

Navios Maritime Acquisition CORP
Form 20-F/A
August 29, 2013

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

FORM 20-F/A
Amendment No. 2

(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, 2012

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

(011) +37797982140

(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 Section 12(g) of the Act. None

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:

40,504,661 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

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

Non-Accelerated Filer

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 "Other" has been checked in response to the previous question, indicate by check mark which financial statement item the registrant has elected to follow.

Item 17

Item 18

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

Explanatory Note

This Amendment No. 2 (this Amendment No. 2) to the Annual Report on Form 20-F for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012 of Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation, which was originally filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 25, 2013 (the Original Form 20-F) and was amended on March 28, 2013 solely for the purpose of furnishing Interactive Data File disclosure (Amendment No. 1), is being filed solely for the purpose of providing additional disclosure, adding a subsection Exchange Act Section 13(r) Activities to the section Governmental and Other Regulations beginning on page 36 of the Original Report under Item 4.B., in response to certain comments from the Staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission in connection with its review of the Original Report with regard to Section 219 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 which added Section 13(r) to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

Other than as expressly set forth above with respect to Item 4.B., adding subsection Exchange Act Section 13(r) Activities , no other information in Item 4.B. has been updated and this Amendment No. 2 does not, and does not purport to, amend, update or restate the information in any other item of the Original Form 20-F, as amended by Amendment No. 1, or reflect any events that have occurred after the Original Form 20-F was initially filed.

Item 4. Information on the Company

B. Business Overview

Introduction

Navios Acquisition owns a large fleet of modern crude oil, refined petroleum product and chemical tankers providing world-wide 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.

Navios Acquisition's Fleet

As of March 21, 2013, our fleet consisted of a total of 29 double-hulled tanker vessels, aggregating approximately 3.3 million deadweight tons, or dwt. The fleet includes seven VLCC tankers (over 200,000 dwt per ship), which transport crude oil, eight Long Range 1 (LR1) product tankers (50,000-79,999 dwt per ship), 12 Medium Range 2 (MR2) product tankers (30,000-49,999 dwt per ship) and two chemical tankers (25,000 dwt per ship), which transport refined petroleum products and bulk liquid chemicals. Of the 29 vessels in our current fleet, we have taken delivery of seven VLCC tankers, seven LR1 tankers, five MR2 product tankers and two chemical tankers, and we expect to take delivery of five vessels in the remaining of 2013, and three vessels in 2014 based on current construction schedule. All the vessels that we have taken delivery of, as well as three of the MR2 and one of the LR1 product tankers that we will take delivery of during 2013, are currently chartered-out to high-quality counterparties, including affiliates of Shell, Formosa Petrochemical Corporation, Sinochem Group, SK Shipping and DOSCO (a wholly owned subsidiary of COSCO) with an average remaining charter period of approximately 2.8 years. As of March 19, 2013, we had charters covering 91.1% of available days in 2013, 56.4% of available days in 2014 and 36.2% of available days in 2015, based on the estimated scheduled delivery dates for vessels under construction.

Vessels	Type	Built/ Delivery Date	DWT	Net Charter Rate ⁽¹⁾	Profit Share	Expiration Date ⁽²⁾
Owned Vessels						
Nave Cielo	LR1 Product Tanker	2007	74,671	11,850 ^(3,4)	50%/50%	November 2013
Nave Ariadne	LR1 Product Tanker	2007	74,671	11,850 ^(3,4)	50%/50%	November 2013
Nave Cosmos	Chemical Tanker	2010	25,130	11,700 ⁽⁵⁾	50%/50%	August 2013
Nave Polaris	Chemical Tanker	2011	25,145	11,700 ⁽⁵⁾	50%/50%	July 2013
Shinyo Splendor	VLCC	1993	306,474	38,019	None	May 2014
Shinyo Navigator	VLCC	1996	300,549	42,705	None	December 2016
C. Dream	VLCC	2000	298,570	29,625	50% above \$30,000 40% above \$40,000	March 2019
Shinyo Ocean	VLCC	2001	281,395	38,400	50% above \$43,500	January 2017
Shinyo Kannika	VLCC	2001	287,175	38,025	50% above \$44,000	February 2017
Shinyo Saowalak	VLCC	2010	298,000	48,153	35% above \$54,388 40% above 59,388	June 2025

