value to its fair value. Fair value is estimated primarily through the use of third-party valuations performed on an individual vessel basis.

Although management believes the underlying assumptions supporting this assessment are reasonable, if charter rate trends and the length of the current market downturn vary significantly from our forecasts, management may be required to perform step two of the impairment analysis in the future that could expose Navios Acquisition to material impairment charges in the future.

Impairment loss recognized amounted to \$0, \$0 and \$10.7 million for the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Revenue Recognition: Revenue is recorded when services are rendered, under a signed charter agreement or other evidence of an arrangement, the price is fixed or determinable, and collection is reasonably assured. Revenue is generated from the voyage charter and the time charter of vessels.

Voyage revenues for the transportation of cargo are recognized ratably over the estimated relative transit time of each voyage. Voyage expenses are recognized as incurred. A voyage is deemed to commence when a

Table of Contents

vessel is available for loading and is deemed to end upon the completion of the discharge of the current cargo. Estimated losses on voyages are provided for in full at the time such losses become evident. Under a voyage charter, a vessel is provided for the transportation of specific goods between specific ports in return for payment of an agreed upon freight per ton of cargo.

Revenues from time chartering of vessels are accounted for as operating leases and are thus recognized on a straight-line basis as the average revenue over the rental periods of such charter agreements, as service is performed. A time charter involves placing a vessel at the charterers' disposal for a period of time during which the charterer uses the vessel in return for the payment of a specified daily hire rate. Under time charters, operating costs such as for crews, maintenance and insurance are typically paid by the owner of the vessel.

Profit-sharing revenues are calculated at an agreed percentage of the excess of the charterer's average daily income (calculated on a quarterly or half-yearly basis) over an agreed amount and accounted for on an accrual basis based on provisional amounts and for those contracts that provisional accruals cannot be made due to the nature of the profit share elements, these are accounted for on the actual cash settlement. Profit sharing for the years ended December 31, 2016, December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 amounted to \$7.6 million, \$32.1 million and \$6.7 million, respectively.

Revenues are recorded net of address commissions. Address commissions represent a discount provided directly to the charterers based on a fixed percentage of the agreed upon charter or freight rate. Since address commissions represent a discount (sales incentive) on services rendered by the Company and no identifiable benefit is received in exchange for the consideration provided to the charterer, these commissions are presented as a reduction of revenue.

Pooling arrangements: For vessels operating in pooling arrangements, the Company earns a portion of total revenues generated by the pool, net of expenses incurred by the pool. The amount allocated to each pool participant vessel, including the Company's vessels, is determined in accordance with an agreed-upon formula, which is determined by the margins awarded to each vessel in the pool based on the vessel's age, design and other performance characteristics. Revenue under pooling arrangements is accounted for on the accrual basis and is recognized when an agreement with the pool exists, price is fixed, service is provided and the collectability is reasonably assured. Revenue for vessels operating in pooling arrangements amounted to \$50.8 million, \$43.4 million and \$17.0 million, for the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

The allocation of such net revenue may be subject to future adjustments by the pool however, such changes are not expected to be material.

Investments in Equity Securities: Navios Acquisition evaluates its investment in Navios Midstream, Navios Europe I and Navios Europe II for other than temporary impairment (OTTI) on a quarterly basis. Consideration is given to (i) the length of time and the extent to which the fair value has been less than the carrying value, (ii) the financial condition and near-term prospects of Navios Midstream, Navios Europe I and Navios Europe II, and (iii) the intent and ability of the Company to retain its investment in Navios Midstream, Navios Europe I and Navios Europe II for a period of time sufficient to allow for any anticipated recovery in fair value.

Navios Acquisition considers whether the fair values of its equity method investments have declined below their carrying values whenever adverse events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value may not be recoverable. If we consider any such decline to be other-than-temporary (based on various factors, including historical financial results, economic and industry events resulting in changes in the affiliate's trading performance and the overall health of the affiliate's industry), then we would write down the carrying amount of the investment to its estimated fair value.

As of December 31, 2016, the aggregate carrying value of our investment in Navios Midstream was \$184.8 million or \$14.67 per unit, which represents our total ownership interest in the Partnership of 59.9%. The