					50% above 69,388	
Shinyo Kieran	VLCC	2011	297,066	48,153	35% above \$54,388	June 2026
					40% above \$59,388	
					50% above \$69,388	
Buddy	MR2 Product Tanker	2009	50,470	21,503	None	October 2014
Bull	MR2 Product Tanker	2009	50,542	21,503	None	September 2014
Nave						
Andromeda	LR1 Product Tanker	2011	75,000	12,000 ⁽⁶⁾	100% up to \$15,000	November 2014
					50% above \$15,000	
Nave Estella	LR1 Product Tanker	2012	75,000	11,850 ⁽⁷⁾	90% up to 15,000	January 2015
					50% above \$15,000	
Nave Atria	MR2 Product Tanker	2012	49,992	13,331 ⁽⁸⁾	50% /50%	July 2015
Nave						
Cassiopeia	LR1 Product Tanker	2012	74,711	11,850 ⁽⁹⁾	50% /50%	August 2013
Nave Cetus	LR1 Product Tanker	2012	74,581	11,850 ⁽⁹⁾	50% /50%	October 2013
Nave Aquila	MR2 Product Tanker	2012	49,991	13,331 ⁽⁸⁾	50% /50%	November 2015
Nave Bellatrix	MR2 Product Tanker	2013	49,999	13,331 ⁽¹⁰⁾	50% /50%	January 2016
Nave Rigel	LR1 Product Tanker	2013	75,000	11,850 ⁽⁹⁾	50% /50%	February 2014
<u>Owned Vessels to be Delivered</u>						
TBN	LR1	Q2 2013	75,000	11,850 ⁽⁹⁾	50% /50%	
TBN	MR2	Q1 2013	50,000	13,331 ⁽¹⁰⁾	50% /50%	
TBN	MR2	Q1 2013	50,000	13,825 ⁽¹¹⁾	50%/50%	
TBN	MR2	Q2 2013	50,000	13,825 ⁽¹²⁾		
TBN	MR2	Q2 2013	50,000			
TBN	MR2	Q2 2014	50,000			
TBN	MR2	Q3 2014	50,000			
TBN	MR2	Q4 2014	50,000			

- (1) Net time charter-out rate per day (net of commissions).
- (2) Estimated dates assuming midpoint of redelivery of charterers.
- (3) On October 28, 2011, the charter contracts for the Nave Cielo and the Nave Ariadne were terminated prior to their original expiration in June 2013. Navios Acquisition entered into certain settlement agreements with the charterers that provide for an amount of approximately \$5.0 million to compensate for the early termination of the charters and to cover any outstanding receivables, out of which \$2.0 million will be settled in installments through June 2015.
- (4) Charterer's option to extend the charter for 6 months at same rate.
- (5) Charterer's option to extend for additional 6 months at \$12,188 (net) plus 50%/50% profit sharing.

- (6) Charterer's option to extend the charter for 1+1 years at \$13,000 (net) 1st optional year plus 100% profit up to \$16,000 plus 50/50% profit sharing above \$16,000; \$14,000 (net) 2nd optional year plus 100% profit up to \$17,000 plus 50/50% profit sharing above \$17,000. Profit sharing formula is calculated monthly and incorporates \$2,000 premium above the relevant index.
- (7) Charterer's option to extend the charter for 1+1 years at \$11,850 (net) 1st optional year plus 90% profit up to \$16,000 plus 50/50% profit sharing above \$16,000; \$11,850 (net) 2nd optional year plus 90% profit up to \$17,000 plus 50/50% profit sharing above \$17,000. Profit sharing formula is calculated monthly and incorporates \$2,000 premium above the relevant index.
- (8) Charter duration three years. Charterer's option to extend the charter for 1+ 1 years at \$14,566 (net) 1st optional year plus profit sharing; \$15,553 (net) 2nd optional year plus profit sharing. The profit sharing will be calculated monthly and profits will be split equally between each party. Profit sharing formula incorporates \$1,000 premium above the relevant index.
- (9) Charter duration one year. Charterer's option to extend the charter for another 6 months at \$11,850 (net) plus 50% profit sharing.
- (10) Charter duration three years. Charterer's option to extend the charter for 1 year at \$14,813 (net) plus profit sharing. The charterers will receive 100% of the first \$1,000 in profits above the base rate and the owners will receive 100% of the next \$1,000. Thereafter, all profits will be split equally to each party.
- (11) Charter duration three years. Charterer's option to extend the charter for 1 year at \$15,306 (net) plus profit sharing. The charterers will receive 100% of the first \$1,000 in profits above the base rate and the owners will receive 100% of the next \$1,000. Thereafter, all profits will be split equally to each party.
- (12) Charter duration one year. Charterer's option to extend for 1 year at \$14,813.

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 \$1.0 billion, including investments of approximately \$0.6 billion in newbuilding constructions. As of March 19, 2013, our fleet had an average age of approximately 5.9 years. Once we have taken delivery of all of our vessels, scheduled to occur by the end of the fourth quarter of 2014, the average age of our fleet will be 5.3 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.

Operating Visibility Through Contracted Revenues. All of the vessels that we have taken delivery of as of March 21, 2013, as well as the three MR2 and one LR1 product tanker vessels that we will take delivery of in the first and second quarter of 2013, are chartered out with an average remaining charter period of approximately 2.8 years, and we believe our existing charter coverage provides us with predictable, contracted revenues and operating visibility. As of March 21, 2013, we had charters covering 91.1% of available days in 2013, 56.4% of available days in 2014 and 36.2% of available days in 2015, based on the estimated scheduled delivery dates for vessels under construction. The charter arrangements for our seven VLCC tankers, eight contracted LR1 tankers, eight MR2 product tankers and two chemical tankers represent \$ 179.4 million in 2013, \$142.0 million in 2014 and \$111.5 million in 2015 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 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, Dalian Ocean Shipping Company (DOSCO), a wholly owned subsidiary of COSCO, one of China's largest state owned enterprises specializing in global shipping, logistics and ship building and repairing, Sinochem, a Fortune Global 500 company; Formosa Petrochemical Corporation, a leading Taiwanese energy company; Navig8, a company that controls a substantial fleet of product tankers and SK Shipping Company Limited, a leading Korean shipowner and transportation company and part of the Korean multinational business conglomerate, the SK Group; or their affiliates.

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 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 20 years of experience in the shipping industry. Ms. Frangou is also the Chairman and CEO of Navios Holdings and Navios Partners 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.

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 long term time charters, to provide us with potential incremental revenue above the contracted minimum charter rates. Depending on 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 March 19, 2013, we had charters covering 91.1% of available days in 2013, 56.4% of available days in 2014 and 36.2% of available days in 2015, based on the estimated scheduled delivery dates for vessels under construction. We will look to secure employment for the newbuilding product tankers scheduled for delivery over the next three years, as we draw nearer to taking

delivery of the vessels.

Capitalize on Low Vessel Prices. We intend to grow our fleet using Navios Holdings' global network of relationships and extensive experience in the marine transportation industry to make selective acquisitions of young, high quality, modern, double hulled vessels in the crude oil, product and chemical tanker transportation sectors. We are focused on purchasing tanker assets at favorable prices. We believe that the recent financial crisis and developments in the marine transportation industry created significant opportunities to acquire vessels in the tanker market near historically low prices on an inflation adjusted basis. Developments in the banking industry continue to limit the availability of credit to shipping industry participants, creating opportunities for well capitalized companies with access to additional available financing. Although there has been a trend towards consolidation over the past 15 years, the tanker market remains fragmented. In the ordinary course of our business, we engage in the evaluation of potential candidates for acquisitions and strategic transactions.

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, as is currently the case, 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 Leading Risk Management Practices and Corporate Managerial Support. Risk management requires the balancing of a number of factors in a cyclical and potentially volatile environment. Fundamentally, the challenge is to appropriately allocate capital to competing opportunities of owning or chartering vessels. 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. Navios Holdings has established policies designed to ensure that contracts are entered into with counterparties that have appropriate credit history. Counterparties and cash transactions are limited to high credit, quality collateralized corporations and financial institutions. Navios Holdings has strict guidelines and policies that are designed to limit the amount of credit exposure. We believe that Navios Acquisition will benefit from these established policies.

Implement and Sustain a Competitive Cost Structure. Pursuant to the Management Agreement, the Manager, a subsidiary of Navios Holdings, coordinates and oversees the commercial, technical and administrative management of our fleet. The current technical managers of the VLCC vessels, affiliates of the seller of such vessels, are technical ship management companies that have provided technical management to the VLCC vessels prior to the consummation of the VLCC Acquisition. 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 management agreement with Navios Holdings, management fees of our vessels are fixed for the first two years of the agreement. 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 2012 were: DOSCO and STX Panocean Co. LTD. For the year ended December 31, 2012, these two customers accounted for 43.3% and 10.7%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition s revenue. For the year ended December 31, 2011, DOSCO, Blue Light Chartering Inc and Jacob Tank Chartering GMBH & CO. KG

accounted for 43.9%, 11.5% and 11.3%, respectively, of Navios Acquisition's revenue. For the year ended December 31, 2010, Jacob Tank Chartering GMBH & CO. KG, SK Shipping Company Ltd, DOSCO, Formosa Petrochemical Corporation, Blue Light Chartering Inc and Navig8 Chemicals Shipping and Trading Co. accounted for 42.5%, 18.6%, 12.9%, 12.9% and 10.9%, 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.

Expenses

Management fees: Pursuant to a Management Agreement dated May 28, 2010, Navios Tankers Management Inc. (the Manager), a subsidiary of Navios Holdings, provides for five years from the closing of the Company's initial vessel acquisition, commercial and technical management services to Navios Acquisition's vessels for a daily fee of \$6,000 per owned MR2 product tanker and chemical tanker vessel and \$7,000 per owned LR1 product tanker vessel and \$10,000 per VLCC tanker vessel for the first two years. On May 4, 2012, Navios Acquisition amended its existing Management Agreement with the Manager, to fix the fees for ship management

services of its owned fleet at current rates for two additional years, through May 28, 2014. This daily fee covers all of the vessels' operating expenses, other than certain fees and costs. During the remaining one year of the term of the Management Agreement, Navios Acquisition expects it will reimburse Navios Holdings for all of the actual operating costs and expenses it incurs in connection with the management of its fleet. Actual operating costs and expenses will be determined in a manner consistent with how the initial fixed fees were determined. Drydocking expenses are fixed for the first four years under these agreements for up to \$0.3 million per LR1 and MR2 product tanker vessel and will be reimbursed at cost for VLCC vessels. Commencing as of March 30, 2012, Navios Acquisition can, upon request to the Manager, partially or fully defer the reimbursement of drydocking and other extraordinary fees and expenses under the Agreement to a later date, but not later than January 4, 2014, and if reimbursed on a later date, such amounts will bear interest at a rate of 1% per annum over LIBOR. Commencing as of September 28, 2012, Navios Acquisition could, upon request, reimburse the Manager partially or fully, for any fixed management fees outstanding for a period of not more than nine months under the Agreement at a later date, but not later than December 31, 2014, and if reimbursed on a later date, such amounts will bear interest at a rate of 1% per annum over LIBOR. Total management fees for the years ended December 31, 2012, 2011 and 2010 amounted to \$47.0 million, \$35.7 million and \$9.8 million, respectively.

General and administrative expenses: On May 28, 2010, Navios Acquisition entered into an administrative services agreement with Navios Holdings, expiring on May 28, 2015, pursuant to which a subsidiary of 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. Navios Holdings is reimbursed for reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with the provision of these services. For the years ended December 31, 2012, 2011 and 2010, the fees for administrative services rendered by Navios Holdings amounted to \$2.1 million, \$1.5 million and \$0.4 million, respectively.

Off-hire

When the vessel is off-hire, the charterer generally is not required to pay the basic 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. Under 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.

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 a 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 we have with Navios Holdings and the administrative services agreement we have with Navios Holdings, please read Item 7. Unit holders 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 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. 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 of charter agreements 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 by multiple oil majors. The technical manager is responsible for obtaining and maintaining the vetting approvals required to operate our vessels. The current technical manager of the VLCC vessels, an affiliate of the seller of such vessels, is a technical ship management company that has provided technical management to the acquired VLCC vessels prior to the consummation of the VLCC Acquisition, and such technical manager has been vetted and approved. This technical manager 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.

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.

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.

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.

Ship safety regulation

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.

Security Regulations

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, there have been a variety of initiatives intended to enhance vessel security. On November 25, 2002, 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 SOLAS created a new chapter of the convention dealing specifically with maritime security. The new chapter went into effect on July 1, 2004, and imposes various detailed security obligations on vessels and port authorities, most of which are contained in the 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 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 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 higher 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 sulphur 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 sulphur 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, initially to 3.5% (from the previous cap of 4.5%), with effect from January 1, 2012, then progressively reducing to 0.50% effective from January 1, 2020, subject to a feasibility review to be completed no later than 2018; and the establishment of new tiers of stringent nitrogen oxide emissions standards for marine engines, depending on their date of installation. We anticipate incurring costs in complying with these more stringent standards.

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. Such ECAs have been formally adopted for the Baltic Sea and the North Sea including the English Channel and North America, including Canada and the United States. In addition, the United States Caribbean Sea ECA came into force on January 1, 2013 having effect from January 1, 2014. For the currently-designated ECAs, much lower sulfur limits on fuel oil content are being phased in (1% from July 2010 and 0.1% from January 1, 2015), as well as nitrogen oxide after treatment requirements that will become applicable to the Baltic and North Sea ECAs in 2016. These more stringent fuel standards, when fully in effect, are expected to require measures such as fuel switching, vessel modification adding distillate fuel storage capacity, or addition of exhaust gas cleaning scrubbers, to achieve compliance, and may require installation and operation of further control equipment at significant increased cost.

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. All of our newbuild tanker vessels 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 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. The European Union 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. That deadline

has now expired and it remains to be seen what position the EU takes in this regard in period ahead. 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 in early 2013. This may be seen as indicative of an intention to maintain pressure on the international negotiating process. In the United States, in 2007 the California Attorney General and a coalition of environmental groups petitioned the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA, in October 2007 to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from ocean-going ships under the Clean Air Act, and in 2010 another coalition of environmental groups filed suit to require the EPA to do the same. Any passage of climate control legislation or other regulatory initiatives by the IMO, European Union, or individual countries where we operate, including the U.S. that restrict emissions of greenhouse gases from vessels could require us to make significant financial expenditures we cannot predict with certainty at this time.

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. The BWM Convention will not enter into force until 12 months after it has been adopted by 30 states, the combined merchant fleets of

which represent not less than 35% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant shipping. To date, there has not been sufficient adoption of this standard by member-states representing enough of the gross tonnage of the world's fleet for it to take force. However, as of January 31, 2013, the Convention has been ratified by 36 states, representing 29.07% of the global merchant shipping fleet's gross tonnage and its entry-into-force with attendant compliance costs may therefore be anticipated in the foreseeable future.

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. 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 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 offence 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 on grounds which the international maritime community has found hard to understand. 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 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 currently limits liability of the responsible party for single-hull tank vessels over 3,000 gross tons liability to the greater of \$3,200 per gross ton or \$23.5 million (this amount is reduced to \$6.4 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 \$2,000 per gross ton or \$17.0 million (or \$4.27 million for a vessel less than 3,000 gross tons), whichever is greater. These amounts are periodically adjusted for inflation. These limits of liability 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.

In response to the Deepwater Horizon incident in the Gulf of Mexico, in 2010 the U.S. Congress has proposed, but has not formally adopted legislation that would amend OPA to mandate stronger safety standards and increased liability and financial responsibility for offshore drilling operations, but the bill did not seek to change the OPA liability limits applicable to vessels. 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 \$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.

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 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. We intend to comply with all applicable state regulations in the ports where our vessels call.

The United States Clean Water Act 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 Clean Water Act 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, or 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. Compliance with the conditions of the VGP is required for commercial vessels 79 feet in length or longer (other than commercial fishing vessels.) In November 2011, the EPA issued a revised draft Vessel General Permit that is expected to go into effect in 2013. This new VGP will impose a numeric standard to control the release of non-indigenous invasive species in ballast water discharges. In addition, through the CWA certification provisions that allow US 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.

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 with the applicable engine and fuel standards of MARPOL Annex VI, including the stricter North America Emission Control Area (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. MARPOL 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, the U.S. Coast Guard has since 1990 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. In October 2010, the U.S. Coast Guard proposed a rule that would make its VCS requirements more compatible with new EPA and State regulations, reflect changes in VCS technology, and codify existing U.S. Coast Guard guidelines. It appears unlikely that the updated U.S. Coast Guard rule when finalized will impose a material increase in costs.

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 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 Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (The OPA) discussed below, 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 January 31, 2013 it was in effect in 68 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, shipowner's rights to limit liability for maritime pollution in such jurisdictions may be uncertain.

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. 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. 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.

Exchange Act Section 13(r) Activities

Section 219 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 added Section 13(r) to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the Exchange Act). Section 13(r) requires an issuer to disclose in its annual or quarterly reports, as applicable, whether it or any of its affiliates knowingly engaged in certain activities, transactions or dealings relating to Iran or with certain natural persons or entities designated by the U.S. Treasury Department. Disclosure is required even where the activities, transactions or dealings are conducted outside the United States by non-U.S. affiliates in compliance with applicable law, and whether or not the activities are sanctionable under U.S. law.

Three VLCC, vessels owned by the Company and chartered to Dalian Ocean Shipping Co. (DOSCO) and one VLCC vessel owned by the Company and chartered to Formosa Petrochemical Corporation of Taiwan (FPCT), made port calls to Iran during 2012 for a combined length of approximately 15 days for the transportation of crude oil from Iran to China and Taiwan. The shipper of the cargo in all cases was National Iranian Oil Company (NIOC), and the recipients of the cargoes were, respectively, Unipac Asia Company Limited, HK Intertrade Company Limited, and Formosa Petrochemical. Exchange Act Section 13(r)(1)(D)(iii) requires disclosure in an issuer's annual or quarterly report, as applicable, if, during the period covered by the report, the Company or any of its affiliates knowingly conducted any transaction or dealing with any person or entity identified under Section 560.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to the definition of the Government of Iran) without the specific authorization of a U.S. Federal department or agency. NIOC is an entity identified as the Government of Iran under the cited provision. Neither the Company, nor, to the knowledge of the Company, DOSCO and FPCT had any contact or dealings with the government of Iran or affiliates of the government of Iran in connection with these port calls, other than receiving cargo owned by NIOC.

The foregoing contacts were limited to a routine acceptance and loading of cargo for the benefit of DOSCO and FPCT while the vessels were on charter to and under complete operational control of DOSCO and FPCT. Although NIOC was an entity whose name appeared on the U.S. Office of Foreign Assets Control's List of Blocked Persons and Specially Designated Nationals at the time of the port calls, the purchase and lifting of crude oil shipped by that entity, did not constitute prohibited activity by the Company as a non-U.S. person, and as such, this did not have any legal compliance consequence for the Company as a non-U.S. person and to the Company's transactions, which had no U.S. nexus. The acceptance and transportation of the crude oil to China also did not constitute sanctionable activity under U.S. Iran sanctions laws.

The Company's aggregate gross revenues attributable to these 15 days of port calls was approximately \$0.7 million. In light of the immaterial amount of port calls associated with these activities, the Company has not attributed any profits to these activities. Since May 2012, the Company's vessels performed no voyages involving calls to Iran. Notwithstanding the foregoing, there can be no assurance that one or more charterers of the Company will not at any future time perform voyages which, if so performed, would require disclosure pursuant to Exchange Act Section 13(r).

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 Navios

Acquisition believes that its 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

Navios Acquisition has obtained marine hull and machinery and war risk insurance, which includes the risk of actual or constructive total loss, for all of its vessels. The vessels will each be covered up to at least fair market value, with deductibles in amounts ranging between \$100,000 and \$250,000, depending on the size of the tanker vessel. Navios Acquisition has also extended its 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, including a piracy seizure.

Navios Acquisition has arranged, as necessary, increased value insurance for its vessels. With the increased value insurance, in case of total loss of the vessel, Navios Acquisition 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 under insurance. Navios Acquisition does not expect to maintain loss of hire insurance for its 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 provided by mutual protection and indemnity associations, or P&I Associations, which covers Navios Acquisition's third-party liabilities in connection with the operation of its ships. This includes third-party liability and other related expenses of 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.

Navios Acquisition's protection and indemnity insurance 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 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 \$9.0 million of every claim. In every claim the amount in excess of \$9.0 million and up to \$70.0 million is shared by the clubs under a pooling agreement. Any claim in excess of \$70.0 million is reinsured by the International Group 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, overspill protection has been placed by the International Group for claims up to \$1 billion in excess of \$2.07 billion, i.e. \$3.07 billion in total. For passengers and crew claims the overall limit is \$3.0 billion any one even any one vessel with a sub-limit of \$2.0 billion for passengers.

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 its 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.

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 do not own any real estate or other physical property. Our headquarters are located at 85 Akti Miaouli Street, Piraeus, Greece 185 38. 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, expiring 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. See Item 7B-Related Party Transactions the Administrative Services Agreement.

Legal Proceedings

To the knowledge of management, there is no litigation currently pending or contemplated against us or any of our officers or directors in their capacity as such.

Item 19. Exhibits

Exhibit

No.	Description
12.1	Certification by principal executive officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. +
12.2	Certification by principal financial officer pursuant to section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. +

+ Filed herewith.

SIGNATURES

Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation hereby certifies that it meets all of the requirements for filing on Form 20-F and that it has duly caused and authorized the undersigned to sign this Amendment No. 2 on Form 20-F/A to its Annual Report on Form 20-F for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012 to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned.

Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation

/s/ Angeliki Frangou
By: Angeliki Frangou

Its: Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Date: August 29, 2013